SHRI G. MURAHARI: I draw your attention to the fact that the Public Accounts Committee is a Joint Committee of the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha and if any Report is to be referred back to the Public Accounts Committee I feel that it is the duty of both the Houses together to take such a course. The Public Accounts Committee's Report is presented to both the Houses; it is laid on the Table of this House also. Therefore, it shall not be within the jurisdiction of one House to return that particular portion to the Public Accounts Committee. We are also members of the Public Accounts Committee from this House. Therefore, I feel that you should move in this matter and see that if at all anything is to be referred back, it should be done with the concurrence of both the Houses. Otherwise, whatever action is to be taken on the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee should be taken by the Houses as and when it is presented and not be referred back.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Otherwise, it will be a breach of privilege.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Yes, then it will be a breach of privilege of this House, Sir.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Since the Home Minister is here, I would like to know if the Home Minister and particularly the Ministry that he runs with sadachar and anti-corruption methods, has been seized of the matter and if any enquiries have been made by his Ministry in this matter . . .

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA): If you want me to give an answer . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Say 'yes' or 'no'.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I have not followed all that. I was looking at something else, Sir.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: I would like you to go through this point and give the ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will go through it.

THE DELHI ADMINISTRATION
1966

MR. CHAIRMAN: We proceed to the Delhi Aministration Bill, 1966. I would like to close the general discussion at 1.00 p.m. because there are a large number of amendments. Or we might sit up to 1.30 p.m. because there are a large number of amendments.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): May I request you to order that we another day to discuss this Bill?

MR CHAIRMAN: I am afraid . . .

SEVERAL HON MEMBERS: No, no.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It is utterly impossible. Excepting the Members of the Government, nobody has read this Bill. I have just got the Bill after a request was made. I have just got to page 3 of the Bill. That is all that I have read. I am quite certain that no Member of the Opposition has read this Bill.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया: (मध्य प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, कल आपने जो व्यवस्था दी थी उसके अनुसार हम आज इस बिल पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं और मुझे उस व्यवस्था से कोई आपत्ति भी नही है। लेकिन मुझे एक शिकायत यह है कि जब यह बिल लोकसभा से आया था तो हमें तुरन्त मिल जाना चाहिये था। मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जब मै यहां 10.40 पर पहुंचा तब यह बिल मिला। अब आप इससे अपेक्षा कर लीजिये कि सारे बिल को देखकर हम किस समय चर्चा कर सकते है और यह बात कहां तक न्याय सगत तथा तर्क संगत होगी ? इसलिये मै आप पर यह छोडता हूं कि जिस तरह की परम्परा यहा पर चलाई जा रही है वह ठीक नहीं लगती है और इस पर व्यवस्था दी जानी चाहिये।

MR. CHAIRMAN. Copies of the Bill were sent earlier in the morning. But the peon who took them got his tyre punctured and so he could not deliver it early

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I draw your attention to the fact that . . .

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): All of us got copies of this Bill many days ago. The moment it was placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha, all of us were given a copy of this Bill.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend is rather lucky, he has studied the Bill. We are not in a position to read it. I draw your attention . . .

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: The Lok Sabha with 500 Members has taken five hours.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I draw your attention to another occasion when Mr. V. J. Patel was in the Chair and he ruled that no adequate discussion could take place on the Public Safety Bill, and he ruled it out of order. He ruled that particular discussion out of order; it never took place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very kind of you to have reminded me of it. But I say, there was a difficulty. The Lok Sabha had not passed this Bill till yesterday. I requested some of the Members of the Opposition and Members of this side to advise me. We agreed on taking it up today and that is why the session has been extended.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): We have agreed to sit today to discuss this Bill. But it should not be hustled through. There is no mortal hurry that it should be finished, that the general discussion should be over before 1.30. It is a very controversial Bill. We need some more time to give our views.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had allotted 2½ hours. I will give you five hours. I want you to speak up to 1.30 and finish with the general discussion and take up the very large number of amendments and then those who have not been able to speak will take part and speak on the amendments.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): What is the hurry and why this hustling through this Bill? The entire proceedings with regard to this Bill have been very suspicious in nature because even in the Lok Sabha it was hustled through. See the way it is being brought forward; we propose that we take up this Bill in the next session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no, they have decided; I have decided with the Members of the House that it should be taken up today and therefore it will be taken up today. I am very sorry. I cannot postpone it.

Mr Jaisukhlal Hathi.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND ALSO MINISTER OF DEFENCE SUPPLIES IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): Mr. Chairman, before I make this motion I would like to express my deep sense of gratitude to you, Sir, and to the Members of this House for extending the session by a day and showing the indulgence of taking up this motion. I know that it might cause some inconvenience but this House of elders has always been considerate, as is natural of elders. I, therefore, thought it my duty to express my gratitude to all the Members and to you, Sir. (*Interruptions.*) I say that it is natural and inherent in the elders and this House has shown that indulgence. Therefore, I would like to express my deep sense of gratitude to you and to the Members for showing us this indulgence of extending the session of this House by a day.

I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the administration of the Union territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Delhi Administration Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha on the 18th November, 1965 and the motion to refer the Bill to a Joint Committee of both the Houses was adopted by this House on the 11th December, 1965. The Report was presented to this House on the 9th May, 1966.

[Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi.]

I will firstly show what changes have been made by the Joint Committee. Sir, in the original Bill and then the changes made by the Lok Sabha in the Report of the Joint Committee. The changes made by the Lok Sabha are not many. Only one or two changes are there and they are not important. Members had with them the Report of the Joint Committee which was placed on the Table of this House on the 9th May, 1966. I shall fully explain the changes that have been made by the Lok Sabha so that Members may have a full opportunity of discussing those changes.

I explained the scope of the Bill when I moved it for referring it to the Joint Committee. And I would not therefore like to go into details with regard to the scheme of this Bill. But I will only say that the question that was raised, and that would be raised, is, why not have a Legislative Assembly for the Union territory of Delhi? The reply is that under article 239 of the Constitution, the President has the responsibility of administering the Union territories except where an exception is made by article 239-A of the Constitution which gives the power to Parliament to create Legislatures for the other territories like Goa, Daman, Diu, Pondicherry, etc. The other question may be asked why Delhi should be out of this. The reply is very clear. It has been explained to the House often. The Joint Committee took days, to consider this question, and we had the benefit of an eminent jurist and constitutional lawyer, and now a Member of this House, Shri M. C. Setalvad. He was also examined as a witness. According to his opinion, he told the Committee that it is not only not possible within the framework of the Constitution but even otherwise, he said as a constitutional lawyer, also he did not think it was possible as a matter of policy. He said:

"As a constitutional lawyer I would say that it would be extremely unusual to have a Legislature at the capital where Parliament itself is functioning. There are likely to be conflicts, and perhaps deadlocks and delays in the administration."

And, therefore, he also was not in favour, and this view has been explained more than once.

Then, Sir, the question would be, what does this Bill aim at? Let me frankly say so that unnecessarily the time of the House may not be wasted. It is not that this Bill is to provide a democratic, responsible Government to Delhi. It is not so. And, therefore, there is no question of the Government coming forward with something in the garb of a democratic Government and not giving it. The present position is that the President administers Delhi through an Administrator, and the people of Delhi have no voice, or no representation except in Parliament. What this scheme of the Bill envisages is that there will be an elected body, the Metropolitan Council, and out of the elected body, 4 members will be the members of the Executive Council who will assist the Administrator. Therefore, they will be actually in charge of certain departments; they will be the representatives of the people who will be in charge of certain departments to aid and assist the Administrator. To that extent here is the participation of the people of Delhi in the day-to-day administration. There will be unified administration now. This is a step further to what the previous legislations sought to do in Delhi. Therefore, there is no idea of having a democratic, responsible Government, namely, an elected body. Actually, it is there.

Then, the leader of the majority party should be the Chief Executive Councillor. He should nominate three other Councillors. The President should appoint the three Councillors on the advice of the Chief Executive Councillor. The Chief Executive Councillor has no place in the scheme because this is not a party Government or a democratic, responsible Government, as envisaged in other Legislative Assemblies. I want to make this clear so that there may not be unnecessary criticism saying that the Government has come forward with a scheme which is not democratic. It is not so. What is envisaged is participation of the people with the administration of Delhi, not merely in an advisory capacity, but in the capacity of Executive Councillors to be in charge of certain departments. There may be all the departments except law and order and the Metropolitan Council will have all the rights to discuss all important questions, the budget also of the Delhi Territory. Now, this is the scheme.

Then, Sir, I come to the changes which the Joint Committee made in the original Bill. Because the Members do not have time, I shall very thoroughly deal with each particular aspect.

There were 37 clauses in the original Bill. The present Bill has now 38 clauses. To the 37 clauses, two new clauses, 15 and 36, have been added. One clause, No. 24, has been deleted. Eleven clauses have been amended.

In two clauses, No. 1 and No. 13, consequential changes have been made. Thus, in all, 16 clauses, out of 37, have undergone changes. The present Bill, as is now before this House as passed by the Lok Sabha, is as under. The first change which the Joint Committee made and of which the report is already before the House, submitted on the 9th May, is that in the original Bill the number of the elected members of the Metropolitan Council was 42. The Joint Committee raised it to 49. The Lok Sabha has raised that number to 56. This is the one change which the Lok Sabha has made. If the hon'ble Members have read the Joint Committee's report, this is the one change which the Lok Sabha has made.

Secondly, instead of associating three members of the Interim Metropolitan Council nominated by the Government for association with the Election Commission for the purpose of delimiting the constituencies of the Metropolitan Council, provision has been made for associating the Members of the Lok Sabha representing Delhi with the Election Commission for the work. In the original Bill, three members were to be nominated by the Central Government from among the Metropolitan Council. Instead of that, now all the Members from Delhi representing Delhi will be associated with the work of this delimitation.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Why not the Rajya Sabha also?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Elected Members. This is delimitation of constituencies. Now, no change has been made by the Lok Sabha in this. So this is the change that the Joint Committee has suggested in the original Bill.

The third change which the Joint Committee made was that clauses 12 and 13 were amended. In the constitution of the Metropolitan Council, there was the provision of the Chairman only; there was no provision of a Deputy Chairman. That provision has been made by the Joint Committee. No change has been made by the Lok Sabha in these clauses.

The next clause is No. 15 which specifies that every member of the Executive Council shall have a right to speak or otherwise take part in the proceedings of the Metropolitan Council, or any committee thereof, of which he may be a member. This change was made by the Joint Committee. No change has been made by the Lok Sabha in this clause.

The next clause is No. 20, where a provision has been made regarding the power of a person who has a right to speak and otherwise take part in the proceedings. No change has been made here also by the Lok Sabha.

The Committee has deleted the original clause 24 regarding the use of language or languages for transaction of the business of the Metropolitan Council. It has now been decided that this question will be determined by the Metropolitan Council itself. The Lok Sabha has not made any change in this also.

Clause 24 has been amended. The Administrator shall make rules under the proviso to clause 24(1) after consulting the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council. Originally, when the Bill was introduced, there was no provision for consultation with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council. The Joint Committee had suggested this change. This has been accepted by the Lok Sabha. No other change has been made in this clause also.

Then there were demands from various Members that one of the members of the Executive Council should be designated as

[Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi.]

the Chief Executive Councillor and other members as Executive Councillors. This change has been made in clause 27. The Lok Sabha has not made any change in this clause also. In this connection, I may again say, the idea is not that the Chief Executive Councillor will again nominate, or select, three of his colleagues, recommend to the President that these should be the three members, because this, as I said, is not a party Government, not a responsible Government in that sense. But certainly the President will nominate as Executive Councillors who are elected members of the Metropolitan Council. In order to avoid by-elections to the Delhi Metropolitan Council, clause 32 has been amended to the effect that membership of the Corporation should not preclude a person from being a member of the Interim Metropolitan Council. This proviso removes the bar to being simultaneously members of the Interim Metropolitan Council and of the Delhi Municipal Corporation.

Clause 35 is of a consequential nature which provides that the electoral college of the Union Territory of Delhi shall consist of the elected members of the Metropolitan Council constituted for the territory under the Delhi Administration. The Joint Committee has suggested that until that Council is constituted, the electoral college shall consist of the elected members of the Interim Metropolitan Council. But instead of that the Lok Sabha has made an amendment saying that the present electoral college of the existing territory should continue and that the Interim Metropolitan Council will not be the electoral college till then. And then in clause 36 the term of the elected members in the Delhi Development Authority had been suggested to be four years. But the Lok Sabha has now suggested that it should be five years. So the Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, says that instead of four years it should be five years.

These are the only changes that have been made. First is the change of number of members from 49 to 56 in the Metropolitan Council. Then the duration of the term of office has been changed from 4 years to 5 years. And then the present electoral college is to continue. These are the only changes which have been made by the Lok Sabha in the report of the Joint Committee which was placed before the House on the 9th May, 1966.

Within the framework of this, what has been given is the maximum participation of the people of Delhi in the administration. I may again repeat that it is not full Legislative Assembly and a Council of Ministers. The Committee had also considered whether financial powers could be given. But that was also not possible because under the Constitution there can be only one Consolidated Fund of India and money has to be withdrawn by Appropriation Bills. The suggestion has been made by some members of the Committee that the House could pass and give a lump sum to Delhi, say Rs. 20 crores or Rs. 30 crores, whatever the people want. But even a single pie spent from the Consolidated Fund of India has to be scrutinised by Parliament and by the Public Accounts Committee and every Bill that comes before the House has to be passed as an Appropriation Bill. So that scheme also did not fit in and we have got expert opinion, including that of Shri Setalvad, who said that this is not possible because financial power means also the power of taxation. Taxation power you cannot give to this Metropolitan Council unless there is a Legislative Assembly and this is not contemplated.

Therefore, within the framework of this scheme this is the best that has been given and I am sure that the people of Delhi will have greater opportunities of having their own administration and association with the Administrator and they will be in charge of different departments and I wish that with the cooperation of the people of Delhi this scheme would prove a success, Sir.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): What is the relation between the Metropolitan Council and the Executive Council?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Four members of the Metropolitan Council will be members of the Executive Council.

The question was proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before I call Mr. G. Murahari to speak, I would like to inform hon. Members that the Finance Minister will make a statement at 2.30 p.m. on the question raised by Shri Chandra Shekhar.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : सभापति महोदय, जिस ढंग से यह बिल हमारे सामने लाया गया है उससे यह लगता है कि कांग्रेस के अन्दर जो झगड़ा फसाद है उनको मद्देनजर रखते हुए सरकार में ऐसी प्रवृत्ति आई है कि इस बिल को जल्द से जल्द इस सेशन में पास करवाना चाहिये।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Execuse me for interrupting. I want to say that I hope hon. Members will confine their speeches to fifteen minutes because I want to give an opportunity to as many people as possible.

SHRI G. MURAHARI : Sir, this is a Bill which will require a lot of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You can say many things in fifteen minutes.

SHRI G. MURAHARI : I think we will take more than fifteen minutes, Sir.

जिस ढंग से इस बिल को लाया गया है उससे यह मालूम होता है कि कांग्रेस के अन्दर जो भी झगड़ा फसाद हो—दिल्ली की कांग्रेस के अन्दर कुछ ग्रुप्स हैं जो इस बिल को चाहते हैं, कुछ नहीं चाहते हैं—हमें तो लगता है कि गृह मंत्रालय में सरकार के जो अधिकारी लोग है उनका यह मकसद शायद रहा हो कि जल्द से जल्द इस बिल को पास करवाना चाहिये। वे एक गुट की तरफदारी कर रहे है। उस गुट को खुश करने के लिये शायद इस ढंग से इस बिल को लाया गया, लोक सभा की अवधि भी बढ़ाई गई, फिर राज्य सभा की अवधि भी बढ़ाई गई और इतनी जल्दबाजी करके इस बिल को हमारे सामने लाया गया। इस बिल की इतनी क्या जल्दी थी ? देश में कई और ऐसे मसले हैं जिनको इसी तरह और इतनी ही जल्दबाजी करके इस सदन में पास कराया जा सकता था। मसलन, डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूल्स का मसला, जिसके बारे में गृह मंत्री की ओर से बयान पढ़ा गया, ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है, लेकिन उसके बारे में कोई बिल इस सदन में नहीं लाया गया और उसके लिये कोई ऐसी जल्दी नहीं की गई जो इस बिल में दिखाई जा रही है। वह सारा मामला सारे देश से सम्बन्ध रखता है, लोगों के फंडामेंटल राइट्स से ताल्लुक रखता है और जिसके बारे में सारी पार्टियों के, हिन्दुस्तान के जो जजेज हैं, एडवोकेट्स हैं उन सबके बयानात हुए और देश की पब्लिक आपीनियन देश में इस इमरजेंसी को और डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूल्स को अभी तक चालू रखने के खिलाफ है। यह सब होने के बाद होम मिनिस्टर नन्दा जी, ने यहां पर एलान किया कि वे इसी सेशन में उसका बिल लाएंगे और यह देखेंगे कि बार्डर एरियाज के सिवा और कहीं पर डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूल्स लागू नहीं होंगे. लेकिन इस सेशन में बिल नहीं लाया गया। उसकी जगह दिल्ली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बिल 1966 जो लोगों के फंडामेंटल राइट्स की जड़ काटने वाला बिल है, जो लोगों की इलेक्टेड असेम्बली बनाकर अपना राज्य अपने आप चलाएं, उसके खिलाफ है, ऐसे बिल को इतनी जल्दबाजी करके लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में लाया गया और इसे अन्तिम दिनों में ला करके यहां पर हम लोगों को ठहराया गया इसलिए कि यह बिल पास हो जाय। मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि इतनी जल्दबाजी क्यों करनी पड़ी इस बिल के लिए। यह हो सकता है कि गृह मंत्रालय में कुछ लोगों की तरफदारी की गई हो और एक गुट को खुश करने के लिए इतनी जल्दबाजी की गई हो, लेकिन पार्लियामेंट और राज्य सभा का वक्त इस तरह जाया नहीं करना चाहिए था। इसके बजाय और चीजों के बारे में सरकार हम लोगों को ज्यादा मौका देती और उसके बारे में कोई बहस होती।

[श्री गौड़े मुराहरि]

उड़ीसा का मामला था, डिफेंस आफ इंडिया रूल्स का मसला था, इमरजेंसी को उठाने का मसला था। इन सब चीजों के बारे में यहां बहस होनी चाहिये थी। इन पर जल्दबाजी की गई होती तो मेरी समझ में आती, लेकिन अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ेगा कि गृह मंत्रालय ने इस बिल को--जिसे रद्दी की टोकरी में फेंकना चाहिए--इतना महत्व दे दिया और हमारे सामने उसे लाया गया।

इस बिल की एक एक लाइन लेंगे तो ऐसा मालूम पड़ेगा कि यह बिल जो अभी शासन चल रहा है दिल्ली में उसको एक नया स्वरूप देने के लिए पुरानी बोतल में नई शराब डालकर पिलाई जा रही है। असल में अगर दिल्ली के शासन के बारे में कुछ कहा जाय तो एक शर्मनाक कहानी है। दिल्ली का जो ला एंड आर्डर है उसको ले लीजिये, आजकल की क्या परिस्थिति है। दिल्ली के ला एंड आर्डर की परिस्थिति तो यह है कि हर तीसरे दिन या चौथे दिन एक कत्ल दिल्ली में होता है। यह ला एंड आर्डर का दिल्ली में हिसाब किताब है। जहां तक चोरियों का मामला है और जहां तक एक्सीडेंट्स का मामला है, इन सब को भी अगर आप देखेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि दिल्ली का मामला बहुत ही खराब हो गया है और यह सब आजकल का दिल्ली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन जो है उसके चलते चलते इस ढंग का कामकाज हो रहा है। और हमारे सामने एक मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल लाया गया है, मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि हिन्दुस्तान में मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल जैसी चीज लाने की जरूरत क्या पड़ी है। एक तरफ तो आप जनतंत्र की घोषणा करते हैं, आप कहते हैं कि लोगों के वोट पर सरकार चलायेंगे और दूसरी तरफ आप हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसी जगहें पैदा कर रहे हैं जिनमें जनतंत्र का बिल्कुल नाम नहीं और एक हिन्दुस्तान से भी अलग कुछ जगह बना रहे हैं। मैं सिर्फ दिल्ली का नहीं कह रहा हूं, दिल्ली है, चितरंजन है, टाटानगर है, नागालैंड है, काश्मीर है, यानी सारा हिन्दुस्तान का ढांचा एक और उसमें भी तरह-तरह के अलग-अलग किस्म के ये नमूने आप तैयार कर रहे हैं, कहीं पर सेंट्रल एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है, कहीं पर कम्पनी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है, कहीं पर नोटीफाइड एरिया कमेटी है और कहीं पर कंटोनमेंट की नोटीफाइड एरिया कमेटीज है और आज एक नई चीज हमारे सामने आई है मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल। समझ में नहीं आता कि दिल्ली के लोगों को कुछ अपने शासन में अधिकार देना था तो असेम्बली क्यों नहीं बनाई गई। असेम्बली कुछ दिन पहले थी और अब फिर बनाई जा सकती थी, गलत होता, सही होता, यह दूसरी बात थी लेकिन कम से कम दिल्ली के लोग अपने बल-बूते पर एक सरकार बना लेते चाहे वह किसी तरह की सरकार होती और अपना कामकाज चलाते और फिर इसके बाद कांग्रेस के लोग जरूर उसमें बहुमत में रहेंगे और आप फख्र के साथ आ कर कह सकते थे कि हमने तो जनतंत्र का एक परिचय दिया है, असेम्बली बनाई है, लोगों के चुने हुए लोग कामकाज कर रहे हैं, जब आपोजीशन के लोग टीका-टिप्पणी करें और यह कहें कि दिल्ली में यह खराब हो रहा है वह खराब हो रहा है तो आपकी ओर से यहां जवाब मिलता कि हमने तो एलेक्टेड असेम्बली बनाई है जिसमें कि लोगों के चुने हुए लोग कामकाज करते हैं, ऐसा बड़े फख्र के साथ आप कहते। देश में जो बिगाड़ हो रहा है उसके बारे में बहस करते हैं तो आप लोग यही कहते हैं कि हम तो लोगों के चुने हुये लोग हैं, हमको तो लोगों ने चुना है इसलिये हम तो लोगों के विश्वासपात्र हैं और हम जो कुछ कर रहे हैं ठीक कर रहे हैं, आप लोग तो ऐसे ही बकवास कर रहे हैं, यह तो आपका जवाब हमेशा रहता है। लेकिन दिल्ली में क्यों नहीं वह चीज हो रही है यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता। इसमें सिर्फ एक बुनियादी चीज मुझे यह लग रही है कि शायद सरकार के दिमाग में यह है कि दिल्ली एक कैपिटल होने की वजह से एक अलग ढंग से यहां पर सरकार का काम-

काज चलाया जाय और अगर सारे बिल को पढ़ा जाय तो एक एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर जो होगा वह सारा कामकाज करेगा और फिर प्रेसिडेंट की मर्जी पर सारा कामकाज चलायेगा। तो मेरे ख्याल में मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल बनाने की जरूरत ही नहीं थी, प्रेसिडेंट्स रूल यहां पर लगा कर के एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर से कहते कि वह अपना कामकाज चलाये।

फिर, इस बिल में यह है कि एडवाइजरी कैपेसिटी है, यानी मैनडेटरी नहीं होगा। तो फिर मैट्रोपालिटन कांसिल बनाने की क्या जरूरत है। अगर एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर को ही सब कामकाज करना है और मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल या एग्जीक्युटिव कौंसिल जो बनेगी उसको जब भी प्रेसिडेंट चाहे तब खत्म कर सकता है तो फिर यह सब करने की जरूरत नहीं थी। एक खाली आईवाश है लोगों को दिखाने के लिये कि हम भी कुछ चीज बना रहे हैं जिसमें आपके भी कुछ नुमाइंदे बैठ सके तो मेरा तो इसका सख्त विरोध है और मैं चाहता हूं कि यह बिल जैसा भी है इसको हमें खत्म करना चाहिये।

एक और चीज़ मैं आपके सामने कहना चाहूंगा कि दिल्ली हिन्दुस्तान की राजधानी है और यहां अगर अलग ढंग का सरकार बनाया गया तो जो भी बाहर के लोग आयेंगे उनको यह दिखाने के लिये शायद आपको मिलेगा कि यह जो दिल्ली का शासन है वह हिन्दुस्तान का एक नमूना है। आप लोग शायद यह चाहते हैं कि दिल्ली में मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल बना कर के सेंट्रल सरकार के मातहत जो भी काम-काज करेंगे वह इस ढंग से करेंगे ताकि बाहर के लोग जो यहां देखने के लिये आयेंगे—अकसर लोग दिल्ली आ कर लौट जाते हैं—तो जो बड़े-बड़े डिगनिटरीज होते हैं उनके लिये एक नया नमूना बनाने की कोशिश मेरे ख्याल में हो रही है लेकिन उनको आप मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल का यह कांस्टीट्यूशन दिखा कर के जनतंत्र का कोई सबूत नहीं दे पायेंगे इतना तो मेरा बिल्कुल विश्वास है क्यों-कि जो भी आदमी इस ढंग का एक एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन राजधानी में देखेगा वह तो यही कहेगा कि यह तो कुछ गाइडेड डेमोक्रेसी है या क्या कहते हैं।

श्री बांका बिहारी दास (उड़ीसा) कंट्रोल्ड डेमोक्रेसी।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि हां, कंट्रोल्ड डेमोक्रेसी के ढंग की चीज है जो कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट यहां दिल्ली में चलाना चाहती है।

तो मेरा तो यह कहना है कि मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल बनाने के बजाय दिल्ली में असेम्बली बनाये और उस असेम्बली में न सिर्फ अभी जो कहा गया उतने मेम्बर हों बल्कि ज्यादा कांस्टीट्यूएन्सीज हों और उसमें एक ऐसा ढांचा भी हो जिसमें कि कुछ रिजर्वेशन हो, रिजर्वेशन कोई नामिनेशन के लिये नहीं बल्कि इसलिए रिजर्वेशन हो जिससे कि कुछ खास माइनारिटीज़ को या कुछ खास सेक्शंस को जिनको कि उसमें नुमाइंदगी नहीं मिल सकती उन लोगों के लिये कुछ रिजर्वेशन हो लेकिन वह भी इलेक्टेड होना चाहिये, आम जनता से और आम वोटों से इलेक्टेड होना चाहिये। तो मेरा तो यही कहना है कि जैसा आप इसका कांस्टीट्यूशन बना रहे हैं उसमें जितने भी नामिनेशन के क्लाजेज हैं उनको खत्म कर के एक एलेक्टेड असेम्बली बनाई जाय जिसमें 60 परसेंट तक वह हो जो कि हमारे देश में बैकवर्ड क्लासेज कहे जाते हैं, जैसे कि औरतें हैं, माइनारिटीज हैं, मुस्लिम्स हैं, क्रिश्चियन्स हैं, सिख माइनारिटीज जहां भी हैं—यहां तो सिख माइनारिटी के हिसाब से नहीं है लेकिन मुस्लिम्स, क्रिश्चियंस और दूसरी जो माइनारिटीज है उनकी कुछ रिजर्वड् सीट्स हों, लेकिन वह भी एक आम चुनाव में चुने जायं। अगर यह ढंग हो और इस तरह से एक असेम्बली बने तो आप कोई सही ढंग से जनतंत्र का परिचय दे सकते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में आपको मालूम ही है कि शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के अलावा और भी बहुत से

[श्री गोड़े मुराहरि]

ऐसे तबके है जिससे कि आपका जिस ढंग का एलेक्शन होता है उसमें बहुत कम उनको मौका मिलता है इन सब असेम्बलियों में जाने का क्योंकि हमारे देश में जो जातिप्रथा है उसकी । जनता में हर चीज में जो उच्च जाति के लोग है वह अगुआ लोग होते है, यह परम्परा बन गई है और हजारों साल की परम्परा है उसको एक दिन मे क्या एक साल मे भी आप खत्म नही कर सकते, और इस परम्परा के चलते-चलते हिन्दुस्तान मे एक ऐसी परिस्थिति है कि चाहे एलेक्शन हो, चाहे एग्जामिनेशन हो, चाहे सेलेक्शन हो, हर चीज में जो उच्च जाति के लोग है उनको मौका मिलता है। और जो यह कहा जाता है कि इक्वालिटी आफ अपारचुनिटी दे दी है और सब ठीक ठाक हो जायगा तो मै इससे विश्वास नही करता कि इक्वालिटी आफ अपारचुनिटी से ठीक हो जायगा, इसमे भी जो उच्च जाति के लायक लोग है उन्ही को मौका होता है क्योंकि उनकी एक परम्परा है, उनका रहन-सहन का एक ढंग है, उनके पीछे विद्या की और-और चीजो की एक परम्परा चली आ रही है और उसका प्रभाव यह होता है कि उन घरानो के लोग चाहे वह कोई एलेक्शन हो, एग्जामिनेशन हो, सेलेक्शन हो उसमे अगुआ रहते है। तो इसलिये हिन्दुस्तान के जो दबे हुए लोग है उनको कोई न कोई प्रतिनिधित्व देना चाहिये। खास कर हिन्दुस्तान मे जो बैकवर्ड क्लास कहलाते है, और शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट है उनके लिये कुछ रिजर्वेशन बने है। यह बैकवर्ड क्लासेज का बहुत बड़ा तबका है और मै समझता हू कि हिन्दुस्तान मे जो औरते है उनको भी इसमे शामिल इसलिये करना चाहिये कि उनको भी मौका बहुत कम मिलता है। और साथ-साथ जो और माइनारिटीज है, जैसे मुसलमान और क्रिश्चियन्स है, उन सबको भी इसमे रिजर्वेशन होना चाहिये और तब जाकर इस असेम्बली का कोई एक रेप्रेजेन्टेटिव कैरेक्टर हो सकता है और यह सिर्फ देहली के लिये ही मै नही कह रहा हूं बल्कि हर असेम्बली मे इस ढंग की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये और हमारे हर सार्वजनिक स्तर मे उस तरह का रिजर्वेशन होना चाहिये।

(*Time bell rings*)

मै यही कह रहा था कि जब तक एक ऐसी असेम्बली नहीं बनती जो लोगो का एक प्रतिनिधित्व कर सके, जो लोगो का रेप्रेजेन्टेटिव कैरेक्टर हासिल कर सके, तब तक इस तरह की मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल बनाने से कोई फायदा नही होगा। साथ-साथ मै यह कहूंगा कि दिल्ली का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन जो अभी चला आ रहा है उसमे ला एन्ड आर्डर का यह हाल है कि अभी-अभी कल हमने सुना कि श्री मेहर चंद खन्ना साहब के घर पर एक आदमी आ गया और उनके प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी के ऊपर हमला कर दिया। तो समझ मे नही आता कि दिल्ली का ला एन्ड आर्डर किस ढंग से चल रहा है और मै समझता हू कि इस ढंग का मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल बनाने मे आजकल की जो सरकार है, या जिस ढंग से सरकार चल रही है, उसमे कोई तब्दीली नही आने वाली है। न सिर्फ ला एन्ड आर्डर की बात है बल्कि दिल्ली के हर क्षेत्र मे आप देख लीजिए व्यापार को ले लीजिए, या एजुकेशन को ले लीजिए, हर स्तर मे गिरावट आई है। दिल्ली मे एजूकेशन, विद्या की जो शाखा है उसके भी बारे मे मै कुछ कहना चाहूंगा। एक तरफ टेन्टों मे बच्चों को पढाया जाता है और साथ-साथ कुछ ऐसे प्राइवेट एडेड इन्स्टीट्यूशन्स है जिनको ग्रान्ट दी जाती है। तो ग्रान्ट इस ढग मे दी जाती है कि कही-कही पर तो सात, सात लाख रु० की ग्रान्ट दी गई है, मेरा मतलब है एक स्कूल है जिसने 7 लाख रु० अपने बच्चों से कलेक्ट किया अनआथाराइज्ड लेवीज लगा कर। यानी दिल्ली मे एजुकेशन एक अच्छा खासा बिजनेस, व्यापार हो गया है जो दिल्ली मे आजकल चल रहा है। एक एजुकेशन आफिसर है जिन्होंने 7 लाख 75 हजार 806 रु० एक कान्ट्रेक्टर को दिया जिसमे से 33 लाख 83 हजार का कुछ पता ही नही क्या हुआ ?

श्री सभापति : 7 लाख में से 33 लाख आपने कहा ?

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : 7 लाख 75 हजार ।

श्री सभापति : उसमे से तेतीस लाख का पता नही है ?

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : उसमे से तीन लाख का पता नही है। उसका पता नही कि क्या हुआ।

तो इस ढग से यहा पर कामकाज चलते है--कही स्टाफ ज्यादा है, कही पर किसी को नौकरी देनी है तो नयी नौकरी बना दी स्कूल मे और कही कोई इक्विपमेन्ट किसी कान्ट्रेक्टर से या कम्पनी से मंगवाना हो तो आर्डर प्लेस कर दिया, सरकार का उसमे पैसा खर्च होता है लेकिन जब स्कूल मे आता है तो उसका कोई इस्तेमाल नही होता है। तो इस ढंग से अगर विद्या का चलन दिल्ली मे रहा, और उसके बारे मे हम कोई व्यवस्था नही कर पाते है तो फिर किस तरह से यह मेट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल उसको ठीक कर पाएगी मै नही समझता।

एक गाधी हरिजन विद्यालय है जहा पर 8 महीने से वहा के टीचर्स को उनका वेतन नही दिया गया और एक वैश्य हायर सेकेन्डरी स्कूल है जहां पर 29 बार और 36 बार, तीन साल के अंदर, उनको वेतन ठीक समय पर नही दिया गया यानी यहा के टीचर्स की हालत तो सबको मालूम है लेकिन फिर भी इस ढंग से . . . (*Time bell rings*) यहा के स्कूल वगैरह चले तो मै समझता हूं . . .

श्री सभापति : आपने पाच मिनट ज्यादा ले लिये है, 20 मिनट ले चुके है। आपका वक्त हो चुका है।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : अभी तो मुझे और बोलना है। तो पाच मिनट मे खत्म कर देता हू। तो इस ढग से अगर दिल्ली मे विद्या का चलन हो तो फिर मेरे ख्याल से कुछ हो नही पाएगा।

यह आपको मालूम है कि अभी हमारे पार्लियामेन्ट भवन के सामने दिल्ली पेरेन्ट्स एन्ड टीचर्स कौसिल के लोग अनशन करके बैठे हुए है, अभी कुछ दिनो से वे अनशन कर रहे है। वे अभी भी बाहर बैठे है, आप देख सकते है। उनकी कुछ माग है लेकिन उनके बारे मे कोई तहकीकात नही हुई और अब तक उनकी मागो के ऊपर कोई विचार भी नही हुआ है। तो दिल्ली का प्रशासन जो है वह इस ढग से चले और उसको ठीक करने के लिये आप यह मेट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल जैसी चीज बना रहे है ऐसा मुझे नही लगता

वैसे तो मुझे इसके जितने क्लाजेज है उन सब पर बोलना था लेकिन बाद मे बोलूगा। कुछ अमेन्डमेन्ट्स भी हमारे है उनके बारे मे भी बोलूगा। लेकिन जैसा बिल है उससे मुझे लगता है कि इस ढंग का बिल कोई भी जनतान्त्रिक सरकार हमारे सामने नही ला सकती लेकिन अफसोस है कि एक सरकार जो अपने आप को बड़ा जनतान्त्रिक समझती है वह हमारे सामने इस ढग का बिल लाकर हमको कहती है कि इस बिल को पास करो। इसलिये मै आपसे कहूगा कि इस बिल को खत्म करो और इसकी जगह कोई नया बिल अगले सेशन मे आए तो बेहतर होगा। वैसे मै इस बिल के इन्ट्रोडक्शन के ही खिलाफ रहता। इसको अभी कसिडरेशन के लिये हमारे सामने लाया गया है लेकिन मै आपसे यही अपील करूगा कि इसको खत्म कर दें।

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi): Mr. Chairman, much dust has been raised in the controversy over this Bill and I would like to remove some of the dust if the Home Ministry would be in a mood to listen and see that some of the dust is cleared. I feel that if the Government had paid more attention and more time to other

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]

important Bills like the Constitution (Amendment) Bill and so on, it would have been better for the prestige of the Government. Rather they have spent so much time and wasted so much energy on a very small measure of this kind, to which they do not really pay any attention. Any-how, there are bigger issues facing us. In 1961 or so I suppose roughly, when the Part 'C' States were going to be given some sort of a set-up in Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura, we had raised this issue in this House—actually in both Houses—and the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, at that time and also the Home Minister—I think Mr. Shastri was then the Home Minister—both gave an assurance here as well as in Lok Sabha that they wanted to give something even better to Delhi because this was a better place than Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura. They wanted to give a better set-up here. They wanted to think about it and give a pattern that would be suitable to this place. This could not be taken up along with Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura. This is what our late Prime Minister then said. Also, the former Home Minister, and our late leaders, had given us this assurance. But I am sorry to say that from 1961 onwards or so, it took them nearly more than three years or rather four years to prepare the Bill. They took more than three years even to begin negotiations on the Bill, even to begin talks with the people of Delhi about the set-up here. They started it, I think, some time in 1964 or so, not even in 1963, or it may be later. Then the whole year 1965 went by. Sometimes our meetings took place after two months, after six weeks, sometimes after one month. They were a sort of sporadic meetings, not systematic or on the basis of certain minutes or notes or anything. I am sure the Ministry must have kept notes and minutes, but we were not given any paper at any time. We wanted to see what these papers must have contained. They said: 'No, no, this is secret. You cannot see them." So, after three years, when they did not take any steps, they started negotiations and talks with us. For every inch there was a very serious battle going on backward and forward. Unfortunately the Secretary for Union Territories, who was advising the Home Ministry, was fighting every inch tooth and nail, as if it were a family property which was going to bad hands and which he had to protect. When this is the feeling, when we fight with the bureaucrats of the Home Ministry and officials of the Home Ministry who very often gave advice to the Minister and this is the atmosphere in which negotiations go on even for a set-up, I do not think this is a good start. When every inch you have to put up a very fierce battle and fight as if you are fighting for life, I think it is not worth the trouble. But this atmosphere is not conducive to bring about a new set-up, a proper set-up. Gradually after these meetings were taking place we were discussing greater details about the subjects to be given to the Council—the Mayor in Council that was going to be constituted; probably they will bring that Bill next time and discuss it—the subjects were discussed at great length. On some points we agreed, and on some points we did not. Finally after long negotiations we agreed with the Home Ministry as to the subjects which might go to the Council and those which might stay on with the Corporation.

12 NOON

As for our point that the Executive Councillors should be responsible to the House, this matter was discussed at great length with the Home Minister and his Deputies, and lots of arguments from our side were given as to why they should be responsible to the elected members of the House, and Home Minister also found it very difficult to give responsibility because they were afraid that they might be voted out or thrown out and that would create difficulties. These points were also discussed in great detail with the Home Minister in various meetings and by and large I was present at practically all the meetings. But on one point as far as finance is concerned, even when we had agreed on many points, we were not agreed. We said: 'What about financial powers ?' The Home Minister, Mr. Nanda, said that he would sit down and discuss this matter also with us. But unfortunately whatever may be the reasons, it may be that he was preoccupied or he might have overlooked inadvertently, somehow there was no further meeting, and still the Bill came up for introduction in the Lok Sabha probably sometime in November or so;

rather it came up for consideration in the Lok Sabha on the 30th of November and later on in our House. Till the 30th November no particular discussion had taken place amongst all of us about financial powers. That thing had remained undiscussed though two letters were written by Shri Brahm Perkash, a Member of the Lok Sabha, to the Home Minister that this might be discussed. We had passed a resolution in the Pradesh Congress Committee in May, 1965 saying that we were discussing the second best. It is not a question of an Assembly. It is not that we were thinking that an Assembly was coming. They had made it clear that an Assembly could not be there because it was the capital. Our target remained the Assembly to be achieved at some time. But we were discussing the second best alternative, wanting that the Metropolitan Council should have financial power over budgeting and control over expenditure and all that. Secondly, that the Chief Executive Councillor should be the leader of the party in the Metropolitan Council and that he and the Executive Council should be jointly responsible to the House. We had also discussed at length that the nominated members cater to the Chief Commissioner or the Lieutenant Governor, whoever he may be, sometimes they cater also to the Home Minister, and it led to a good deal of flattery, and all those who are elected members of the House may not find the Executive Councillors to be very responsible to the House, and the members who are elected, the elected people, have a responsibility to the electorate. All these things were discussed. This was the resolution of the Pradesh Congress Committee that we wanted financial powers and the responsibility of the Executive Council to the House, and that the party leader should be the chief there on whose advice his other colleagues should be appointed. These resolutions were probably sent also to the Home Minister. At least they were all published in the newspapers, and I am sure he must be having much knowledge of the newspapers also. This was our stand throughout. Later on much blame and dust were thrown to cloud many of the things. But the facts are there. This is the truth and nothing else but the truth. Then ultimately we saw on the 30th November the Bill without the financial powers, only a debating society, people coming and discussing without any work to be executed, without anything which would keep them occupied; it would become a place where people indulge in loose talk, where debates would go on and where people would fight among themselves or with the Chief Commissioner, where the energies of these people would be wasted and not utilised in a constructive channel. This sort of debating society could not deliver the goods and people would remain as dissatisfied as they are now. When we found that nothing could be done, then we thought that we may go almost on the advice of Mr. Khanna and seek relief from the Prime Minister, late Lal Bahadur Shastri. There again we thought we would not be able to sell it to the public, it would be difficult to implement, it would not work. We did not think it was feasible without financial powers. He assured us that he intended to give maximum financial powers. Mr. Nanda said—also Mr. Hathi was present—"We would like to explore the possibilities of giving financial powers and also to make constitutional changes if necessary". With this assurance from the leaders we came back hoping that it would be possible with all examinations at our instance. Mr. Setalvad was called in the Select Committee. The Bill was referred to the Select Committee under the impression that, when it came on 30th November for consideration and passing in the Lok Sabha the Bill would have been passed that very day, but to explore these possibilities Shastriji had suggested that time would be available and in the meantime these things can be examined, financial powers and so on. Unfortunately under the Constitution a body that is neither a State Government nor a corporate body cannot have financial power nor can it have a consolidated fund, because it is neither a State nor a corporate body. This is what has come in the way. At our insistence Mr. Setalvad was asked to give evidence. Of course he was supplied all material and the speeches of Ministers. Being guided by the speeches of Ministers and on the basis of the Bill he gave a similar opinion that under the Constitution . . .

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Being guided by the speeches he gave an opinion? He had nothing on his own?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: He had the speeches and the Bill. A jurist always gives his opinion on the basis of the Bill and sometimes on the background of the speeches and the intention of the Government, and he had done precisely that. That is what I am saying. Other witnesses are generally not given the speeches of Ministers. They are only given the document if they want it. They come and give evidence without it. He was properly given the speeches also which is not ordinarily done for other witnesses who come. In the background of those speeches he gave his opinion that within the framework of the Constitution this cannot be done. This happened and we came to the realisation unfortunately that no financial powers were going to be given. When the Bill was going to the Select Committee, we had heard from very reliable people including some very responsible Members of this House that the Home Minister did not want to give any powers in the Select Committee, that you cannot wrest it from him in the Select Committee, that you sit with him and get the powers as much as you can from him but you cannot have it in the Select Committee. There was a certain tinge of anger about it—either have this way or that way, you cannot have it both ways. This was told again and again by some responsible people. Even I raised this question on the floor of the House that this was what I heard and Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi had contradicted it. But today I can say, unfortunately, by and large, the Bill is as it was. I can appreciate your handicaps in this and also your intention. You cannot go beyond a certain limit and it is there. Then, while all this was going on, various developments took place. Now this Bill is here. I still feel that the Metropolitan Council should have financial powers and it is workable with financial powers. It should have a certain sense of responsibility to the public at large and to the elected representatives of the people. If it is not responsible to them, it will only become a great financial burden, a wasteful body which will be wasting its time and more or less it will not be serving the people at all. Therefore, I feel that it should definitely have financial powers and it cannot serve any purpose without financial powers. And also the people will go on grumbling that there is no financial power, what can we do? We can only discuss and debate, we can only make recommendations which may be listened to or may not be listened to. The Government may accept these recommendations or they may not.

We have now two Chairmen of two bodies in Delhi, who were previously our Ministers in Delhi. Both of them are frustrated and unhappy because often the Government do not even listen to their recommendations. They do not even consult them. Sometimes they even make their subordinate officers as Chairmen and make the Chairmen as members of the Committees which are formed in the Delhi Administration. Sometimes members fight against each other—what is worse, both of them—because both of them are nominated and they preside over committees which are also nominated. The only difference will be that this Metropolitan Council will be an elected House with nominated Councillors. This, I think, is very unsatisfactory. Later on, we met the Prime Minister also. She too said, we can give financial powers, but not just now, later on. We do not feel happy that we should do things under pressure. I agree that the prestige of the Central Government is greater than the prestige of the Delhi people because if they lose prestige we will also lose prestige. If we lose prestige, they will also lose prestige. I can appreciate that point and I respect that point. For the last fifteen years when I have seen the history of the Delhi Congress and its affairs, I have found that our fate lies like the fate of the Indian Government *vis-a-vis* Pakistan before the United Nations, just like the Kashmir issue before the Western powers. Whether we are right or wrong, the sympathies always lie elsewhere. Whether India is right or wrong, Pakistan will always manoeuvre a good deal more than what India can manoeuvre. Whether India is right or wrong, somehow they will come in and help Pakistan, as though Pakistan is very pleasant, nice and charming. Always this has been so and I have always found that their sympathies are generally elsewhere and I have a very serious grievance about it. I am not happy. I think some leaders sometimes work in a very partisan manner. I am sorry to say that they favour a certain people and they do not favour a certain people. I am sorry to say that large stories are carried to them which are very much spiced, which are manoeuvred, which are lies, which are not truths, which are not fair and which are not just and I feel unhappy, and I have reason to feel unhappy about it and I do not know why they do not take the trouble of verifying these things. So, I feel that they have worked in this partisan manner and a much fugitive attitude was seen in the way in which the Bill is passed, in the way in which it is pushed through. I do not mind if they punish us. Why should they punish the public of Delhi? What have the people of Delhi done? Secondly, it behoves the leaders that they should be guided by benevolence and generosity. And it was the benevolence and generosity and the greatness and the goodness of Nehru which made him a big and a great man because in his heart he had room for all these crores and crores and crores of people of India. I wish our leaders today also had as big a heart as Jawaharlal Nehru had and they also had room for everybody, big or small, whether nice-looking or not nice-looking, whether very brilliant or not so brilliant, whether old or young. They should not worry about small matters or small things. They should be guided by big issues and big matters. If they go into little intrigues and politics, they come down in their stature and come down in everybody's eyes also. I expect and I hope and I want that they should have very large hearts as they should have very big minds and only a large heart makes a big leader. The leaders do not become big just by being in the Ministries and so on. This is my grievance, a very long-standing one also. When I get very old, I shall write the history of the Delhi Congress and Delhi affairs and I shall have very much to say and that will give an idea of the history of this country and how high and low politics are being played and how they are damaging public causes and public affairs. I am very unhappy about it and I have a very serious grievance about it that a very tremendous amount of partisanship, intrigues, manoeuvrings and such things are going on, about which we have no remedy. There is nothing else that we can do.

I feel that this Delhi Development Authority is a thing about which two Ministers were concerned; the Health Minister was handling it and now it has gone to the Housing Minister. It has crores and crores of funds. It passes lay-outs and gives sites to hotels and so on. Our amendment is only to bring some members of the Metropolitan Council into the Delhi Development Authority. And I feel that some Members from Parliament also should be associated with this because a tremendous amount of patronage is involved in that body.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi): All Members of Parliament should be associated.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Yes, quite right. They should be associated because sometimes the Ministers are very powerful. And they want to do what they want to. We believe in a democracy with checks and balances. Sometimes the bureaucrats do what they want to. Sometimes the Members of Parliament want to do what they want to. And things are done with the Ministers' influence, with the officers' influence; and the bureaucrats and the Members are there. Our ordinary Municipal Commissioners, Councillors or the ordinary Metropolitan Council members may not be able to be in a position to manage these big people; and some big bullies are also there because they exercise so much pressure.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Who are those bullies?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: You should know them.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Shri Dahyabhai Patel is very happy.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: They exercise so much pressure. Members of Parliament are there. So many crores and crores of funds are involved there, so much money is involved. I do not see why certain checks should not be there because it is a great source for the people to make money and all sorts of things. Therefore, I feel that there should be proper checks and balances. Those people should be replaced by the Metropolitan Council members so that greater manoeuverability will be there. I think this is not proper—if a no-confidence motion can be passed against

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]

the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman, I see no reason why a no-confidence motion cannot be passed against the Executive Councillors also Why should they be like that for the rest of their lives? I feel that this thing is very unfortunate

I should end with a small story. I have picked up from my friend, they say:

"वही बहू का पीसना, वही ससुर की खाट"

So, our Government of India also is there with bag and baggage and the daughter-in-law has to do all her cooking in the same room, thus creating constant friction and embarrassment to both of them. This is the position of the Delhi Government as well as the Central Government and I feel very sorry about it, because it creates so many difficulties for us There was a farmer who had a dog. The dog was a very nice one There were wild animals around and he used to keep it to look after his house. One day he found that his dog had a lot of blood on its mouth So he thought that it had killed his little baby in the house. Therefore, he went and killed the dog because he thought that the baby had been killed by the dog; there was so much of blood on the mouth of the dog He killed it. But when he went inside the house he found that there was a wild animal that was dead and that his child was playing Later on he felt very sorry for having killed his very loyal dog and he cried bitterly about it. And I do not want that the Government of India should cry like that farmer some day. If they behave in a punitive manner and if they want to do many things

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI We are not killing any dog

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT · By this you may try to kill the leaders of Delhi That will be very unfair and I think that it should not be allowed If the intention of certain people is that with the help of certain other people they should finish the Congress of Delhi, the people of Delhi, we shall also take due action about it because we shall not want to be punished on very unjust and unfair grounds and on loose propaganda. And I am very sorry that they misunderstand and create difficulties I shall be sorry about it. I am not happy about the Bill and I wish the Government withdrew the Bill

Thank you very much

SHRI M N GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala) Mr. Chairman, Sir, I cannot understand this hurry on the part of the ruling Party to insult the citizens of Delhi by passing this Bill in this session itself. I am afraid they have succeeded even in getting your consent for continuing the House for a day.

Now, Sir, there were certain very important legislations to be passed in this session of Parliament Unfortunately, by the irresponsibility of the ruling Party, we could not get those Bills through . .

SHRI G MURAHARI Same Ministry

SHRI M N GOVINDAN NAIR: . I mean the Constitution (Amendment) Bill which was moved in both the Houses. Now from the speeches I heard here, from the discussion that took place yesterday in the other House, I am afraid, the Government is treating this matter, the administration of Delhi, as a family affair to spite somebody or to favour somebody We are not concerned about that

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Since the favours have been denied, the favourites are annoyed

SHRI M. N GOVINDAN NAIR · But I feel this Bill is outmoded. After the Bill was first introduced in the House, certain developments took place in this country At that time there was no Punjabi Suba in the picture Now the Government had conceded the formation of Punjabi Suba after the introduction of this Bill. This has created a new situation and certain new problems That is why I say that this is an outmoded Bill During the last few years the people in Punjab were agitating for Punjabi Suba. But for some reason or the other, the Government was not conceding that issue But now the Government have conceded certain parts of Punjab State, I mean Haryana; that part goes out of Punjab State Already there is a quarrel whether Chandigarh should be the Capital of the Punjab State or whether it should be the Capital of the Haryana State. Now with the formation of Punjabi Suba, there is a new demand raised by some districts in U.P. that there should be Greater Delhi, a separate State. The Government should have considered all these aspects and they should have waited for some time more to give the final shape to the Delhi set-up. With the formation of the Punjabi Suba, one phase in the matter of the States' reorganisation is completed.

Sir, it was a very correct democratic urge of the people that the whole country should be reorganised on a linguistic basis. But it took nine years for them to concede this demand and it took another ten years to complete the reorganisation. Anyway, with the formation of Punjabi Suba, reorganisation of States on linguistic principles has been completed. But if anybody believes that this is the last word in the reorganisation of States, I think he is sadly mistaken. Now, another phenomenon will come up, and that is for reorganising the States on the basis of administrative competence.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That is a different thing.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR : My point is that the first phase is over. Without undermining that, you will be forced to reorganise the States on the basis of administrative competence. Take, for example, the case of U.P. U.P. is one of the biggest States in India. It has produced all the Prime Ministers. Still it is unfortunate that it is one of the most backward States in India. While speaking the other day about Orissa, the Prime Minister mentioned about the backwardness of U.P. If you are to get over the backwardness of that State, you cannot have such a vast, extensive, unwieldy State as one unit. You will have to break it up. So also in the case of some other States like Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh. This does not mean we are giving up the linguistic principle, still for administrative purposes you will have to break up a State speaking the same language into smaller States.

So, we are now at a stage where the first phase is over and we are at the beginning of the second stage.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That was the opinion of Sardar Panikkar.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Might have been. He spoke only about U.P. I am speaking about other States also. So my point is that, at this stage, instead of rushing with this Bill, the Government could have waited and planned the whole thing in such a way that either Haryana and Delhi should have been made into one State or some more districts from U.P. could have been added on to them. But they were in a hurry. I said the situation at the time of the introduction of the Bill and the situation today are different. As such, the Government should not have rushed with this Bill.

My second point is that it is a matter concerning 3 million people residing in Delhi including the Parliament Members. What is going to be the set-up in Delhi is a matter of personal interest to all the Members of Parliament because we are to reside here. The question is asked whether the capital of India can be left to the mercy of some people like Mr. Brahm Perkash or Kumari Shanta Vasisht or somebody else.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Or Mr. Gujral.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR . . or Mr. Gujral or the great Mr. Khanna. The reason for denying a democratic set-up to Delhi is that to look after the affairs of the capital, the Centre should have a greater say in the matter. This is the reason. Yesterday, while replying in the other House, our hon. Minister has categorically said that there would be no democratic set-up for Delhi. He gets strength from this position that the capital of India has to be looked after by the Centre.

Now, Sir, I have been in Delhi for the last ten years, and during these ten years there was no democratic set-up, there was no Ministry. It was under the direct rule of the Home Ministry, and whatever organisation the Home Minister set-up was there to help him in the administration of Delhi. So we, the people residing in Delhi have had a good chance of understanding what would be the fate of the citizens in this city if it is directly under the rule of the Home Ministry. I want all my friends

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.]
sitting on that side and this side for a moment to forget their political loyalties and think as citizens, merely as citizens residing in Delhi. Elementary things like water we do not get. Air, of course, we do get. But for water we have to depend on the Government and what has been our experience ? I know that an hon. Member of this House, comrade Sundarayya in the year 1952 got ill. There was widespread jaundice and what was the cause ? Sewage water and filtered water surreptitiously making love and contaminating the whole water supply and causing serious damage to the health of thousands of the people of Delhi. Comrade Sundarayya is alive today because of the miraculous advance of medical science in the Soviet Union. But I ask you, though a few people may succeed in going either to the Soviet Union or to the USA, for such treatment, what about the thousands of people, who had to die because of this ? It was in the year 1952. Very well. We could at least expect that it would not be repeated. The unfortunate part was that it was repeated year after year. But during these years under the Centre's administration, they have failed to guarantee even pure drinking water. We do not know when it will get contaminated. Any moment it may. And yet shamelessly they come and say, "We will look after this city."

Then take the case of electricity. There also the AC and the DC currents come together and we do not know when they will come together and all the lights go off.

What about transport ? What has been our fate ? The other day somebody was speaking about the D.T.U. and explaining what that means. He said it meant "Don't Trust Us." One does not know when a bus would come. Members of Parliament have their own bus arrangement, or some of them may have their own conveyance and so they may not fully know about the difficulties of public transport. Some times they may have to wait for a bus for hours and hours before they get one.

(*Time bell rings*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are warming up, but your time is coming to a close.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR : Sir, you have also been residing here all these years and you know all about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Then why do you tell all this ?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI : Please say what to do about it.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Please give me a few more minutes. Now, I will only say this. Let them at least put the numbers on the buses clearly. Let them also show the name of the place to which it goes. Even in this they are indifferent.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI : You may move an amendment to the Bill.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR : What is the use of moving any amendment ? As long as this is under the direct rule of the Centre, things will not change for the better.

SHRI G. MURAHARI : The Government itself must change.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR : They claim all powers to themselves in order to look after the affairs of this city, the capital of India. That is why they want it to be directly under the Centre. But all these years we have been directly under the administration of the Centre and this has been our sad experience.

Coming to the question of law and order, ask hon. Members this question : How many of you are here whose houses have not been burgled ? Now, here is one victim that I know. Please forget your political bias and tell me or raise your hands So that I may know how many of you are here whose houses have not been burgled. Is there any M.P.'s house in North or South Avenue which was spared by the burglars ? (*Interruption*). The hon. Member there seems to be new, and so he does not know. So this is the law and order situation in this city.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): What about the maintenance of the houses by the Ministry of Works and Housing ?

MR CHAIRMAN Mr Govindan Nair, you have already taken twenty minutes. I wish you wind up now after saying the essential things

SHRI M. N GOVINDAN NAIR I am a very slow speaker, Sir, and so I take a little more time

MR. CHAIRMAN : I know you put in less number of words than others in a minute

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR . What about education ? Every civilised Government give maximum care for the education of their children Is it not a shame that wherever you go in Delhi you find that the schools are held in tents ? The other day the hon Minister said that there is a phased programme for school buildings. Of course, buildings are coming up in Delhi but not school buildings, I know. I have great respect for the competence of our Housing Minister When you return to Delhi after one session, you find another big building has come up, a four-storeyed or five-storeyed building. They come up everywhere, some in semi-circular shape and some in circular shape and so on All credit to him But the schools are still run in tents. And what is the result of all this ? Here is the story given by the Delhi parent-eachers. They say there is stagnation and large-scale failure of students, and over 68 per cent of the students fail in the stage from the 9th to the 11th class. That means that the percentage of failures comes up to nearly 70 per cent Is this not a shame that such things should happen in this capital city of Delhi ? So if anything has been clear during the last ten years, it is this, that as long as this is under the direct administration of the Centre, no improvement can be made. So the question is whether this Bill contains anything which gives it a different set-up. Unfortunately, nothing of that kind is there and that kind is there and that is why we find it difficult to support it and we oppose this Bill.

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH (Delhi) Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Delhi Administration Bill, 1966 as passed by the Lok Sabha is now before us and obviously we are going to pass it There is no power which can prevent that now.

(*Interruptions*)

MR CHAIRMAN Order, order.

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH · Sir, I have never been a Chief Minister and .

AN HON MEMBER You may be one.

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH I say I have never been the Chief Minister in any State; nor shall I be because the Bill that has come before us, *i e*, the Delhi Administration Bill, says that there is no such thing as Delhi State and there is not going to be any Chief Minister and I can never be a Chief Minister in this State. So I am not going to speak with the background of an ex Chief Minister or a would-be Chief Minister, as was said—I read it in the papers—by somebody in the other House

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT It was very unbecoming of the Minister to have said that

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH But as a small scientist and as a small industrialist I would like to view the facts as they are Sir, the pathetic story of this Bill has already been given by my hon. friend Kumari Shanta Vasisht and I would not take up the time of the House by again dwelling on that. From the dozen or two dozen meetings that we had—and I also attended them—I know that we always talked of a full-fledged Assembly. The people of Delhi through their various organisations, through their political organisations and other representative bodies have always asked for a full-fledged Assembly for Delhi. They passed resolutions that they should have this Assembly today or tomorrow. During these meetings that we had with our own leaders, including Shri Mehr Chand Khanna, Shri Gujral, Shri Sham Nath, we all eight of us always talked of a full-fledged Assembly It was always said to us that Delhi being the capital it was not possible to give us an Assembly although we had the Assembly from 1952 to 1957, and it worked well. I am told—I was only a small Municipal Councillor then—that there was not a single example when the Centre quarrelled with the Delhi Assembly people It went on smoothly.

AN HON MEMBER Why did you lose it?

SHRI SANTOKH SINGH It was lost because your Parliament passed a legislation and the very same Parliament is again going to pass a law which is going to give us something much less than an Assembly We talked of the Assembly every time but we were told that we will have the second best which might be very near the Assembly We sat through these couple of dozen meetings and in the initial stages even our leaders including the Home Minister thought that perhaps there might be some *via media* by which financial powers could be vested in this Delhi Metropolitan Council I must frankly say that in the later stages our leaders did say that they had consulted everybody, consulted the law pundits—I am not a law pundit and I can't talk on those points, I can't even remember this 239 and 239(a) or 245 or 246—and we were told that financial powers can never be vested in the Metropolitan Council Right at that time some of us began to say that this Metropolitan Council Bill without the financial powers was not acceptable to us We said it unequivocally and categorically Then when the Bill was going to be introduced in the Lok Sabha we met the late lamented Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, and it was decided that the Bill be sent to the Joint Select Committee It was sent with the hope—as we always hoped and though no doubt our leaders said that it was not possible to give any more powers we still hoped—that there might be some way whereby financial powers could be vested in the Metropolitan Council And now the fact is, the Bill is before us without any financial powers, even the Executive Councillors will not be responsible to the Metropolitan Council and there are many other shortcomings in it I have been watching for the last fifteen years and I would say that the people of Delhi are a sort of second rate citizens of India and they have not been enjoying the freedom although we want to take that freedom to every home and to every village in the country The Delhi people will remain as second rate citizens without a full-fledged Assembly Without such an Assembly we cannot rule ourselves and we cannot meet the legitimate aspirations of our own people I found myself absolutely helpless during the ten years I was in the Municipal Committee and the Corporation and Sir in these four years I have passed in the Rajya Sabha I have found that I am unable to serve my own people I respect my leaders; I am all for my own Government but, Sir, without a responsible Government where we have some say somewhere we are unable to redress the grievances of our people There are many examples I do not want to enter into the Haryana problem or the Greater Delhi problem In these 500 sq miles the standard of living of the Delhi people is said to be the highest in the country today but it will not remain so As a matter of fact our Master Plan is based on this that there should be no large scale medium scale or small-scale industries in Delhi, there is going to be no land set apart for industries in Delhi Sir, I had a meeting with the Works Minister, Mr Khanna in his office in Nirman Bhavan Having only this beautiful Nirman Bhavan we cannot take care of the entire 30 lakhs of people in Delhi We cannot have factories in Nirman Bhavan. We discussed with Khannaji the other day about the 10,000 acres of land acquired for this purpose and it was decided that we will meet a number of times to see what the problems are like, where the obnoxious industries are, where the less obnoxious industries are, how they are to be shifted, what to do and what not to do. If these things continue as they are, I say that the standard of living of the people of Delhi in another decade is going to be much less than in the other States of the country We talk of sales tax, we talk of the distribution character but in the absence of industries we will be nowhere Therefore I would urge this upon the Minister of State for Home Affairs who, as far as I have seen him in the last four years, is a constitutional pundit and is a great lawyer himself He does want in his heart of hearts that something should be done for Delhi but Sir when once it is decided that as per 239 or 239(a) we can give but we do not want to give an Assembly to the City of Delhi, there is no help, there is no remedy I am very pained to see that it has become a question of prestige now If you give an Assembly to Delhi now then the prestige of some people will be lowered if you do not give then some people feel it If the Bill is passed today I do not know what the consequences will be. I do not want to enter into those things but I would urge upon the hon. Minister that since it has been the demand of the people of Delhi for the last 14 years that they should have a responsible Government, this legitimate demand of theirs should be met if not today, at least later. I would like that this Bill is withdrawn today; since financial powers could not be given to this Metropolitan Council I would urge upon the Home Minister to withdraw this Bill today and maybe next year or still next year—I do not mind—you should see that the right thing is done at a right time.

Thank you very much.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चोरड़िया सभापति महोदय, यह जो दिल्ली प्रशासन विधेयक हमारे सामने रखा है उसका लक्ष्य तो होना यह चाहिये था कि दिल्ली में अभी जितनी भिन्न-भिन्न आथारिटीज है, सस्थाएं हैं, उनको एक सूत्र में बांधा जाय, उनमें आपस में कोआर्डिनेशन हो और उनमे प्रजातांत्रिक सिद्धांतो के अनुसार कार्य मिले । अगर हम इन तीनों को ध्यान में रखकर इस विधेयक को देखते है तो मुझे लगता है कि हम इसकी बिलकुल विपरीत दिशा मे जा रहे हैं और यूनीफाइड होने की अपेक्षा हम बिखरते जा रहे हैं और उसके परिणामस्वरूप जनता का कष्ट बढेगा।

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI *M. P.* BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

पहले ही, चार-पांच आथारिटीज यहा चल रही है । एक तो दिल्ली म्यूनिसिपल कार्पोरेशन, एक नई दिल्ली म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी, एक एकजीक्यूटिव्ह काउन्सिल और एक केन्द्रीय सरकार। ये चार आथारिटीज तो पहले से है और एक और आथारिटी हम मेट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल की करना चाहते हैं। हम चौखम्भे वाली बात तो समाजवादी पार्टी की सुनते थे। उनका लक्ष्य था कि चार खम्भे प्रजातंत्र मे रहने चाहिये। लेकिन हमारी सरकार पाच खम्भे चलाना चाहती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा लगता है है सरकार दिल्ली के प्रशासन को गोवर्धन पर्वत के समान मानने लगी है। ये पांच खम्भे खड़े करके कई ग्वाल बालो के हाथ मे लकड़ी देकर कहेगी कि तुम अपनी लकड़ी अलग-अलग गाड़ रखो। दिल्ली मिल्क सप्लाई को एग्रिकलचर विभाग के जिम्मे रखो, तुम भी लकड़ी का सहारा दो नहीं तो गोवर्धन पर्वत गिर जायेगा, जमीन को बांटने का काम हमारे खन्ना साहब कर रहे है, फिल्टर्ड वाटर की जरूरत पड़ती है तो कारपोरेशन के पास जाइये, अगर अनफिल्टर्ड वाटर की जरूरत पड़ती है तो सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० के पास जाइये और प्रकाश की जरूरत पड़ती है तो इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड के पास जाइये और ट्रान्सपोर्ट की जरूरत पड़ती है ट्रान्सपोर्ट विभाग के पास जाइये। इस तरह से ये अलग-अलग डंडे लेकर ग्वाल बाल गोवर्धन पर्वत की व्यवस्था ठीक चलाने के लिये खड़े है। मैं चाहता था कि मंत्री महोदय एक ऐसा बिल लाकर पेश करेंगे कि एक विशाल मजबूत डंडा बनाकर सारे दिल्ली का प्रशासन उसके द्वारा चलाएंगे मगर उसको करने की अपेक्षा उन्होने एक-एक खम्भा खड़ा करके एक नयी प्रशासन व्यवस्था कर दी। इस तरह से जो जनता पर भार बढ़ा रहे है, साथ ही अव्यवस्था को बढ़ा रहे हैं, इसको मैं ठीक नहीं समझता। जो हमारा मूल लक्ष्य है कि हम एक यूनीफाइड व्यवस्था की ओर अग्रसर हों, ऐसा कुछ लगता नहीं। जहा तक कोआर्डिनेशन का सवाल है, अगर हम इस मेट्रोपालिटन कौसिल को एक कोआर्डिनेटिंग सस्था बना देते तो भी एक बात मानने की होती कि सभी संस्थाओं को एक ही में बाध कर सारे दिल्ली प्रशासन की व्यवस्था हम ठीक तरह से कर रहे है और उसमें किसी प्रकार की आपत्ति नही होती। तो भी किसी प्रकार आपत्ति नही होगी कि एक कोआर्डिनेटेड फैक्टर है। लेकिन इस बात का पता नही कि आप एक अलग संस्था बनायेंगे जो सब को एक सूत्र में बाधेगी। इस तरह के

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया] कोई व्यवस्था इस बिल में दिखाई नही देती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब हम अपने देश का इतिहास पढ़ते है तो हम दोहरे शासन की बात पढ़ते है और ऐसा लगता है कि इतिहास की बात को फिर यहां पर दोहराया जा रहा है। मुगल काल में नवाबों ने ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी को कर वसूल करने और दीवानी के अधिकार दे दिये थे और इस तरह से वहां पर दोहरा शासन चलता था जिसकी वजह से बंगाल और बिहार की जनता काफी परेशान रही। उस काल को और उस व्यवस्था को इतिहासकारों ने निकृष्टतम माना है। इसी तरह की अवस्था आज हमारी सरकार भी करना चाहती है कि किसी व्यवस्था के लिये कोई जिम्मेदार हो, किसी व्यवस्था के लिये कोई जिम्मेदार हो। इस तरह से दोहरे शासन मे कोआर्डिनेशन के अभाव मे अराजकता की स्थिति का निर्माण हो गया है और हमारी सरकार ठीक व्यवस्था की ओर जा रही है, ऐसा लगता नही है। मै चाहता था कि माननीय मंत्री जी इस बार अच्छा बिल पेश करते जिससे दिल्ली की जनता का भला होता, लेकिन ऐसा कुछ भी नही हुआ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रजातात्रिक दृष्टि से भी देखा जाय, अगर हम इतिहास को देखें तो ऐसा लगता है कि जब स्वतंत्रता की लड़ाई लड़ी गई थी तो उसके लिये लोगो को जेल जाना पड़ा था, और बड़ी मुश्किल से 1909 मे मिन्टो मार्ले रिफार्म हुए थे जिसमें उन्होंने सभाओं को कुछ मामलों मे सिफारिश के अधिकार दिये थे। उसी तरह के अधिकार आज इस मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल को दिये जा रहे है, जो बात समझ मे नही आती है। 1909 के बाद भी जनता ने आन्दोलन जारी रखा और उसके परिणामस्वरूप मान्टेग्यू चैम्पसफोर्ड रिफार्म आया और उसके अनुसार कुछ अधिकार प्राप्त हुए। इसके बाद भी लड़ाई बंद नही हुई जबतक कि पूरी तरह से आजादी हासिल नहीं कर ली गई। आजादी के पहले गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ऐक्ट आया जिसमे प्रजातंत्र के सिद्धान्तो को मान्यता दी गई और उसमें यह सिफारिश थी "नाट टू रेन बट टू गवर्न आलसो" लेकिन हमारा जो यह विधेयक है वह इसके बिपरीत है। तो ऐसी स्थिति में हमारे मैट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल मे जनता के निर्वाचित सदस्यों को भेजकर सरकार काम लेना चाहती है जिसमें उन्हें केवल बहस करने का अधिकार देना चाहती है कि तुम केवल बहस कर लो। बहस करने के बाद अगर तुम एक मत हो जाओ तो कुछ सिफारिश कर दो। अगर उस सिफासिफारिश को एग्जीक्यूटिव कौंसिल ठीक समझेगी तो कार्यान्वित करेगी, अगर ठीक नही समझेगी तो नही करेगी और कहेगी कि तुम अपनी बहस अपने पास रखो। तुम ने जो सिफारिश की है उसको शोभा बढ़ाने के लिए अपने पास रख लो, चाहे हम कुछ करे या न करें। इस तरह की बात समझ मे नहीं आती है।

इसके साथ ही साथ मै यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस कौंसिल को सिर्फ चर्चा करने का ही अधिकार दिया गया है, लेकिन उसे वित्त सम्बन्धी अधिकार नही दिये गये हैं। अगर यह कौसिल जनता की नब्ज टटोलकर कुछ टैक्स कम करना या बढाना चाहती है, तो इस तरह का अधिकार इसको नही है। यह एक महत्व की बात है कि इस तरह के वित्त संबंधी अधिकार सरकार ने इस कौंसिल को नही दिये है। मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल बहस करने के साथ जो उसका अंतिम निर्णय होगा उसको कार्यान्वित करने के लिए भी एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल बाध्य नही होगी। एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर भी उसकी सिफारिशों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए बाध्य नहीं है जो कि एक न्याय संगत बात मालूम नहीं देती है। एक्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल को प्रेजीडेंट नौमिनेट करेगा और इस तरह से सारा सूत्र उसके हाथ में होगा। जिस तरह से कठपुतली

वाला धागे को पकडकर सब जगह कठपुतलियो को घुमाते रहता है, उसी तरह से प्रेजीडेन्ट के हाथ में यह सूत्र रहेगा। जिस तरह का निर्देश एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल देगी उस तरह की चीज इसमे होगी। फिर भी प्रेजीडेन्ट जिस तरह का निर्देश देगे उसी तरह का कार्य एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल करेगी। तो इस तरह की दोहरी व्यवस्था की बात मेरी समझ मे नही आती है।

हमारे मंत्री जी प्रजातंत्र की बात करते है कि हम तो केवल एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को रिप्लेस करने की दृष्टि से यह कार्य कर रहे है। तो मै यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या आप एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर को अधिकार नही दे रहे है कि वह जो निर्णय चाहे ले और उसे कार्यान्वित भी करे। फिर आप इस मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल को अधिकार क्यों नही दे रहे है और उसको न देने के कारण क्या है? वह जो निर्णय ले उस निर्णय को कार्यान्वित न कर सके तो फिर यह कौसिल तो केवल राय बहादुरो की एक जमात बन जायेगी और इस तरह से आप उनकी एक फौज तैयार कर रहे है। ये राय बहादुर वहा पर चर्चा करेगे और जो भी डिसिजन लेगे, अगर एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल की मर्जी होगी तो कार्यान्वित करेगी, मर्जी नही होगी तो नहीं करेगी। इस तरह से वहा पर एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर ही सब कुछ करेगा। आप कहते है कि हम एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर को रिप्लेस करने के लिए ही मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल बना रहे है।

श्री जयसुख लाल हाथी : रिप्लेस नही करेगे Administrator will be assisted by elected members who will be members of the Executive Council

SHRI V M CHORDIA Administrator will be there. एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर तो रहेगा, वह हटेगा नही और वही सब काम करेगा। लेकिन मै यह कहना चाहता हू कि जैसा आप का मकसद है कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर की जगह मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल काम करेगी, मगर उसमे उसकी राय चलने वाली नही है क्योंकि उसको आपने कोई अधिकार नही दिये है। इसका काम तो एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल ही करेगी।

श्री जयसुख लाल हाथी एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल के चार मेम्बर मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल मे होगे जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर के साथ काम करेगे और उनके अलग-अलग पोर्टफोलियो होगे।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया · एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल प्रेजीडेंट द्वारा नामजद होगी और उसका सूत्र प्रेजीडेंट के हाथ में होगा और उसी के बंधन मे भी होगे। जो लोग मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल मे जनता द्वारा चुनकर आयेगे उनको तो कुछ अधिकार नही होंगे क्योंकि एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल ही सब कुछ करने वाली है और फिर वहा पर शान्ता जी या गुजराल जी की भावना चलने वाली नही है क्योकि इसमे कठिनाई आयेगी। इस दृष्टि से मै यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जब हम प्रजातंत्र के सिद्धातों की चर्चा करते है तो फिर हम मैट्रोपोलिटन कौसिल को अधिकार क्यो नही देना चाहते है। मेरी समझ मे नही आ रहा है कि सरकार किस मनोवृत्ति मे काम कर रही है और सारे अधिकार एग्जीक्यूटिव कौसिल को दे रही है। इसका मतलब तो यह हुआ कि आप फिर लालफीताशाही और भ्रष्टाचार तथा मनमाने ढंग से काम करना चाहते है। वैसे तो श्री नन्दा जी सदाचार की बात करते है, सदाचार की बातो को बढाने की व्यवस्था करते है, लेकिन काम इस तरह का सरकार का होता है कि वे जनता के प्रतिनिधियो को कुछ भी अधिकार नही देना चाहती है। मै चाहूंगा कि सरकार इस बात पर पुन. विचार करे और जल्दी मे इस बिल को पास करने की कोशिश न करे तो ठीक रहेगा।

अब मुझे एक बड़ी शिकायत यह है कि सरकार हिन्दी के प्रति नैगलैक्ट होते जा रही

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया]

है और अगर मैं उसे बेशर्म कहूं तो स्वयं को लज्जा आती है। उसने हिन्दी में विधेयक नहीं दिया जबकि हिन्दी के बारे में होम मिनिस्ट्री से सर्कुलर निकाला जाता है कि हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा के रूप में हर तरह से बढ़ावा दिया जाना चाहिये। दफ्तरों में हिन्दी में नाम लिखे जा रहे हैं, नये नाम अब हिन्दी में लिखे जा रहे हैं, लेकिन होम मिनिस्ट्री जब अपना बिल पेश करती है तो उसकी कापी वह हिन्दी के बजाय अंग्रेजी में भेजती है। यह बात गलत है और माननीय मंत्री जी को इस पर अवश्य ध्यान देना चाहिये और जवाब के वक्त वे कारण बतलायेंगे कि वे हिन्दी में कापी पेश क्यों न कर सके, तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

जब पूर्व में यह बिल आया था तो उस समय भी उसकी चर्चा की थी कि हिन्दी में बिल आना चाहिये। जब सिलेक्ट कमेटी में इस पर बहस हो रही थी तो मैंने उस समय भी इसकी चर्चा की थी। इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा कि अगर हम किसी अच्छे काम को करना चाहते हैं तो उसके लिये थोड़ा प्रयत्न भी करना पड़ेगा। अगर हम थोड़ा भी प्रयत्न नहीं करेंगे तो हम पथभ्रष्ट हो जायेंगे या फिर गलत रास्ते पर चले जायंगे। जो आदमी गलत रास्ते पर चला जाता है उसको सही रास्ते पर लाने के लिये पकड़ कर लाना पड़ता है। इसलिये हमारा यह प्रयत्न होना चाहिये कि हिन्दी भाषा को हर तरह से प्रोत्साहन दें क्योंकि जब दिल्ली की जनता अधिकतर हिन्दी भाषाभाषी है तो उसका काम भी हिन्दी में ही होना चाहिये। इस तरह का डायरेक्टिव इस विधेयक में दे कि उसका काम हिन्दी में होना चाहिये। मैं यहां पर यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जब हमारी लखनऊ नगरपालिका अपना काम हिन्दी और उर्दू में अच्छी तरह से कर सकती है तो यहां पर क्यों नहीं हो सकता है। क्या हिन्दी में काम करने से मुहल्ले की सफाई में कमी आ जायेगी या किसी किस्म की दिक्कत हो जायेगी?

श्री आबिद अली (महाराष्ट्र): वहां पर सफाई अच्छी नहीं है। हिन्दी के काम से वहां पर बेहतरी नहीं हुई।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया: क्या बिगड़ गया?

श्री आबिद अली: आप चश्मा बदल लीजिये।

1 P.M.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया: आप दे दीजिए। (*Interruption*) मैं इस कंट्रोवर्सी मे नहीं पड़ना चाहता हूं। खैर, मैं इस कंट्रोवर्सी में जाना नही चाहता। मेरा यह नम्र निवेदन है कि जिस दल को माननीय आबिद अली साहब बिलांग करते हैं उसने यह तय किया है और उसने ही नहीं हमने भी यह तय किया है कि हमारे देश की भाषा हिन्दी होनी चाहिये, पर हिन्दी से सफाई नहीं हो पाई और अगर उर्दू या अंग्रेजी होती तो सफाई हो जाती, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई।

श्री आबिद अली: क्योंकि जनसंघ वहां है, इस लिये सफाई नहीं हुई है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया: तो असली बात यह मालूम पड़ी कि यह हिन्दी के कारण नहीं है। मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि हिन्दी की वजह से वहां सफ़ाई रुकी नहीं। मगर इनका आरोप है कि जनसंघ की वजह से वहां सफ़ाई रुकी है। जब वहां की जनता चुनाव करेगी तो मालूम पड़ जायगा कि जनसंघ की वजह से वहां सफाई बढ़ी है या रुकी है। इसका प्रमाण पहले भी चुनाव में मिला और आगे भी चुनाव में मिल जायगा। इस लिये आबिद अली साहब को इससे घबड़ाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है और जैसा कि कहा जाता है कि जितने बाल होंगे सब सामने आ जायंगे और सब मालूम हो जायगा।

तो, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह प्रार्थना करूंगा मंत्री महोदय से कि जैसी उन्होंने

अनुभूति की थी और जिस बात को ध्यान में रख कर उन्होने इस विधेयक में हिन्दी का प्रावधान किया था, उसके अनुसार यदि वे इसमें हिन्दी की व्यवस्था करने का कष्ट करेंगे तो बड़ी कृपा होगी। इस तरह जनता में जिस भाषा को हम बढाना चाहते है उस भाषा को हम अधिक विकसित कर सकेंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कई बातें है और इसके बारे में हमने कई सुझाव दिये है और इस दृष्टि से मै प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जब संशोधनों पर चर्चा हो तो उन सुझावो पर ध्यान दे कर के उनको स्वीकृत करने की कृपा की जाय। मै मंत्री महोदय से और सदन से भी प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जल्दी में यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि लोक सभा उठ गई है, इस लिये इसको इसी तरह पास करना है। हम यह चाहते है कि ऐसी दलील न दे कर कि अभी हम इसको जल्दी से पास कर लें और फिर बाद मे अमेंडमेंट कर लेंगे, इसके बजाय अगर कोई अच्छा अमेंडमेंट हो तो उसे हम स्वीकार कर लें और फिर जब नेक्स्ट सेशन बैठे तो उसमे यह विधेयक पारित करेंगे। यही निवेदन है।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, you will agree with me that we have reason to be grateful that the atmosphere of discussion here has been cooler and calmer and of an examining type than it has been elsewhere and we are grateful that an atmosphere has been created wherein it is easier to examine the issues on their merit and come to conclusions. I do know that some talks have gone on and some friends have spoken with a great deal of emotion and surcharged emotion, telling us what democracy is and what democracy should stand for. To these things I will come later, but I would only like to submit that it is easier to get swayed by emotion, frustration, unfulfilled ambition and ego. These emotions generally blur the judgment. I submit that when we come to any conclusions about this Bill, we should not allow any of these to come in our way.

Having said that, I should like to submit that it would have been much easier for us and the Government if, from the very beginning when the talks or negotiations—if I may use that word—with the Government were started, this motivation were clear. Unfortunately, the entitle history of these talks and negotiations was blurred by the fact that the basic motivations never came out. It took time for us to discover what the basic motivations were. It would have been easier for us if from the very beginning it had been stated that the aim was to achieve Haryana Prant with merger of a part of Delhi. So, the talks were a mere camouflage.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT. It is wrong.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL. This is not wrong. When I proceed I will prove my point. I am not in the habit, in this House, of saying anything which I could not prove. (*Interruptions*) It is easier for my friend to interrupt, but he will have to be patient. I am sure he will come to the same conclusion as I have if he will recall the history of the talks. I have with me the dates of the talks. The talks were held about two dozen times. They were on an even keel till the announcement about the Punjabi Suba Committee came. The moment the announcement by the Punjabi Suba Committee came, the talk of financial powers came up, the talk of empowering the Chief Executive Councillo[r] came up, the responsibility for educatio[n] came up. I submit that I have no objec[tion] to examining the demand for greate[r] Haryana also, but on its own merits. Bu[t] before I proceed to that, I would like t[o] make it very clear that the demand fo[r] Greater Haryana is neither the demand o[f] the people of Delhi, nor it has the back[ing] of any part of Haryana itself. No[t] from Haryana has a call emerged. It [is] only some, who have had dreams, hav[e] stated this, after the Punjabi Suba Com[mittee] gave its recommendations.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: It [is] wrong.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: In one of t[he] Notes it is said:

"Ancient legend has it that 'He w[ho] rules Delhi rules India'. Delhi has se[en the] rise and fall of many empires."

[Shri I. K. Gujral.]
I think it is this approach which had blurred these talks and it is this which really put the talks which were going on, off the even keel.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Was there unanimity on the Delhi Assembly ?

(*Interruption*)

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I have quoted from the Note, which has been submitted to the Punjabi Suba Committee by two very worthy friends representing Delhi. But this does not represent anybody else's view. There are some people who feel that PCC is the monopoly of some and only they have the authority to speak in the name of Delhi. This is most unfortunate, because those who have repeatedly pleaded for democracy should look within themselves, but I am not going into that, into Congress politics at all, because this Parliament is not the forum for discussion of these subjects. These subjects could be examined elsewhere. As I have said, this led to blurring the negotiations and talks.

(*Interruption*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Murahari, please address the Chair.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : These efforts led to clouding the issue and really unsettled the mind of the people here and did not allow them to take an objective view of the situation

Having talked about Haryana, I would like to submit that the fundamental point in our discussion today is that we have to start with the hypothesis that Delhi is the national capital. I hope Mr. Govindan Nair knows it and since Delhi has to be the national capital . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI : Cannot you take it to Trivandrum ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I do not mind it, but the point remains that as long as the national capital is there, the politics of Delhi or of the areas around, will have to be viewed from this fundamental point. You will recall that earlier in the century, the capital of India was in Calcutta and then it was moved from Calcutta. I am quoting from the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. I would like to say here for the information of my friends what the SRC said :

> " . . . the desirability of excluding the seat of the Central Government from the jurisdiction of a Provincial Government was one of the main considerations which led to the transfer of the Imperial capital from Calcutta in 1912. It was then considered essential that the Supreme Government should not be associated with any particular Provincial Government . . ."

Again, they say :

> " 'It is generally recognised', observed the Government of India in their Despatch to the Secretary of State dated 25th August, 1911, 'that the capital of a great Central Government should be separate and independent, and effect has been given to this principle in the. . .".

This has been done in other parts of the world as well. That basic consideration still remains.

SHRI G. MURAHARI : What is that ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : This is the SRC's recommendation. Therefore, the basic point remains that if it is a national capital, any talk of taking either a part of it or the whole of it to be merged into Haryana or of Haryana being brought into Delhi, would be against the interests of the nation, against the interests of the national capital. This point has been conceded and in these reports and speeches, etc. it has been sometimes said. You can keep New Delhi as the capital city, but other portions may go out. It means that, in principle, this point has been conceded. Having conceded this point, the only point which remains is the line of demarcation. In 1956 this plea was put before the SRC, as to where the line between Delhi and New Delhi should be drawn and then this point was examined by the SRC I quote again from the SRC

"From the point of view of law and order, the social life of the people, trade and commerce and common public utility services, old Delhi and New Delhi now constitute one integrated unit and it will be wholly unrealistic to draw a line between the two"

I would not like to say more because this report has been given by three most eminent citizens of the nation, and it will neither be good nor realistic nor honourable to try to go into those details again. Mr. Govindan Nair has been worried about the multiplicity of authority but what happens if you draw the line at Minto Bridge I know that it does suit very much his party (*Interruption*) I do know that it very much suits both Mr Govindan Nair and Mr Murahari that such circumstances should prevail in the national capital. This would further their line of thinking

SHRI M N GOVINDAN NAIR It is a revelation to us

SHRI I K GUJRAL · I do not like to go further into this question I am glad that sitting for ten years and living in Delhi the atmosphere has done good to him Today he tries to preach to us what democracy should be If working in the Parliament is not democracy, if sitting and enacting laws here for the people is not democracy, I do not know what he means by democracy It is a basic fact recognised everywhere and I make the bold statement that the Central Government cannot be a guest in its own capital It cannot be possible that there should be two Governments working in the same place On this, Sir, there are no two opinions between us also We have always conceded this point We have always believed that every effort must be made to improve and nothing should be done which can possibly jeopardise the interest of the nation or of the national capital.

I now proceed to try to put before you that it is in the basic concept of the national capital that the entire structure has to be thought of and conceived My friend, Mr Govindan Nair, did well to pinpoint that the basic problems of this town are civic That transport is not satisfactory, I second him there; that much more should be done to improve power supply, there are no two opinions, that slums are a shame to this town, I think we all share it. It is very important that expeditious and good civic service should be available to everyone in the town It is very necessary Therefore, I submit and the S R C again has said that the basic problem of this town is civic Here I quote

"Municipal autonomy in the form of a Corporation which will provide greater local autonomy than is the case in some of the federal capitals is the right and in fact the only solution of the problem of Delhi State"

Having said that, I ask my hon Friend, the Home Minister, when the Corporation itself unanimously made a demand and forwarded it to him last year that the only way here is to make the Corporation more potent and to give them more powers and to make the Council more effective, why was it that the Home Minister did not concede that point? At whose behest did the talks take a turn? Why did the Home Minister once concede the point, and when negotiations were going on, why did the Home Minister change the line, on whose behest, on whose cajoling, on whose request? Those who talk more in the name of democracy, it is they who are responsible for making the Home Minister change his line I accuse the Home Minister and the Home Ministry of showing a weak-kneed policy. They neither had the vision nor the concept nor the idea as to what they wanted Delhi to be They acted under pressure They reacted to situations They went on drifting from one to the other till they came to this position, and the logical consequence of their weakness is now on them

AN HON MEMBER. Under whose pressure?

SHRI I K GUJRAL I would also like to know under whose pressure they are working now Is it under the pressure of

[Shri I. K Gujral.]

those friends who in another place have said that there would be unrest in Delhi? Is it under the pressure of those who have said that life in Delhi will never get settled? Is it under the pressure of those who in their statements have said "if such issues are not solved in time and are allowed to simmer, they are creating a volcanic situation"?

SHRI G MURAHARI. Whose speech he is quoting?

SHRI I K. GUJRAL. I am quoting from the Punjabi Suba Committee report two worthy members of Delhi. I ask this question. This Bill is a part of the said scheme. Having said that, if the people did not want a Bill, if the people here were not anxious that such a Bill should come up, may I ask the Home Minister: did he put it before the Home Ministry Advisory Committee? Was it passed? Was it approved? Did everyone sign and put his thumb on it? Having said that, I ask: when everyone in the Home Ministry Advisory Committee agreed to the clause by clause reading of the Bill, when the name of the Bill was changed from Territorial Council to Metropolitan Council, why does not the Home Minister tell us that those who gave approval are the very people who today think otherwise?

Mention has been made here of their talk with the late Prime Minister who was warm-hearted, and we all bow to him in reverence, great was the soul, great was the person, very considerate, very humane, always bowing before popular demands, wise or unwise, just or unjust, and in this particular case out of his humanism he went to the extreme extent. When some of us went to him requesting him that the Bill be referred to the Select Committee, we gave a solemn assurance—I would like to repeat to those who make mistatements because the honoured person is dead and there are other witnesses also—that in whatever shape it emerges from the Select Committee we shall accept it I would like to proceed further and say only one thing that some of us are being accused of many things. It is being felt as if this Haryana chapter has been brought in by us. I shall ask the Government again and this is my third question and Mr. Hathi should reply: Did the Government make it clear from the beginning or did it not that the Central Government could not be a guest in its own capital? Did the Government make it clear or did it not that the compulsions which were applicable when the S.R.C. report was given apply today also? Did they or did they not make it known when the negotiations were going on that because of the situation of its being the national capital an Assembly may not be possible? If it was at all made clear, did the Government receive any protest against it? If they received any protest against it, why they negotiated further? If they did not receive any protest, then I would only say this thing that they have erred If they have erred, they must pay for it If they have not, they must clearly state what they have to say

A minute more and I finish. I would like to say this that it is a strange position; we are being painted as if myself and some of my friends have committed a sin. Our sin is only this that we have witnessed the birth of this child by consent This Bill is a child by consent. In this the two parties were the Government and those who negotiated. When the child is born the delinquent parents accuse the witnesses of committing a sin This only is our fault.

Sir, I have stated . . .

SHRI B K P SINHA: Is it a legitimate child?

SHRI I K GUJRAL: I said, with consent.

I would like to submit one point and sit down and that is that in the interest of the town every effort must be made to make the machinery of the civic administration more efficient and effective and I am glad the Government are going to do something for that; it is now desired that in the sphere of administration, public opinion is to be associated and this should be given.

Thank you.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Sir, on a point of explanation. Charges have been made that because of the Suba demand this was put up. I have quoted from the PCC Resolution of May of more than one year ago when there was no question of Punjabi Suba and this matter was raised in August and in October; in all letters the matter of these financial powers was raised and in the Home Minister's Advisory Committee also this particular matter had been raised. So, it is very wrong on his part to say that this suddenly came up because of the Suba issue And I say, their emotions come up because Punjabi Suba has been created much against the peoples' wishes and of Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.

SHRI I K GUJRAL: Since she has raised . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) No, no Shri Jagat Narain.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I would only like to reply to that

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): No, please. Shri Jagat Narain.

श्री जगत नारायण (पंजाब) वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, मुझे दिल्ली की सियासत में कोई खास दिलचस्पी नहीं है, कोई खास वाकफियत भी नहीं है मगर मुझे इस बिल के मुताल्लिक एक बात कहनी है कि यह बिल जो आज हाउस में पेश किया जा रहा है और जिस तेजी से इसको पास करने की कोशिश की जा रही है . . .

निर्माण, आवास और नगर विकास मंत्री (श्री मेहरचन्द खन्ना): बडी तेजी है।

श्री जगत नारायण . . मैं समझता हूं कि यह दुरुस्त कदम नहीं है। क्यो दुरुस्त कदम नहीं है। मैं यह इसलिये कहना चाहता हूं कि जब यहा पर कार्पोरेशन ठीक तरह पर काम कर रहा है तो इस मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल को बनाने की क्या जरूरत है जब कि इससे खर्चा बढ़ेगा और फिर यही अखाडा बनेगा, जो कि आज यहा इस हाउस मे और लोक सभा मे देख रहे है कि दिल्ली के हमारे जो नेता है वह किस तरह से आपस मे लड़-झगड रहे है। जनता से, वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, अगर आप पूछे तो कोई नहीं चाहता, जनता के दो-चार आदमी जो कि दिल्ली के मान्य प्रतिष्ठित शहरी हैं उनसे मैंने पूछा तो वह कहने लगे कि यह तो नेताओं का झगड़ा है, जहा तक जनता का ताल्लुक है उसे इस मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल के बनने से बिल्कुल फायदा नही पहुचेगा और बिल्कुल एक अखाडा बन जायगा नेताओ की वहम का और झगड़ो का। इसलिये मैं समझता हू कि वज़ीर साहब को यह सोचना चाहिये कि यह बिल इस वक्त लाना चाहिये या नही लाना चाहिये। मैं क्यो कहता हू। अभी आपके सामने एक नक्शा हुआ, गुजराल जी ने कहा, जब पंजाबी सूबा बना तो उसके बाद यह बनाने की कोशिश की गई, मैं समझता हूं कि कुछ इसमें सच्चाई नज़र आती है कि गवर्नमेंट की अपीज़मेंट की पालिसी है, पजाब के विभाजन के खिलाफ पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू से ले कर सब ही कहते रहे कि पजाब का विभाजन नही होगा, पहले सच्चर फारमूला बना और फिर उसके बाद बाईलिग्वल फ़ारमूला बना और उसके बाद भी कहा गया कि पंजाब का विभाजन नही होगा और आज पजाब का विभाजन एक हकीकत है। अगर केन्द्रीय सरकार को दिल्ली के लिये विधान सभा देनी है और इसी ढंग पर देनी है जिससे कि अपीजमेंट की यह पालिसी हो तो यह एक रास्ता खोला है आपने मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल से, और अगर यही रास्ता है और गवर्नमेंट को अपीजमेंट की पालिसी करनी है तो फिर यह जल्दी क्यों हो रही है, जल्दी क्यो कर रहे है, अगर दिल्ली की विधान सभा बनानी है तो अभी इंतजार कर ले, हालात को देख ले और इस बिल को वापस ले लें। अगर बनाना है, अपीजमेंट करना है तो दो-तीन साल के बाद सोचकर

[श्री जगत नारायण]

बनायें, सोच ले कि किस किस्म का बिल लाना है और आया विधान सभा बनानी है या नहीं बनानी है। अगर यह बनायेंगे तो एक बात याद रखिये, यह मै हाउस के मेम्बरान को कहना चाहता हूं, कि जिस ढंग से आज यहां दिल्ली के नेताओं मे यह बहस चल रही है उसका जनता से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, इस बहस को जनता बिल्कुल समझती नहीं है और वह बिल्कुल समझती है कि इसके होने से कोई फ़ायदा नहीं है, यह कोई उनके लिये फ़ायदे की चीज नही है, चाहे विधान सभा हो या न हो, मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल हो या न हो, जनता तो यह समझती है कि हमको यहां पीने को पानी मिलना चाहिये, हमको यहां पर डाक्टर मिलना चाहिये, हमको यहां पर अपनी सेहत के लिये तमाम वह इंतजाम जो गवर्नमेंट को करना चाहिये वह मिलना चाहिये, वह चाहती है कि बिजली वक्त-वक्त पर फेल न होती रहे, बिजली मिलती रहे। तो दिल्ली के लोगों को अमेनिटीज़ चाहिये। उनकी हालत क्या हो गई है? मुझे भी दो साल यहां रहते हुये हो गये हैं। मै समझता हूं कि पंजाब से भी गया गुज़रा दिल्ली का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन हो गया है। आप पंजाब में आइये तो कम से कम आपको बसेज़ में ट्रैविल करने में बड़ा आराम मिलेगा, सारे हिन्दुस्तान में बेस्ट बसेज़ है जो कि पंजाब मे चलती है। अभी श्री गोविन्दन् नायर ने जो हालत बताई वह बिल्कुल ठीक है, चार-चार घंटे बस के लिये ठहरे रहना पडता है तब जा कर बस में जगह मिलती है और बड़ी मुश्किल से मिलती है। अगर दिल्ली में गाड़ी लेट आ जाय तो फिर आपको न तो स्कूटर मिलेगा और न टैक्सी मिलेगी, यहा तक कि सामान उठाने के लिये कुली तक नहीं मिलेगा। तो इस तरह की हालत है। तो मै समझ रहा हूं कि अगर आपको विधान सभा दिल्ली को देनी है और इनके थ्रेट के नीचे देनी है—जैसा कि आपको थ्रेट किया गया, उस हाउस में भी थ्रेट किया गया और यहां भी थ्रेट किया गया कि पहले तो श्री ब्रह्मप्रकाश आपके लायल सर्वेंट थे, लायल साथी थे और अब आप उसको छोड़ कर के दूसरे के साथ अपनी दोस्ती बढ़ा रहे है तो आपको नुक्सान उठाना पडेगा, इस किस्म का थ्रेट वहां दिया गया, मेरा कोई ताल्लुक इससे नही है, न ब्रह्मप्रकाश से है और न किसी से है और आपको तो पता है कि मै ग्रेटर दिल्ली के खिलाफ हूं, मैं नही समझता कि हरियाणा मे ग्रेटर दिल्ली बनना चाहिये—तो इस बिल को वापस ले। मै क्यो कहता हूं कि आप इसे वापस ले ले, इसलिये वापस ले ले कि आप एक नया अखाड़ा खड़ा कर रहे हैं, आप लड़ाई का अखाड़ा खड़ा कर रहे है और जनता को इससे कोई फायदा नही पहुंचेगा। वह तो यह समझती है कि आपको जिन आदमियो को कौंसिल मे नामिनेट करना है वह इनके खिलाफ जो ग्रूप है उनमे से नामिनेट करेंगे और इनके मेम्बर जो मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल मे आयेंगे वे आपका काम नही चलने देंगे। आप देख लें कि यह अखाड़ा बनेगा और जनता का कोई फायदा नही होगा। इसको सामने रखते हुए मै अर्ज करूंगा कि वजीर साहब इस बिल को वापस ले ले या फिर वह हमे बताये कि इस मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल को बनाने से दिल्ली की जनता को क्या फायदा पहुंचेगा। जहा तक दिल्ली की जनता का ताल्लुक है आपका कार्पोरेशन कायम है, उसको आपने तोड़ नही दिया है, नई दिल्ली की म्युनिसिपल कमेटी कायम है, वह सारी चीजे कायम हैं और इसके अलावा जो तमाम इम्पार्टेंट मैटर्स हैं उन्हे तो गवर्नमेंट ने अपने हाथ मे रख लिया है, मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल के हाथ में वे मैटर्स भी नही है, तो सिवाय इसके कि वहा आपस में लड़ाई हो और रोज अखबार के सफे काले हो और बाहर के अम्बैसेडर्स जो यहां बैठे है वह यह पढे कि दिल्ली मे, भारत की राजधानी मे, हम कोई किसी किस्म का काम नही चला सकते है और लोगो को कोई अमेनिटीज़ नही दे सकते है, और कुछ नही होगा। तो फिर आपको इस मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल के

बिल को लाने से क्या फायदा है? इसकी कोई जरूरत नही है।

इसलिये मैं आपकी खिदमत मे अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि अगर वाकई आपको कोई चीज यहा पर करनी है तो सच समझ कर करिये, दो साल के बाद कीजिए, आज जो देश की हालत है वह खराब है। आज आपने पंजाब का विभाजन कर दिया है। वहां क्या हालत है। बिजनेस वहा से भाग रहा है, वहा कोई काम नही हो रहा है, लोग घबडाये हुये हैं कि यहा रह सकेंगे या नही रह सकेंगे। और आज आप एक नया बखेड़ा शुरू कर रहे हैं कि दिल्ली के लिये मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल बनाने वाले हैं। याद रखिये कि आप देश मे बिल्कुल वही हालत पैदा कर रहे हैं जो हालत कि चीन में च्यागकाई शेख के जमाने मे पैदा हुई थी। वह समझ रहे थे कि मैं हुकूमत कर रहा हूं और उसे पता नही था कि उसके पांव उखड़ रहे हैं। उसी ढंग से आप चल रहे हैं, आप देश का विभाजन करते जा रहे हैं और कौंसिल बनाते जा रहे हैं और इससे सिवाय इसके कि जंग का एक अखाड़ा हो जनता को, दिल्ली की जनता को, कोई फायदा नहीं पहुंचेगा, नेता अपने लिए कुर्सी ले लेंगे, अपने आप लड़ते रहेंगे और जहां तक जनता का ताल्लुक है उसे रत्ती भर फायदा नही पहुंच सकता और उसका असर सारे के सारे देश पर होगा कि यह भावना जगेगी कि आप देश का विभाजन करते चले जा रहे हैं। अभी आपकी यह विभाजन की पालिसी खत्म नही हुई है। मुझे याद है कि हमारे स्टेट मिनिस्टर साहब ने, जब कि पंजाब का विभाजन हो रहा था तो कहा था कि यह आखीरी है इसके बाद और आगे ऐसा नहीं चलेगा लेकिन आज आप एक नई चीज मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल को लाये हैं और कल यहा दिल्ली में विधान सभा भी बनेगी। मैं कहता हूं कि यह जो आप को थ्रेट मिल रही है यह जो आपको सरकार को थ्रेट मिल रही है वह कांग्रेस से मिल रही है अपोजीशन का इसमें कोई ताल्लुक नही है, आज जो यह झगड़ा हो रहा है वह कांग्रेस का झगडा है, उनकी इक्तदार की जो भूख है उसे मिटाने के लिये आज मैट्रोपालिटन कौंसिल का यह बिल पेश किया गया है, मैं समझता हूं कि यह बिल आपको वापस ले लेना चाहिये और बड़े अदब से आपसे दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि देश का विभाजन न करिये, देश की हालत को समझने की कोशिश करिये। देश की सरहदों पर खड़े हैं चीन और पाकिस्तान। रोज आप कहते हैं, आज भी अखबार में छपा है पाकिस्तान ने कुछ गड़बड़ की है। उधर आपके मीजोज़ ने और नागाज ने हालत खराब कर रखी है। इधर दिल्ली शहर मे जो हिन्दुस्तान की कैपिटल है यहा कांग्रेस ने खाना जंगी शुरू कर दी है और आपको पार्लियामेन्ट में धमकी दे रहे हैं कि अगर बिल पास कर दिया तो आपकी चलने नही देंगे। तो अंदाजा लगाइये आप दुनिया के सामने कौन सी तसवीर पेश करेंगे इस मैट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल को बना कर? तो इस खयाल से मैं चाहता हूं कि आपको इस बिल को वापस ले लेना चाहिये और ये जो उनके झगड़े हैं, ये लड़ते रहें एम० पी० बनने के लिये बजाय इसके कि आप एक नया बखेड़ा शुरू करें यह कौंसिल बना कर के

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र (उड़ीसा) : यह तो यदुवंश का झगड़ा है कांग्रेस का नही है।

श्री जगत नारायण : मैंने तो कहा है कि आपोजीशन का कोई ताल्लुक हो नहीं। यह तो उनका आपस का झगडा है। आपने अपनी पिछली असेम्बली जो थी सिर्फ इसलिये तोड़ी थी कि आप समझते थे कि कैपिटल में जो असेम्बली काम कर रही है उसकी वह इमेज नहीं है जो एक रेप्रेजेन्टेटिव्ह बाडी की इमेज होनी चाहिये—बडी रिश्वत चलती थी, बड़ी शिकायतें थी। आपने चीफ मिनिस्टर बदला, आपने कौंसिल को तोड दिया, उसके बाद आपने कारपोरेशन बनाया, अब कारपोरेश . . .

कुमारी शांता वशिष्ठ : आपकी पंजाब की मिनिस्ट्री में क्या होता था ?

श्री जगत नारायण : आपको पता ही है कि हम किस तरह से उनके खिलाफ लड़ते रहे हैं । खैर, मैं जो अर्ज कर रहा था वह यह था कि आपने विधान सभा को खत्म किया, असेम्बली को खत्म किया और इसलिये खत्म किया कि हम दिल्ली शहर की सेवा करें दिल्ली शहर की जनता की सेवा करें और जो यहां पर व्ही० आई० पीज़० आते हैं, एम्बेसेडर्स आते हैं, उनके सामने एक ऐसी तसवीर पेश करेंगे कि दिल्ली शहर बहुत अच्छा है । उसके बाद आपने कारपोरेशन बनाया, अब आप यह मैट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल बनाने लगे हैं । कारपोरेशन भी रहेगा । मगर आप यकीन रखिये, जिस चीज़ की आप इमेज पेश करना चाहते हैं वह इमेज आप क्या पेश करेंगे । आपने तो दिखाना है हर रोज की जूत बाजार, जो आप यहां देख रहे हैं दिल्ली की कांग्रेस के नेताओं में और जो लोक सभा में आपने देखा है वह आप देखेंगे । वहां इतनी 'बिटर' स्पीचेज़ हुई हैं कि मैं तो हैरान हूं । वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, जब आप आल इंडिया कांग्रेस के सेक्रेटरी थे, छोटी-छोटी बात पर आप नोटिस लिया करते थे कि यह तो कांग्रेस के लोग हैं इन्डिसिप्लिन्ड हैं । लेकिन आज इन्डिसिप्लिन इस हद तक हो गया है कि यहां पर जो बंध दिल्ली में हुआ उसमें कांग्रेस ने शिरकत की बावजूद इसके कि कांग्रेस हाई कमान्ड से कहा गया कि कांग्रेस के नेताओं में कोई डिसिप्लिन नहीं । तो यह बिल पास करके आप जो इमेज पेश करना चाहते हैं, जो अच्छी इमेज पैदा करना चाहते हैं, वह नहीं होगा और हर रोज आप पढ़ेंगे अखबारात में कि दिल्ली में जो आपने काउन्सिल बनानी है उसके जो मेम्बर बनेंगे उनमें किस तरह से जूत बाजार हो रही है । एक-दूसरे के खिलाफ कहेंगे और उसका असर यह होगा कि आप सोचेंगे कि इसको रखें या खत्म कर दें या विधान सभा बनाएं । तो मैं बड़े अदब से आपकी खिदमत में अर्ज करूंगा कि इस बिल को वापस ले लें, कारपोरेशन जो आपका चल रहा है उसको मजीद ताकत आप दे दें, उससे काम करवाएं इस दिल्ली शहर का । अगर वह नहीं कर सकता तो खत्म कर दें और आप अपने हाथ में सारा काम ले लें । दिल्ली की जनता बहुत दुखी है । मैं बताऊं, जहां तक इस कारपोरेशन का ताल्लुक है या जो काउन्सिल बनेगी उससे भी लोग खुश नहीं हैं । उससे उनको कोई फायदा नहीं पहुंचता । इसलिये अगर वाकई आपके दिल में यह खयाल है कि आप जनता की सेवा करना चाहते हैं, जनता को खुश करना चाहते हैं, उसको एमिनिटीज़ देना चाहते हैं, दुनिया के बाहर के लोगों को बताना चाहते हैं कि दिल्ली में हम अच्छी तरह का एड्मिनिस्ट्रेशन चला रहे हैं तो एक ही रास्ता है कि इस बिल को वापस ले लें और कारपोरेशन को ताकत दें मगर लोगों का खयाल रखें कि लोगों को एमिनिटीज़ देनी है, जनता को सुख-सुविधा देनी है और इस खयाल से कोई अच्छा बिल लाइये, दो साल बाद लाइये, चार साल बाद लाइये, जिससे जनता को फायदा मिल सके । इस बिल से जनता को फायदा नहीं पहुंचता, न नेताओं को फायदा पहुंचता । चार, पांच कौंसिल बन जायेंगी और आप देखेंगे उनमें इस तरह से झगड़े होंगे कि फिर वही बात आप सोचेंगे कि इसको खत्म करें या जारी रखें । यह प्राबलम बन जायेगी । इसलिये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इसको आप को वापस लेना चाहिये ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Are we adjourning for lunch ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : We are sitting through lunch.

श्री आबिद अली : जनाब, इस बिल के संबंध में कई बातें कही गई हैं । वहां जन संघ के एक माननीय सभासद यह कह गये कि जिस तरह मिन्टो मार्ले रिफार्म्स हिन्दुस्तान में

लाकर अंग्रेज़ों ने चाल चली थी वही चाल आज कांग्रेस गवर्नमेन्ट चल रही है। अफसोस की बात है कि यहां तक हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के कुछ सज्जन पहुंच जाते हैं, इस बात का उन्हें खयाल नही कि मिन्टो मार्ले रिफार्म्स अंग्रेज़ो की तरफ से लंदन से हिन्दुस्तान को अपने काबू मे रखने के लिए आए, जब कि यहा हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार खुद अपने लिये कायदा बना रही है, एम० पीज० दिल्ली से भी चुने जाते हैं, और पार्लियामेन्ट में कायदा पास हो रहा है। खैर, हमारे, इस बिल के बारे में मेरी अपनी राय यह है कि हमारी गवर्नमेन्ट की कुछ कमजोर पालिसी रही है, जिस पालिसी की वजह से रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन बना और आज नही, उस वक्त भी मैंने यह अर्ज की थी कि यह गलत हुआ। एक सज्जन ने उपवास किया उसकी वजह से मद्रास के दो टुकड़े बने, आंध्र बना, और बाद में जो अच्छे सूबे थे, शान से कामियाबी से चल रहे थे, उनके भी टुकड़े हुए। आज भी जबलपुर के रहने वाले इंदौर से उतना नजदीक नहीं, इंदौर से उसका उतना भाईचारा नहीं जितना अभी भी नागपुर से है, वह सौ साल से साथ रहे हैं। मेरी अर्ज यह रही, पहले भी, कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने दबाव में आ कर काफी गलतियां की हैं, जैसे कि तिब्बत को उन्होंने चाइना को पेश कर दिया, उसमें मदद की। यहां भी हमारे मुल्क में भी जहां दबाव आया वहां बद गये। गोवा क्यों अलग है, पांडिचेरी क्यों अभी तक अलाहिदा है? पंजाब के बारे में जब हमारे बुजुर्ग नेता माननीय जवाहरलाल जी ने कह दिया कि वह सूबा नहीं बनेगा, तब क्यों बना? इस तरह से हम कब तक दबते चले जायंगे आज यहां भी एक चैलेन्ज दिया गया है कि अगर इस बिल को आपने पास किया तो नतीजा बुरा होगा और आपको पछताना पड़ेगा। जितना यह गवर्नमेंट दबती जाती है उतना हर कोई धमकी देने के लिये खड़ा होता है। वे क्यों कह रहे हैं कि पछताना पड़ेगा? इसलिये कि वे देखते हैं कि यह गवर्नमेन्ट दबती चली जाती है।

श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह : किसका चैलेन्ज है?

श्री आबिद अली : और अफसोस इस बात का है कि दबने के लिये तैयार रहते हैं। अपोजीशन की तरफ से, कम्यूनिस्टों की तरफ से दबाव आता है कि यह कीजिए वह कीजिए। जानते हैं कि आज मुल्क की हालत ठीक नही है लेकिन . . .

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : लेकिन आबिद अली साहब गणतंत्र में यही तो होता है कि गवर्नमेंट पापुलर फीलिंग के आगे झुकती है।

श्री आबिद अली : तो मेरी अर्ज यह है कि आज जो कर रहे हैं वह ठीक है। जो दिल्ली के मामले हैं उनके लिये एक पोर्टफोलियो आप अलग कीजिए, और एक मिनिस्टर के सुपुर्द जो दिल्ली से चुने कर आए हैं वे एम० पीज़० उनके एड्वाइजर हों और दिल्ली का काम अच्छी तरह से चले। मैं यह भी मानने के लिये तैयार हूं कि दिल्ली का एड्मिनिस्ट्रेशन निकम्मा है, आज नहीं पहले भी जब दिल्ली की लेजिस्लेटिव्ह असेम्बली थी उस वक्त भी वह रौटन एड्मिनिस्ट्रेशन था। आपके दिल्ली डेवलपमेन्ट अथारिटी ने लोगों की बहुत सी जगहे दस साल से ली हुई हैं और अभी तक उनको एक पैसा कम्पेन्सेशन का नहीं मिला है। ऐसे बहुत से काम हैं जो गलत तरीके से हो रहे हैं और मुझे उम्मीद है कि इस तरफ भी ध्यान दिया जायेगा। तो मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर आज भी गवर्नमेन्ट इस बात को मान ले कि सेन्टर में एक अलग दिल्ली का पोर्टफोलियो हो और यहां से जो एम० पीज० चुने हुए हैं उनके सलाह मशविरे से यहां काम चले तो ठीक बात है लेकिन अगर यही समझा गया कि यह जो बिल पेश किया गया है यह मंजूर किया जाय तो ठीक है कोशिश कीजिए कि लोगों को एड्मिनिस्ट्रेशन से संतोष हो लेकिन मेहरबानी करके दबाव में न आ जाइयेगा और इस तरह जो आपको कुछ

[श्री आबिद अली]

लोग दबाना चाहते है उनसे साफ-साफ एक दफा आप कह दीजिए कि बस इससे आगे हम नही जायंगे। लेकिन मालूम नहीं कभी वह हिम्मत आयेगी कि नही आयेगी, और अगर आई तो हिन्दुस्तान के लिये वह एक मुबारक कदम होगा और हो सके तो थोड़ा और बढ जाइयेगा, थोड़ा मैने कहा, बहुत काफी आगे बढ जाइयेगा और मेरी दुआ है कि कोई दिन ऐसा आए कि इस मुल्क मे कोई ऐसा बुजुर्ग पैदा हो चाहे वह मर्द हो या औरत, कि इस मुल्क को एक कर सके, जो टुकडे-टुकडे करने का तरीका अब चल रहा है उसको न सिर्फ रोके बल्कि मुल्क को एक करे, तमाम मुल्क मे एक एड्मिनिस्ट्रशन हो, मुसलिम लीग ने जो एक प्रथा चलाई पाकिस्तान बना कर आज हर एक अपने-अपने लिए जगह बनाने की कोशिश कर रहा है, उस चीज को वह रोके। यहा महाराष्ट्रियन महाराष्ट्र की ही बात करेगा, गुजराती गुजरात की बात करेगा, पंजाबी पजाब की बात करेगा। असेम्बली में चले जाइये तो सब अपने-अपने जिले की बात करेगे, डिसट्रिक्ट बोर्ड मे जाइये तो अपने-अपने गांव की बात करेगा। जब कोई कहता है मैं महाराष्ट्रियन हू, पंजाबी हूं, मै बंगाली हूं, मैं गुजराती हूं तब यह ढूढना मुशकिल पड़ जाता है कि हिन्दुस्तानी कौन है। अर्ज यह है कि कभी आप ऐसी हिम्मत कर सकते है कि हिन्दुस्तान के सूबो मे जितनी असेम्बलीज है उन सब को खत्म कर दे। अगर आप मुल्क मे इस बात की जरूरत समझे तो जो पुराने डिवीजनों मे कमिश्नर थे वैसे रख सकते है और अगर आप जरूरत समझते है तो एक-एक पोलिटिकल वर्कर भी इन कमिश्नरी डिवीजन के चार्ज मे रहे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : डैमोक्रेसी का क्या होगा ?

श्री आबिद अली : डैमोक्रैसी तो पार्लियामेंट के मारफत रहेगी और मालूम नही यह बात हो सकती है या नहीं। अगर मान लीजिए कि इस तरह की चीज हो गई तो हिन्दुस्तान मे एक शानदार पार्लियामेंट रहेगी और सूबों मे डिवीजनल कमिशनरी रह जायेगी। अगर आप चाहते है तो पोलिटिकल आदमी मुअय्यन कीजिए और इलाको मे कमिश्नर रखिये जो गवर्नमेंट ऑफ इडिया की पालिसी को मुनासिब तरीके से चलाये। बाकी पिछले 10 सालो मे जो कुछ हुआ है, उस तरीके से चलायेगे तो हम हिन्दुस्तान के हक मे यह चीज अच्छी नही करेंगे। आज हम देख रहे है कि मिनिस्टर बढते ही चले जा रहे है, मिनिस्ट्रिया बढती ही चली जा रही है और लोग काग्रेस को गालिया देते है। ऐसे भी मिनिस्टर है जो काग्रेस मे पहले नही थे। ऐसे भी मिनिस्टर हैं जिन्होने न कोई मुसीबत उठाई है, न कोई कुरबानी ही की है, न कोई मेहनत ही की है, न किसी किस्म का त्याग ही किया है, लेकिन आज वे मिनिस्टर बन गये है। जब हम अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ लडाई लड़ रहे थे तो वे अंग्रेजो के तरफ थे और जब मुल्क आजाद हो गया तो वे कांग्रेस मे आ गये। जब कोई दूसरी पार्टी आयेगी तो वे उसके साथ देने लगेगे। इस किस्म के बेईमान और शराबखोर लोग आ गए है लेकिन अच्छी बात यह है, खुशकिस्मत बात इस मुल्क के लिये यह है कि इस तरह के लोग बहुत कम है। अगर जो है तो वे उसी तरह से खराबी कर रहे है जिस तरह से एक खराब मछली सारे तालाब को गन्दा कर देती है। जिस तरह से एक कडवी ककड़ी सारे रायते का जायका खराब कर देती है इसी तरह के बदमाश हमारे यहां भी नुकसान पहुचा रहे है। लेकिन मै यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह हमारे मुल्क के लिये खुशकिस्मत बात है कि शराबखोर और बेईमान मिनिस्टर बहुत थोडे है। लेकिन उनको निकालना मुश्किल काम है और यह आप मे हिम्मत नही है। सेन्टर मे ऐसे मिनिस्टर बैठे है और स्टेट मे भी है, लेकिन आप उन्हें नही निकाल सकते है। आप हिम्मत

कर और इन सब को निकाल दीजिए। जो अच्छे मिनिस्टर यहा है स्टेट मे है, काबिल है, ईमानदार है, उन्हे आप रखिए, तरह से मुल्क का कारोबार अच्छी तरह से चलाये। जिस आजादी को हासिल करने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान के लोगो ने कुरबानी की उसी चीज को हमे अब भी हासिल करना चाहिये ताकि हम इस मुल्क को उसी तरह बना सके जिसको बनाने के लिये हम इतने सालो से कोशिश कर रहे है। लेकिन आज हम कभी इससे दब जाते है, कभी उससे दब जाते है और इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि लोग हमको गाली दे रहे है। इसलिए मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हू कि अगर काग्रेस को आयन्दा मुल्क की खिदमत करनी है तो जिस तरह से हमने आजादी हासिल करने के लिए कुर्बानी की थी, उसी तरह से हमे काग्रेस की आयन्दा हिस्ट्री बनाने के लिये भी काम करना चाहिये। इस समय मुल्क मे सब चीजे काग्रेस के हक में है क्योंकि काग्रेस ने मुल्क की आजादी हासिल करने के लिए बडी शानदार खिदमत की थी और उस आजादी को निभाने के लिए, मुल्क को बनाये रखने के लिए, हम सब को उसी तरह की कुरबानी करनी चाहिये। अगर हमारे काग्रेस का अमल सही नहीं रहेगा तो आप समझ सकते है कि मुल्क की हालत क्या होगी। आज दीवारो पर हर शब्द लिखा है कि काग्रेस ने मुल्क की आजादी के लिए क्या-क्या कुरबानिया की थीं, आप उस तरफ देखिये और हिम्मत से काम लीजिए। मुल्क आपके साथ है। कुछ लोग कहा करें, बका करे कि काग्रेस खराब है। आज सब पार्टिया मिल जायं फिर भी अगर सब काग्रेस-मैन मुत्तफिक है तो हमने जिस तरह से पिछले इलैक्शनो मे शानदार कामयाबी हासिल की थी उसी तरह से इस दफा भी दिखला सकते है। लेकिन लोग चाहते है कि इस दफा ऐसे आदमियो को खडा किया जाय जिसको लोग वोट देना पसन्द करे, ऐसे बेईमान आदमी को खडा न किया जाय जो जीत न सके। अगर बेईमान को टिकट दिया जायेगा तो लोग वोट देने को तैयार नहीं होंगे क्योंकि काग्रेस ऊंची सिद्धान्त अपनाए हुए है और लोग उससे काफी अपेक्षा करते है। अगर हमारी तरफ से कोई गलत काम हो जाता है तो उससे काग्रेस कमजोर हो जाती है। इसलिए मै यह अर्ज करना चाहता हू कि अगर इस बात का जरा भी ख्याल रखा जायेगा तो लोग आपके साथ जाने के लिये तैयार है। आप मे इतनी हिम्मत है या नहीं, लेकिन इस मुल्क के लोगो मे अब भी इतनी मुहब्बत है कि वे आपका साथ देने के लिये तैयार है अगर आपकी ओर से अच्छा काम हो। आप जो भी रिफार्म करना चाहते है उसे हिम्मत से करिये क्योंकि जनता आपके साथ आने को तैयार है और आपको शानदार कामयाबी देने के लिये भी तैयार है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि इन चीजो को

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र मै आप से एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हू। वाइस चेयरमैन मि० आबिद अली . .

एक माननीय सदस्य हिन्दी मे बोलिये।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र श्री आबिद अली साहब ने कहा कि सेन्टर मे कुछ बेईमान और शराबखोर मिनिस्टर है। ये कौन-कौन है क्योंकि हर जगह पर तो काग्रेस मिनिस्ट्री चला रही है। इसलिये मै यह जानना चाहूंगा . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) हर जगह है, थोड़े-थोड़े है।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : सेन्टर मे कौन है क्योंकि हम पीछे लगे हुए है कि कौन बेई-मान है, बदमाश है और चोर है। हमारा तो यह काम है कि इस तरह के लोगो के पीछे लगे, उनको हटाये, उनको यहा से निकालकर बाहर करें, अगर इस तरह के लोगो के बारे मे हमको मालूम हो गया। यहां पर मेम्बर साहब बोले है और उन्होने हाउस के फ्लोर में इस तरह का स्टेटमेंट दिया है, इसलिये मै

[श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र]

यह जानना चाहूंगा कि सेन्टर मे इस तरह के मिनिस्टर कौन है क्योंकि हम सेन्टर के बारे में रिसपान्सिबल है और हम यहा पर काम करते है। अगर हमे इसके बारे मे खबर मिल गई तो हम उनका पीछा करेगे।

श्री आबिद अली. इस किस्म के दोस्त आनरेबल मेम्बर की पार्टी मे भी है और उनके नजदीक भी रहते है।

(Interruptions)

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : हमारी पार्टी मे नही है। कांग्रेस पार्टी मे होगे और आप बतलाइये।

श्री आबिद अली : हर समाज मे है, हर पथ मे है, मंदिर मे है, मस्जिद मे है, इस तरह के लोग अच्छे और खराब सब जगह रहते है और जूता चोर भी नमाजी हुआ करते है इस तरह के जूता चोर काग्रेस मे है और दूसरी पार्टियों मे भी है, लेकिन वे पकड़े नही जाते है और इस बात से कोई इन्कार नही कर सकता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आपकी पार्टी मे ज्यादा है।

(Interruptions)

श्री आबिद अली : तो मै यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि ये जूता चोर हर जगह है।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The main point is this. We have specifically put it in the Directive Principles of our Constitution that the Government is charged—especially the Congress Party—with the duty of doing its best to do away with drinking. That is one of the Directive Principles of our Constitution and now the hon. Member says here that he knows that some Ministers in this country are addicted to drink, I would like to know from him who they are.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Seek his private advice. Now, you have finished, Mr. Abid Ali ?

SHRI ABID ALI : Yes, Sir.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, despite the persuasive manner in which the hon. Minister moved his motion . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : He is always persuasive.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : . . . he has left us unconvinced, especially after hearing some of the Members of the Treasury Benches who carried on a dialogue—I will not say a controversy, with due respect to them.

About the manner in which this Bill has been brought forward I would say it is nothing but the conspiracy of circumstances that has produced this Bill. Before analysing some of the provisions of this Bill I want to reply to one point that the hon. Minister raised. The only argument that he advanced was that he wants to give a sense of participation to the people of Delhi to administer their own affairs. He had no second argument to advance. Sir, if you scan through this Bill, will you say, or will any sensible person say, that a sense of participation has been given to the citizens of Delhi ? Up till now according to the Constitution we are administering this Union Territory with the help of an Administrator and we know what the consequences are of this sort of administration. And now to give a sense of participation to the people they are going to have a Metropolitan Council. And what is the status of this Council ? It is absolutely an advisory body, a body whose recommendations may not be accepted by the Executive Council which is not responsible to this Metropolitan Council but which is responsible to the President of India through the Home Ministry and even the recommendations of the Executive Council may not be accepted by the Government of India. So I want to know, when the Minister replies, wherein is that sense of participation that he is going to give to the citizens of Delhi. At every stage it is a question of recommendations; it is a question of functioning in an advisory capacity Under these circumstances I do not think there is absolutely any merit in pushing through this Bill and the very manner in which this is being hustled through gives rise to the one and the only conclusion that there are certain motivations behind this Bill. If you go through the various measures you will find that on the question of governance of this Union Territory we have shifted our ground from one to the other. Delhi had a responsible Government earlier and we do not know the reasons why that was abolished Now we are keeping it directly and we know what the consequences are. So I will say that this is not a Delhi Administration Bill but this is Delhi Mal administration Bill. Perhaps they think, the way the affairs of Delhi are managed the way the criticism has been levelled against the Administration both here and outside, the way the journalists are being manhandled in broad daylight in the streets of Delhi with the culprits not being found out, the manner in which water supply and other civic services are being managed, perhaps they want to have a buffer institution so that the shock of all these things could be absorbed; for absorbing this shock they want to have this advisory body called the Metropolitan Council.

Sir, in this connection I want to refer to certain provisions in the Bill. Though the members of the Metropolitan Council will be elected by the citizens of Delhi, the Executive Council will be nominated by the President of India on the advice of the Home Ministry and this Executive Council will not be responsible to the Metropolitan Council Even the recommendations of the Executive Council will not be accepted by the Government of India and even the Administrator who will preside over the Council has certain discretionary functions in respect of law and order and also about some other things. So the only argument of giving a sense of participation to the people of Delhi is lost in the whole process. I would therefore humbly submit this: let us not have a duplicate machinery and spend some money of the tax-payers of India; let us withdraw this measure. If you are not prepared to give taxing powers or financial powers to this body there is no use constituting such a Metropolitan Council They already have a Corporation and it is better to give more powers to that Corporation so that they can govern this city better but if they really want the people of this Union Territory to have a sense of participation in the governance of their affairs they should give financial and other necessary powers to the Metropolitan Council There cannot be any *via media* between these two. It will be better if the Minister, instead of taxing the people of India further for having another redundant Council, could give more powers to the Corporation. Or the other alternative for them is to give this Council a lot of powers, financial and other powers. If they are not prepared to do that there is no use having this Metropolitan Council

In the end I would say that Delhi has been a showpiece Whoever comes from any corner of India or from outside comes to know how the administration is being run directly by the Government of India and perhaps that is why they want to have a buffer institution so that they can say they are not directly responsible for all this maladministration that is going on here; they will say that this Council is responsible Sir, therefore I oppose this Bill and I would humbly request the Minister that if he wants really to give a sense of participation to the people of Delhi then he should give more powers to the Council, otherwise it is better that he withdraws this Bill

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Sir, of late a trend is being noticed of the Government wanting to take more control of autonomy and autonomous bodies from the people This is discernible not only in the case of this Bill but if you look round the country you will find that this tendency is becoming more and more pronounced and somewhat gaining strength That the Government is taking control of such autonomous bodies will be evident from certain legislations enacted so far. I would say that the Government tries to acquire control in the academic sphere

[Shri Chitta Basu.]

also; in the field of civic administration also we have seen they are taking over more control, as will be seen from the proposal of forming a metropolitan authority for the Calcutta Corporation. This I am referring to only to drive home to you that the Government is more and more bent upon taking away the democratic rights of the people. It is in this background that I want to view this Delhi Administration Bill which is now before the House because a Bill of this nature is very very dangerous. It is dangerous because it takes away certain democratic rights and the legitimate hopes and aspirations of the people. You know, Sir, that the people of Delhi have been aspiring for a full-fledged State legislature and through that State legislature they want to govern their own affairs and they want to run their own administration. They want to have a responsible Ministry so that the people may have their own right to govern themselves but if you look at this Bill you will find that the fundamental right of the people of managing their own affairs has been taken away in many places. If that is so, how is it expected that the Bill can be supported by people who have got even an iota of democratic sense ?

2 P.M.

Sir, you know that the Government might have said that because Delhi is the seat of the Central Government, there cannot be any other Government here. But you know there are many countries where the seat of the Federal Government enjoys the same rights as existing in other parts of the countries. Therefore, Sir, to me it is not convincing that because Delhi is the seat of the Central Government, the people of Delhi, the citizens of Delhi, will be deprived of their democratic rights of governing themselves They say that because of the Constitution they cannot offer the people of Delhi those democratic rights. I know there are limitations in the present Constitution but we also know that the Constitution has been changed and amended many a time and this has been possible. The Government has amended the Constitution whenever it has suited it. But when an amendment is sought in the interest of 3 million people of Delhi they say it cannot be done because the Constitution cannot be amended. Now that Punjabi Suba is going to be formed, it has become necessary to amend the Constitution. Then why should it not be amended to offer the people of Delhi their democratic right to govern themselves ? This is the fundamental background on the basis of which I want to discuss this Bill.

Sir, if you look at the various provisions, you will find that in different places and on different occasions these democratic rights of the people have been taken away. Let us see the objects of the Bill The object of the Bill is to provide for a larger measure of association for the representatives of the people of Delhi. The Minister agrees that the fullest measure of participation for the people of Delhi has not been ensured in this Bill. They say that association has been limited in the past and they want to broaden it a little more they want to offer them a larger measure of association. The object of this Bill itself says that this Bill does not aim at ensuring complete and full participation of the people of Delhi in the governance of their own affairs.

Then, Sir, it is wholly undemocratic because the Metropolitan Council which is proposed to be formed out of this Bill has got no power of legislation. What has such a Metropolitan Council to do ? Thosands of rupees will be spent only on unnecessarily continuing debates, debates and debates; they will be debating and debating endlessly and producing nothing for the people whom they represent. Members of the Metropolitan Council will be elected on the basis of adult franchise; they will remain accountable to their electorate but they cannot discharge their responsibilities to the electorate because they have nothing to do except to debate and debate fruitlessly and endlessly. Therefore these elected members of the Metropolitan Council will be deprived of their right to serve their electorate and associate themselves with the hopes and aspirations of the people on whose vote they are elected.

Then, Sir, the Executive Councillors who are going to be appointed will not remain responsible to this Metropolitan Council. They will be in office so long as they enjoy the pleasure of the President, *i.e.* the appointing authority. What will the members of the Metropolitan Council do while the Executive Councillors do not execute the things which they want to get executed in the interest of the people and the electorate? Sir, I feel that these Executive Councillors' posts have been created only to shower favours on some persons whom the people may not like. Therefore you will find how undemocratic it is.

Then, Sir, how will the business of the Metropolitan Council be conducted? Of course there is a provision that the rules of procedure will be evolved finally by the Metropolitan Council but pending that it is the Administrator who will frame the laws, frame the rules of procedure, of course with the consent of the President. Therefore I think during this pendency a member of the Metropolitan Council may not be allowed to raise a question which may be found inconvenient to the Administrator, inconvenient to the Executive Councillors and inconvenient to the Government, because the pleasure of the President will be sought through the Home Ministry, the Government of India. Therefore these members are not going to enjoy their rights and privileges as elected members. Is it not undemocratic? Is it not a mockery of democracy? Therefore, Sir, I strongly oppose this measure.

In the end I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this. Delhi Administration, as my hon friend was saying, has already become a maladministration and this Bill seeks not to remove that maladministration but rather to perpetuate it. The multiplicity of administrative agencies has not been reduced and there will be no co-ordination among the different agencies as existing at present. Therefore in my opinion the present Bill does not only deprive the people of Delhi their democratic rights of having a full-fledged Legislature and responsible Ministry but also fails to ensure civic amenities to them. Therefore, I oppose this Bill and urge upon the Members of this House, on whom rests the responsibility of defending and protecting democratic rights, to see that the Bill is withdrawn.

SHRI P N SAPRU: Mr Vice-Chairman, I think Mr Hathi has very carefully defined the scope and the object of this measure. He has told us that the proposal that he has put forward is not one for the creation of a Legislature in Delhi. From his speech it is clear that this Metropolitan Council will be a purely advisory body. Now, you will remember that the SRC in their Report pointed out that metropolitan cities had to be treated differently from other cities in the country. They pointed out that London, Paris, Washington and Canberra had no Legislatures corresponding to our State Legislatures. I think the SRC was right only up to a point. They were right in so far as Washington and Canberra were concerned. The distinction, if true, about London, Paris and Tokyo, I think, is a little too far-fetched. London has a County Council. The people of London vote for the British Parliament, just in the same manner as in other constituencies. Similar is the case with Paris. I am not sure that the case with Tokyo is different. But there is no denying the fact that metropolitan cities have to be treated somewhat differently from other States. The fact that Delhi is a metropolitan city makes it necessary that the Central Government should exercise some measure of control over the governance of the city. We have got diplomatic representatives here and certainly the responsibility for law and order is a heavy responsibility in a city like Delhi. I am not, therefore, disposed to quarrel with the Government for treating Delhi somewhat differently. There is no doubt that this Bill will not interfere with the Municipal Corporation Act as it exists, but what I want to say is this. The Metropolitan Council may be a purely advisory body. Mr. Hathi emphasised it. It will have all the paraphernalia of a Legislature. Now, experience shows that it is not desirable to have a large body, which has no responsibility. What they will do is to encourage irresponsible criticism in the Metropolitan Council. Of course, they will have a few members drawn from among themselves as members of the Executive Council, but their responsibility will not be to the Metropolitan Council. Their responsibility will be to the Chief Administrator. Now, I supported, when the SRC Bill was here before us, that Part 'C' States should be absolutely done

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]
away with. I am wondering whether I was right in the view that I took then. I think that part 'C' States did serve, in some cases, a good purpose and it is my view that perhaps it would have been better if Government had gone so far as to introduce what I would call an element of dualism or diarchy in the administration of Delhi.

Having said this, let me point out that it is not an inconsiderable gain for the people of Delhi to have, in future, Executive Councillors, who will be drawn from their own sources. True, the Executive Councillors will not be responsible to the Metropolitan Council, which will only be an advisory body but there will be a close tie between them and the Metropolitan Council, inasmuch as they will be drawn from the same sources. Now, you know that in Switzerland the executive is the servant of the Legislature. The executive is drawn by the method of proportional representation from the legislative source. It functions for a fixed period of years. They are elected on that basis of proportional representation. Of course there is referendum. I am not going into the question whether you can have in this country the referendum or the initiative or the recall. But I think it is possible to give some authority howsoever limited to the Metropolitan Council so as to encourage a sense of responsibility in this Metropolitan Council. This is my single criticism. I know it was difficult to frame it because of the special character of Delhi as a metropolitan city. I know that Mr. Hathi and Mr. Nanda had no easy task. I can understand the disappointment of the people of Delhi, but they should also remember that they have this advantage over the people of other cities in this country that they have the capital of India situated in Delhi. For having that capital they have to pay a certain penalty. All that the Bill does is to make them pay that penalty. Let me add however that it is possible to go a little further and vest some power howsoever limited in the Metropolitan Council. Having said this, let me emphasize that it is not desirable to make the Metropolitan Council a purely advisory body.

Thank you

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Mr Vice-Chairman, I am grateful to all the Members who have participated in the debate for making some suggestions but more so for keeping the level of the debate very high and very sober. As I said before at the time of moving the motion, this is a House of elders. It has always been considerate. It has always shown sobriety and this is another occasion again where I find that whatever may be the differences of opinion between Members, no heat was generated and we all behaved in a dignified manner which we have done all these years.

Sir, I owe a duty to the Members of Delhi specially to reply to the various points raised by them. Not that I do not attach importance to other Members. To them also I attach equal importance, but because this is a Bill on Delhi other Members would pardon me if I attached less time to them and more time to friends from Delhi.

Kumari Shanta Vasisht made certain observations. I may tell her and Shri Santokh Singh that there is no question of prestige at all. It is not that the Government has a rigid attitude and that because of this rigid attitude we do not want to give more power to the Metropolitan Council. I may also say that nobody has viewed this measure with any partisan spirit. There is no question of favouring some or patronising some or killing anybody. There was no idea whatsoever of killing a dog or any animal or any organisation or any human being; not even was there the faintest intention to wound the feeling or harm the feeling of anybody. If I may say so, in our anxiety to accommodate the views of various sections from the representatives of Delhi we have discussed this matter to an extent which made Shri Abid Ali say that it was a weak-kneed policy. It was not a weak-kneed policy but it was an anxiety to accommodate the views of different members, different sections, and we wanted to evolve a pattern which might be acceptable.

Shri Gujral had asked me a question, and a right question, whether this Bill was placed before the Advisory Committee. It was placed and all those who had spoken did give their views and agree to the scheme. The only suggestions which were made at that meeting were, I have got them, that the number of Lok Sabha seats should be increased from 5 to 7, the number of elected seats in the Metropolitan Council should be increased from 40 to 42 and simultaneous membership of the Corporation and the Metropolitan Council should be barred. I may also say that the question whether there should be a Legislative Assembly or not had been made clear and very clear at every discussion every time. There was no question of a Legislative Assembly. Kumari Shanta Vasisht told us that the Prime Minister had promised, the late Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, that Delhi would be given something better. I have read what he had said. This was in connection with the Bill to amend article 239 of the Constitution which came up before the House, and when the Members from Delhi wanted that article 239A should not only be applied to the Union Territories of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura and Goa, Daman and Diu, but also Delhi. It was at that time that he said, quoting all the reasons which Shri Gujral has just said from the S.R.C. report and other things, that he did not want Delhi to be put along with the rest. He also said that he was not satisfied with the arrangement in Delhi, and this is a fact. Even the S.R.C. was not satisfied with the way in which the Delhi Administration functioned. Even the Corporation that functioned, I mean the Municipality, did not function well, and the S.R.C. had even suggested that there should be a Corporation. But there was a suggestion that more powers should be given to the Corporation.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Pandit Nehru gave an assurance in 1961 . . .

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: I do not know what better thing than a Legislative Assembly and Statehood the representatives of Delhi would have wished. If they had understood that Delhi was to be given something more than Bombay, Madras or Calcutta, something better than a Legislative Assembly and a Council of Ministers, if that was the interpretation, I do not know what they wanted, or what was in their mind.

Today they would be satisfied with financial powers if the Metropolitan Council is given financial powers, they think that is something. They also would like it and I do not at all find fault with them because everybody would like to be a Member of an Assembly, they would like to be a Deputy Minister, he would like to be a Minister. There is nothing wrong.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Or an Executive Councillor.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Or an Executive Councillor. There is nothing wrong in it. I perfectly agree that these are the ambitions and they would like to be so. But about what at that time Panditji said—that he wanted to give something better—I may disillusion them. If they had understood that he was going to give something more than a Legislative Assembly and a Council of Ministers, that was not the intention.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): If you would agree, Mr. Hathi, let the Finance Minister make a statement.

STATEMENT *RE* THE ADVERSE REMARKS AGAINST A SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT IN THE 50TH REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI SACHINDRA CHAUDHURI): Sir, I have been told to make a statement on certain matters contained in the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee and I am making the statement now.

At pages 51 to 106, Chapter IV, the Fiftieth Report of the Public Accounts Committee has considered barter deals with and by Iron and Steel Control, with particular reference to cases in which Bank guarantee amounts due to Government were not forfeited. The conclusions of the Sub-Committee are to be found at page 105, paragraph 4.165 and 4.166. The recommendations are at page 106, paragraph 4.167, 4.168 and 4.169. Under the