

[Shri Nambiar]

whole thing has ended in a very serious chaos. The formation of the Punjabi Suba which was expected and which is bound to come has been delayed because of the deliberate change brought about by the Government. This is my accusation. The whole country will feel disappointed at the way this thing has been done. I want to make a strong protest and I want to record my objection to this way of doing things. Such a serious issue has not been properly dovetailed. As a consequence of this, we shall be made a laughing stock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What can I do? I cannot do anything.

DELHI ADMINISTRATION BILL—
contd.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on Saturday last, when the House rose, I had just begun my speech on the Delhi Administration Bill as reported by the Joint Committee. This Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 18th November, 1965 and thereafter it was referred to the Joint Committee of both the Houses of Parliament.

The Report of the Joint Committee was presented to Parliament on the 9th May, 1966. As stated in that report, the committee invited memoranda from public bodies and individuals and also took evidence from the representatives of the public bodies, political parties and individuals. The scope of the Bill was thoroughly discussed, and a number of improvements have been effected. I would not like to take the time of the House in explaining the previous history of the administrative set-up of Delhi.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister may kindly stop for a minute. There is so much of noise in the House.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): Members are excited.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): The whole House is excited.

Mr. Speaker: I do understand that the Members are excited. But what can I do now?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): It is not your fault.

It has happened once before also. This is the second or third time when Government have blundered. They are in blunderland.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Members have to give their attention to the proceedings that are going on. They should not go on talking among themselves.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): This was a snap arrangement which we did not anticipate.

Mr. Speaker: What can I do in that case?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Government should explain why all this has happened.

Shri D. C. Sharma: It is a big blow to us.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This is a emissness or blundering on the part of Government.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Minister might continue his speech.

Shri Hathi: I do not like to take the time of the House in explaining the previous history of the administrative set-up of Delhi.

The Home Minister, while moving the motion for referring the Bill to the Joint Committee had explained in full the reasons for bringing forward this measure for the administrative set-up of Delhi. He had explained in detail the special position which Delhi occupied and the position of the other federal capitals in the world also.

14.23 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

A balance is kept between the requirements of democratic association of the people with the administration and the need for effective control of the national Government over the Government of the capital, to avoid conflict which may detract from the efficient working of the metropolis.

It was also explained that keeping in view the fact that a large number of foreign Legations, Embassies etc., were housed in Delhi it was not expedient or advisable to have two sets of Government or a dual Government in the capital.

I would restrict myself to the Bill as it has emerged after the deliberations of the Joint Committee. The House will notice that there were in the original Bill 37 clauses. As the Bill has emerged from the Joint Committee, as the report of the committee shows, there have been two new clauses added, namely clause 15 and clause 36. One clause, namely original clause 24 has been deleted. 11 clauses have been amended, and two clauses have been amended because there are consequential amendments. In all 16 clauses have undergone changes out of 37 clauses. The new Bill has 38 clauses.

I shall now deal with the important changes which have been brought about. The first is the amendment of clause 3. The number of elected members of the proposed metropolitan council has been raised from 42 to 49. That is one important change. The second change which the committee has brought about is that instead of associating three members of the interim metropolitan council nominated by the Government with the Election Commission for the purpose of delimiting the constituencies of the council, provision has been made for associating the Members of the Lok Sabha representing Delhi with the Election Commission for this work. It was found by the committee that it should not be left to the Central Government to nominate any of the members for this purpose.

Then, clause 12 has been amended to make a provision for the Deputy Chairman of the council. There was only a chairman to be elected, but a deputy chairman has also been provided for by amending clause 12.

Clause 13 is only a consequential amendment. All those provisions which applied to the chairman have also to be made applicable to an extent to the Deputy Chairman. Therefore, amendment of clause 13 is a consequential one.

The new clause 15 specifically provides 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.

The next clause amended is clause 20 (old clause 19), where a provision has been made regarding the powers and privileges of persons who have the right to speak in and otherwise take part in the proceedings of the metropolitan council and any committee thereof, as they apply in relation to members.

Then, clause 24 which dealt with the language or languages to be used in transacting the business of the metropolitan council has been deleted. It was thought that it should be left to the metropolitan council itself to decide what language or languages it should use.

Clause 24 (original clause 23) has been amended to provide that the administrator shall make the rules after consulting the chairman of the metropolitan council. That has been added.

Then, there were demands from various members that one of the members of the executive council should be designated as chief executive councillor and the other members as executive councillors. This change has been made in clause 27.

Then, it was also thought that in order to avoid bye-elections to the Delhi Municipal Corporation, clause 32 might be amended so that the membership of the corporation should not preclude the persons from being members of the interim

[Shri Hathi]

metropolitan council. This provision removes the bar on being simultaneous membership of the interim metropolitan council and the Delhi Municipal Corporation.

Then the other clause 35 is of a consequential nature, which provides that the electoral college for the Union Territory of Delhi shall consist of the elected members of the Metropolitan Council constituted for the Territory under the Delhi Administration Act 1966, and until that Council is constituted, the electoral college shall consist of the elected members of the interim Metropolitan Council constituted under the Act.

Then a new clause—as I said, there are two new clauses, one is cl. 15 and the other cl. 36—has been added to provide for the representation of the Metropolitan Council on the Delhi Development Authority in view of the representation of the Delhi Advisory Committee on the DDA. With the coming into force of this Act, the Advisory Committee will not be there. Therefore, the representation which the Delhi Advisory Committee has on the DDA will be given to the members of the Metropolitan Council.

Clause 38 empowers the President to take necessary steps to remove any difficulty whatsoever for giving effect to the provisions of the proposed law, particularly in relation to the constitution of the Metropolitan Council. The Committee, specially Shri Kamath, wanted that orders made by the President shall be laid on the Table of each House and would be subject to such modifications as may be made by both Houses. That also has been incorporated.

These are the main amendments to the old Bill as was introduced. It may be that at the time of the motion for reference of the Bill to the Joint Committee and during the Committee stage, suggestions were made that the Metropolitan Council should be given financial powers, that is, power to approve the budget of the Territory and a provision that the Executive Council should be collectively

responsible to the Metropolitan Council. In substance, this suggestion amounted to placing the Metropolitan Council in the position of a legislative Assembly so far as the budget was concerned and making the Executive Council answerable to that body in the same way as the Council of Ministers is answerable to a State legislature. It was made clear that the theme as was envisaged and under which this Bill has been drafted and introduced is that it was not contemplated that there should be a Legislative Assembly for Delhi—art. 239 stands in the way—and so if there is no Legislative Assembly, it is not possible also to give financial powers. Even then, we have given as much thought as could be bestowed to this question, we have consulted experts, and the Committee came to this conclusion that it was not possible to give financial powers to this body....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Without amending the Constitution.

Shri Hathi: without amending the Constitution. Therefore, the Bill which gives the maximum association to the people of Delhi in the administration of the territory has been the result of the deliberation of the Joint Committee as it has emerged out of the Joint Committee.

I would not like to deal with other suggestions which are likely to come just now because I would be glad to hear the arguments and constructive and helpful suggestions. After that, if we think it feasible to accommodate, we may consider them. But so far as the main theme is concerned, giving financial powers and making the Executive Council responsible to the Metropolitan Council seem not to be possible.

I move.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What is the time allotted?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Three hours.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In view of the importance of the subject and the controversial nature of the Bill, I suggest that the time must be extended—I am sure members on both sides will agree—by at least one hour.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrack pore): No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The programme is very tight. There are other items of business also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There are amendments also. How much for general consideration and how much for clause-by-clause discussion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We can have two hours and one hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: So many amendments are there. They cannot be disposed of in one hour.

Shri Bade (Khargone): The other business collapsed. We have saved some time on that. That may be given to this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall see any way.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर (दिल्ली करोल बाग): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। संविधान में हरिजनों के लिये धारक्षण दिया गया है। संविधान की धारा 332 में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि :

“Seats shall be reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. . .

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो दिल्ली प्रशासन विधेयक है उस की जो 32 धारा है जिस को घाप प्रस्थायी तौर पर रखने की व्यवस्था करने जा रहे हैं उस में कहीं पर भी अनुसूचित जातियों के लिये कोई धारक्षण नहीं रक्खा गया है। उन के लिये सीट्स सुरक्षित नहीं रखी गई हैं इसलिये यह विधेयक संविधान की भावना

के अनुरूप नहीं है और इस पर कोई विचार नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। इस में अंतरिम काल के लिये कहीं पर भी शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के लोगों के लिये कोई रिजर्वेशन नहीं है जब कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में स्पष्ट रूप से लिखा हुआ है कि शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के लोगों के लिये सीट्स रिजर्व्ड होनी चाहियें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This House has never taken up the question of deciding constitutional matters. That is for the courts to determine. Perhaps the provision for representation of scheduled castes will be made in the election rules by the Election Commission. There is no point of order.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर: संविधान में बिलकुल स्पष्ट लिखा हुआ है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have ruled it out of order. We do not decide constitutional questions.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have ruled it out of order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, after hanging fire for a very long time, this Delhi Administration Bill has come before the Lok Sabha. Before coming to Lok Sabha, we have seen it passing through many phases as far as the ruling party is concerned. At one stage one heard that it was being opposed by the Delhi Congress; later we heard that a section of them were supporting it and a section were opposing it. Then we were in the Joint Committee, we witnessed the spectacle of several Members of the Committee, resigning.

Now, what ever may be the reasons for such behaviour, at least we on this side of the House—I can say this at least for my party—have not been able to understand till today why the Home Ministry and the Minister, Shri Nanda, and in his place, Shri Hathi, are consistently denying the people of Delhi a democratically elected

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

and fully representative government, when Delhi actually is the biggest Union Territory from the point of view of population and also from the point of view of its importance. If Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura, can have more or less elected legislatures—and the people there have agitated and got it—I do not see any reason why the Delhi State cannot also have a democratically elected and fully representative legislature.

As a matter of fact, I have not been able to understand why a section of the Delhi M.Ps. and why my hon. friend Shrimati Subhadra Joshi is so opposed to it. It has really puzzled me. Maybe personalities have got mixed up in the whole matter, but I have not understood the principle of it.

We have been told that in USA, Washington does not have such a thing. For everything that we have to do here, must we find a parallel in the United States? If it is a good thing, take it. But I was told that even in a place like Washington, there is much to be desired as far as civic administration goes. As a matter of fact, I heard just recently, and then I thought about the discussions we had in our Select Committee, that recently when Washington had a very big snowfall, the civic administration was such that for days the Indian Embassy was completely surrounded by snow, and they had no means by which to clear it, and for days they could not come down to carry out their normal avocations. I have not been to Washington, I do not know what it was all about, but our Government is always telling us, this is what happens in Washington, this is what happens in New York. I have not been able to understand, if Manipur, Tripura and Himachal Pradesh can have elected legislatures, why the seat of the Central Government being in Delhi presupposes that they should not have an elected legislature.

It appears to me that all the arguments that Shri Hathi has put forward have been totally unconvincing, especially when I find that really in Delhi we have a multiplicity of organisations dealing with

matters which are essentially civic, and which makes the normal life of a State so difficult. For example, they have the Delhi Development Authority, they have the Delhi Milk Scheme, they have a plethora of bodies, all set up one on top of the other. We have the Delhi Corporation, and now we are going to have another Metropolitan Council which is neither fish nor flesh. So, I see absolutely no reason why Mr. Nanda, the Home Minister, the Home Ministry and the Government of India could not see their way to give a legislature to the people of Delhi.

Shri Hathi: Constitution.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The Constitution has been brought up as an excuse, but I am attacking the very basis, the very principle of the Bill. I am not in the Select Committee, I have the right to say that this Bill should be scrapped entirely and a full legislature with full rights to the people given just as are given to all other citizens of India and should be given to the people of Delhi too.

What is the set-up envisaged under the proposed Metropolitan Council? The fact is that even with the new amendments, the Metropolitan Council and its members are nothing but an advisory body. I know my hon. friend Mr. Khanna is very enamoured of this advisory body. So is my hon. friend Shrimati Subhadra Joshi. They would like to advise, but Members of Parliament know what the real status of these advisory bodies is. We have so many consultative committees, and we have seen that they are an absolute farce, a complete farce, with the result that after four or ten years, whatever the number of years, you have been elected to the House, Members have stopped going to them, because it is an utter waste of time, utter waste of breath. Nobody listens to you. You may try, as far as you possibly can, to attend these meetings, but as far as the executive is concerned, it goes merrily on. Therefore, this Metropolitan Council, which is nothing more than an advisory council, is, I would say, nothing more than a debating society.

Actually, all executive authority is going to vest in the Executive Council, and this Executive Council, again, is made a nominated body. Firstly they make the Metropolitan Council such that the Elected Members have an advisory capacity, and the Executive Committee, where they have some executive authority, it is made a nominated body. It is a peculiar concept that if you have elections, you make it advisory, and if you do not have elections and have nominations, you give them executive authority. This shows the undemocratic nature of the entire concept of this Metropolitan Council and the Executive Council set up under the Clauses of this Bill.

Not only that. In many cases it is the Administrator who will be ruling. If the Administrator thinks that questions should not be asked, he will make the rules, he will just take the advice and consult the Metropolitan Council Chairman, but beyond asking the Metropolitan Council Chairman, there is absolutely nothing to prevent him from making the rules as he thinks fit. If there is a deadlock, he will refer the matter to the President, and the President will give his verdict, but prior to getting the President's verdict it will be decided by the Administrator whether a particular matter is important enough for him to utilise the veto and refer the matter to the President or not. So, I say a bureaucrat, an Administrator, will have the whip hand over both the Executive Council and the Metropolitan Council. This is what I have understood from the Clauses of this Bill.

Therefore, after having opposed the very principle underlying the Bill, that the people of Delhi should be deprived of a legislature with full legislative powers given to other citizens in India. I have now tried to make an amendment which I put before the House, within the limitations which this Bill puts before us. As an Opposition Member, I cannot do anything further at this stage.

I propose that in the Clauses of this Bill, if we really are sincere to give the

Metropolitan Council some democratic rights, there should be a provision that after the Metropolitan Council's advice has to be taken, that advice should be referred to the Executive Council or to the Central Government or to the President as the case may be, and that the people to whom it is referred should regard the advice and the recommendation of the Metropolitan Council as mandatory. This at least should be done. If this also is not done, I would say that this is nothing but a farce. The people of Delhi rightly are agitated over this matter, however much my hon. friend Mr. Khanna may say that there is a large number of people in Delhi who do want such rights.

I have also tried, within the limitations of this Bill, to make the Executive Council responsible to the Metropolitan Council. I have not heard any worthwhile arguments made by Mr. Hathi when he introduced this Bill, as to why this also was not possible, why the Executive Council should not be responsible to those who are the elected representatives of Delhi. I believe that there is far too much of a personal element in this quarrel. We are people who come from outside Delhi, we are not at all concerned whether it will be Mr. Khanna who will be Chief Minister or X or Y or Z. What we are concerned with is the principle underlying the Bill. Therefore, I would say that at least the Executive Council and the Administrator should be responsible to the Metropolitan Council for their actions. Therefore, I have proposed and will propose and will press that at least this much should be accepted by Government that any member of the Executive Council against whom the Metropolitan Council has passed a vote of no confidence by a two-third majority should be removed. At least this minimum thing should be there. That is what should be there in spite of all the other arguments which have been put forward before us. If that is not done immediately, I say that this whole thing is useless. We are handing over the entire administration of Delhi to a bureaucratic set up, which is not the real idea behind a Bill of this

[Shrimati Renu Chakravarty]

typo. Sir, I would also urge that the number of elected members of the council should be increased to 56. Here I find myself very lucky; I find that Mrs. Subhadra Joshi has given a similar amendment and so I have a sneaking feeling that it is going to be accepted by the Government. Once in my life, I find I am in good company. But if this point had been accepted earlier it would have been better. Why did we go in for the other 49 which would have overlapping of constituencies. inevitable. It is also a question of deciding the number on the basis of population and other matters which I had explained. 56 is normal; I to 8 constituencies for the Lok Sabha seat. On the basis of the existing population and the constitution of the Delhi municipal authorities this is the most reasonable principle that should have been accepted. I have also proposed that we want this Metropolitan council should be an active body and in every clause we should give such authority and such powers to enable it to actively intervene in the life and well-being of the city. That is why regarding the question of whether the metropolitan council should be called at an interval of not less than six months, I have said not less than three months. Also have said not less than three months. Also whenever a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship of the council, it shall not be left vacant for any unspecified period; election to the chairmanship must not be later than a month from the date on which the vacancy takes place. I would recommend to this House that we should look at this Bill in all its minute details at the second reading stage but even at this stage we should give our verdict that the underlying principle in this Bill is something which we cannot accept. We cannot accept the decision of the Union Government to take away from the people of Delhi their right to have an elected legislature as every other citizen in the rest of India.

श्री बाबू प्रकाश (बाह्य दिल्ली) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर, इस बदकिस्मत दिल्ली वालों के लिए जो यह बिल बनाया गया है मैं उस सम्बन्ध में अपने कुछ सुने हुए विचार

घ्राप के सामने पेश करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यह राय खाली मेरी नहीं है, यह खाली दिल्ली कांग्रेस की नहीं है, यह दिल्ली कांग्रेस की भी है, दिल्ली जनसंघ की भी है, दिल्ली कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की भी है और दूसरी पोलिटिकल पार्टियों की भी है। जितनी यहाँ की ग्रागो-नाइज्ड पब्लिक प्रोपीनियन है चाहे वह ट्रेड यूनियन हो, चाहे वह बिजनेस ग्रागोनाइजेशन हों, चाहे इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रागोनाइजेशन हों, कलचरल, सोशल सभी ग्रागोनाइजेशन की वह प्रोपीनियन है और वह राय है कि सब से पहले यह बिल जो इस वक्त दिल्ली ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बिल के नाम से दिल्ली के लिए आया है यह बेकार है यह ऐडवाइजरी है। कोई ताकत दिल्ली वालों को नहीं दी है यह एक तरीके से दिल्ली वालों को बहलाने का खिलौना दे दिया गया है और यही वजह थी कि दिल्ली के घाठ 8 मेम्बरस में से 5 मेम्बरस ने इस से सम्बन्धित मेलेक्ट कमेटी से इस्तीफा दे दिया था। उन की राय साफ थी कि इस बिल में जान नहीं है यह ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी है इस में कोई ताकत नहीं मिलती और चूँकि गवर्नमेंट कोई ताकत उस में देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है लिहाजा इस कमेटी के साथ इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में ताल्लुक रखना बोटरो के साथ बेइसाफ़ी करनी होगी। यह ठीक है कि हमारे 3 मेम्बरस उस में रहे बल्कि हमारे इस्तीफा देने के बाद वह ज्यादा जोर से गये और उस में हिस्सा लिया। दो वज्जिर हैं। जाहिर है कि वज्जिर बहुत नहीं होते अपनी राय में और उन्हें गवर्नमेंट के कहने के मुताबिक चलना पड़ता है। एक और साहब हैं एक हमारे मेम्बर हैं जिनका कि ताल्लुक सिर्फ नई दिल्ली से है, नई दिल्ली के लिए हो सकता है कुछ जानते भी हैं लेकिन दिल्ली वालों के लिए बहुत ज्यादा नहीं जानते हैं। जो बुनियादी अधिकार हैं फंडामेंटल राइट्स हैं लोगों के उन के बारे में हमें बहुत स्पष्ट होने की जरूरत है। गांधी जी ने एक दफ़्त कहा था:—

To be loyal to our organisation must not mean subordinating of one's settled convictions. Parties may fall and Parties may rise but our deep convictions must remain unaffected by such passing changes.

इसी कनविषयन के साथ मैं आप के खामने अपने विचार प्रज करना चाहता हूँ। इस बिल के द्वारा भी श्रीर इससे पहले भी दिल्ली के 30 लाख लोगों के साथ बेइसाफी की गई है और यह बेइसाफी प्रंग्रेजी जमाने से लगा कर सन् 1912 से जब से यहां राजधानी आई वह बेइसाफी आज तक जारी है उन के साथ। मुझे नहीं पता कि कब तक वह बेइसाफी जा रही होगी? वही जवाब जो सन् 1914 में ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट ने नई दिल्ली के लोगों को दिया था वही जवाब सन् 1947 में दिया गया और वही जवाब आज भी दिया जा रहा है कि दिल्ली के लोगों को राजनैतिक अधिकार, दिल्ली के लोगों को डेमोक्रेटिक अधिकार प्रसेम्बली आदि नहीं दी जा सकती है। मैं प्रदब के साथ प्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि तमाम दुनिया में वाशिंगटन और कैनबरा को छोड़ कर जिसकी कि राजधानी जंगल का टुकड़ा काट कर बसाई गई थी जो किसी आबादी का हिस्सा नहीं था और जो कि हिस्टारिकल शहर नहीं था बल्कि कांस्टीट्यूशन में एक अलग काट कर बनाई गयी थी उन के लिए तो कहना ठीक है कि उन का तो कोई डेमोक्रेटिक राइट नहीं है हालांकि वह अपने लिए लड़ रहे हैं। लेकिन इसके प्रलावा किसी और मुल्क में यहां तक कि फेडरल मुल्कों में जहां किसी सूबे की राजधानी है वही उस की भी राजधानी है। ऐसे कई कंटिल दुनिया के अन्दर मौजूद हैं खासतौर से कनाडा में यही हालत है। जर्मनी में यही हालत है, साउथ अफ्रीका में यही हालत है यह फेडरल कंट्रीज की बात मैं आप से कहता हूँ। इस के प्रलावा कम्युनिस्ट मुल्क हैं उन का जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है सेंट्रल और स्टेट का उस में कोई फर्क नहीं है उन का कॅपिटल वही मौजूद है। इसलिए यह कहना कि दिल्ली में दो राजधानी नहीं

हो सकती यह बात बिलकुल सही नहीं है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कह कर दिल्ली वालों के साथ बेइसाफी की जा रही है। मैंने फिर भी कहा कि आज अगर आप कॅपिटल अलग चाहते हैं और नई दिल्ली वाले, खास तौर से नई दिल्ली के खाना साहब नुमाइंदा हैं वह खास तौर से चाहते हैं तो बेशक नई दिल्ली को अलग रख लें, अगर नई दिल्ली वाले भी यही पसन्द करें। नई दिल्ली को वह कोई अधिकार न दे यहां तक कि मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट को चुनने का अधिकार न दें यह बात भी मेरी समझ में आ सकती है। मैंने पहले भी कहा है कि आप नई दिल्ली को बेशक अलग रख सकते हैं। लेकिन जहां तक हम दिल्ली वालों का ताल्लुक है मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा दिल्ली के बोटों के सामने बायदा है। मैंने उन से बायदा किया था पिछले एलेक्शन में कि हम आप के लिए कोई डेमोक्रेटिक सैट अप लायेंगे क्योंकि हम समझते थे कि उस के बगैर उन की तकलीफों और उन की परेशानियों का कोई हल नहीं हो सकता है और यह मैं आप के सामने पढ़े देता हूँ :-

As has been said earlier, the problems of Delhi are problems of growing city and they need to be tackled with courage and imaginations. The Pradesh Congress is firmly of the opinion that the problems can be tackled properly only through a democratic set-up and a bureaucratic set-up is ill fitted and ill equipped to deal with the multifarious problems which Delhi of today poses.

यह बायदा दिल्ली के बोटों के सामने किया गया था। मैंने और हमारे और काम करने वालों ने जा कर यह कॅम्पेन किया था कि हम आप के लिये एक जिम्मेदार इकतल लायेंगे। हमने यहां तक कहा कि चलिये, एसेम्बली न सही, आप एसेम्बली के प्रलावा अगर कोई और डेमोक्रेटिक सैट-अप, कोई और बांछा दे सकते हैं, तो दीजिये। हम उस पर ईमानदारी के साथ प्रमत्त करने

[श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश]

के लिए तैयार हैं। अगर वह भ्रष्टा होगा तो हम एसेम्बली की बात को छोड़ देंगे। शास्त्री जी अगर पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने हमारे सामने यह वायदा किया था कि आप बेक्रिफ्ट रहें, हम आपको एक भ्रष्टा ढांचा, एक भ्रष्टा निज़ाम देने की कोशिश करेंगे, जिस से आप की तसल्ली होगी, आप एसेम्बली पर खिद न करें।

15 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue afterwards. The Prime Minister may now make her statement.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद)
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। अभी अभी मैं ने सुना कि यह सरकार एक संवैधानिक संशोधन पर गिर चुकी है

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह कानून खत्म हो गया है। इस लिए क्या अब सरकार रह गई है ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They do not arise now. The Prime Minister.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सरकार अब है क्या ? भ्रष्टा सरकार बोल रही हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order, The Prime Minister.

15.01 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO ORISSA

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Sir, I returned yesterday afternoon from a two-day tour of the areas acutely affected by drought and scarcity in Orissa. On the eve of my departure, I extended my stay in the State as originally proposed, by an extra day so as to have a fuller idea of the prevailing situation. I had occasion

to visit ten villages in the three worst affected districts of Kalahandi, Sambalpur and Bolangir, including some which were not on schedule and which were selected on the spot, for surprise visits. At my request, my colleagues Shri Jaganatha Rao and Shrimati Nandini Satpathy, who accompanied me, went to another three villages for which I could not myself find time; Shrimati Satpathy went to two villages to which I was to go, while I went to two others which were not on schedule.

Apart from addressing large gatherings at Senapalli, Khariar and Padampur, I had the opportunity to meet and talk to a large number of villagers, wherever I went specially Adivasis and Harijans—and to visit their homes and see their families and children. I visited many gratuitous relief and free feeding centres, school centres for feeding children, sites where relief works were in progress and centres for the distribution of loans and seed. I also had occasion to meet the Honourable Member of this House from this area, and some Members of the State Legislature including those of the Opposition Party, local officials, Panchayat leaders, representatives of voluntary agencies working in the area, students and youth representatives, as well as others.

I was naturally distressed to see conditions in these affected areas. It was obvious that the people had suffered considerable hardships. There is unprecedented drought and scarcity, and an acute lack of purchasing power. At the same time I was somewhat relieved to find that the situation is under control as a result of the energetic measures taken by the State Government. But there is no room whatsoever for complacency. On the contrary, there is great need for administering the relief programme with the utmost possible efficiency and despatch and for a very vigilant eye on the situation.

My colleague, the Food Minister, apprised the House the other day of various measures taken to provide relief in the affected areas. The State Govern-