

examined and their evidence was recorded *in extenso*. We do not know what it is. Ordinarily, evidence recorded by the Select Committee is circulated to us. So far as I remember, Sir, this evidence has not been circulated to us. I speak subject to correction because it is a very old affair which happened in 1954.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: The evidence has not been circulated.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I think, Sir, it should have been circulated to us, and we could have then seen from that evidence as to how great an extent this measure is going to affect a very large number of citizens of Delhi, more particularly the displaced persons, with whose difficulties I have been associating and interesting myself during all these nine years or so.

Now, Sir, let us see what will be the effect of this measure, if we adopt it in its present form. This Bill is going to affect, as I have already submitted, a very large number of citizens, and more particularly the displaced persons. Even without this amending Bill, Sir, the measure which has already been on the Statute Book for some time past has not been a very happy one. I had, Sir, the opportunity to discuss this measure even on previous occasions, when it was introduced in the provisional Parliament, and when this measure had received much greater attention than it is receiving now. Sir, the one important thing about this measure which we have got to seriously take into consideration is that after we extend the scope of this measure, not only to the lands and buildings belonging to the Delhi Improvement Trust, but also to those which may be requisitioned by the Municipality, if I understand it aright....

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That power is already there. The amending clause is only with regard to the extension of the principle to the buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: And land also?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: With regard to land, the Improvement Trust has already got that power.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, what about lunch interval?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Oh, you want lunch? Then, I think, we can adjourn till 2 O'clock.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: In that case, Sir, why not till 2-30 P.M.? We haven't got much business today.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not know how many Members would like to speak.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, I would like to speak.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): And I would like to take only five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then we can adjourn till 2-30 P.M. But there is a Message to be read.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(KHARAGPUR) BILL, 1956

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha :

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Indian Institute of Technology (Kharagpur) Bill, 1956 as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th August 1956."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House now stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, **MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

THE GOVERNMENT PREMISES (EVICTION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1956—continued.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, before we rose for lunch, I was submitting that this measure, small though in length, was not small in its implications. It has wide implications and far-reaching consequences. It affects, as I was submitting, large numbers of citizens of Delhi and more particularly the displaced persons. It perturbed

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.]

them to such an extent that several associations representing them, viz., the All India Refugee Association, the Jawaharnagar Refugee Quarters Association, the Self-Rehabilitated Displaced Persons Association, the Jhandewalan and Patel Nagar Refugee Association in addition to the representatives of the residents of the Delhi Ajmer Gate area, presented their case and their difficulties before the Select Committee. The Select Committee, realising the difficulties of these displaced persons and other, took the trouble of visiting the various places the residents whereof would be affected by this measure. Therefore they took a long time in their deliberations. That being so, we must give serious consideration to this measure. Even so far as the existing measure is concerned, without the provisions of the present Bill, it would have been perhaps advisable for the hon. Minister to have given us some little idea of the manner in which the existing measure was being worked, and we would have been particularly glad to know something about the manner in which the Delhi Improvement Trust had been functioning for the last several years, particularly after the report of the Delhi Improvement Trust Enquiry Committee which was presided over by Shri G. D. Birla and which had as one of its Members one of our colleagues in the Provisional Parliament, a man of the eminence of Bakshi Tek Chand. That Enquiry Committee had not many complimentary things to say about the working of the Delhi Improvement Trust or rather it had some very uncomplimentary things to say about it. I do not know whether matters have improved since then. Perhaps matters may have improved but we would very much like to know something about it, as to how things are working, whether the citizens are satisfied with its working and so on, because in this measure we are going to give certain additional powers to the Delhi Improvement Trust, and we are naturally hesitant to give it those powers unless we are satisfied that things have improved. If things are continuing to be as bad as they were then, certainly we would be very hesitant to give them additional powers. So, before we come to a decision, the hon. Minister should enlighten us on these points.

The hon. Minister said that, since the Central Government has already got

the power of evicting people in a summary manner, he saw no reason why the same powers should not be given to the Delhi Improvement Trust. He may not be able to see any reason why they should not be given such powers and why we should scrutinise this point very carefully, but so far as we are concerned, in view of the past history of the Delhi Improvement Trust, naturally we are very hesitant, and therefore we must have a little detailed narration of the working of the Delhi Improvement Trust.

Now, as I submitted, it mainly or in a large measure affects the displaced persons. The simple question is whether these displaced persons who came over to this country leaving all their property behind in West Pakistan, should be rehabilitated here or not, whether they should be provided with suitable accommodation or not. Now, in the hurry of the moment they occupied such places as they could get hold of. Surely, there was nothing wrong about it, and they have been there since then. Now, they may not have any legal right; perhaps they have none. But even if they do not have any legal right, certainly they have a moral right to live somewhere under some shelter, under some roof. The question is: Where are they to live? Where are they going to live now when they are going to be evicted from these so-called unlawful possessions? Some place has got to be provided for them. If they had the means with them, they would have certainly shifted to some other premises. Perhaps a very large number of those who are in so-called illegal possession of these premises, have not the wherewithal to shift to any other place. Is it not the duty of the Government and of society and of the State to provide them with some alternative accommodation before evicting them? These persons may not have the legal right to demand it, but surely they have the moral right to ask for it and it is the moral duty of the State and I make bold to say, it is even the constitutional duty of the State and the Government to provide them with alternative accommodation. Ours is a democratic State. We are striving to establish a socialist pattern of society. Surely we must provide a roof to everybody even to the old residents of this country, and we should try to provide shelter to those who have come from Pakistan. No doubt, Government

have done a lot for the displaced persons. They have done all that they could. They have spent hundreds of crores of rupees over them and every day we, who are interested in the subject, are probably flooded with informatory letters coming from the Ministry of Rehabilitation, informing us of the new facilities that are being given to them day after day. Only a few minutes ago, when I went back from this place to my place for lunch, I found a very good informatory letter lying on my table informing us that the Government have been pleased to remit loans up to Rs. 300, which have been given to displaced persons, if those displaced persons have no claim for any property which they may have left in Pakistan. That is all very good. We all appreciate it. But then that should not be the end of it. So far as these displaced persons who are in occupation of any Government or Improvement Trust buildings or lands are concerned before they are asked to vacate, they should be provided with alternative accommodation. Not only should they be given alternative accommodation, but where they are shifted, they must be provided with at least certain of the minimum amenities of life, like water and light, roads and all that. And what is more important, the premises to which they are shifted must not be so far away from their ordinary places of occupation or employment as to render them unemployed altogether. They must be provided with proper bus services. I know that when people are asked to vacate government or municipal buildings or lands, or Improvement Trust lands, they cannot, in all cases, be easily provided with alternative accommodation nearby. That is almost impossible and that cannot also be expected. They may have to be shifted to some distant places, particularly, as Delhi has become such a congested area. But to these distant places, the Government must provide suitable transport and also the necessary minimum amenities of life.

Sir, I am not forgetting the fact that in the other House and also before the Select Committee, the hon. Minister has been pleased to give an assurance that he is going to appoint an advisory committee. He has not said so here, perhaps he has reserved this piece of good news for his final speech or for the Third Reading of the Bill. I do feel happy that he felt inclined to give that assurance. But even after that, it will be

only an advisory body. Sir, I have some experience of advisory committees, and I know how little they are or can be effective. That is so not only because they are not vested with any authority, but because of the limited sphere in which they have to work. I am a member of a minor advisory committee dealing with the allotment of premises to displaced persons in Delhi. Somebody has been kind enough to nominate me to that committee. One of its meetings was held this morning, but I could not go to it, because I was interested in this measure now before us and I had to come here. But I have attended one or two of its meetings and I myself know in what a hopelessly awkward position I was. I have sat there virtually as a dump and mute member and I could do nothing, though it is presided over by a very fine officer, the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, a strong and fine man whose good virtues I have come to appreciate ever since he was the district magistrate of Agra not long ago. But what can that poor officer do? He has a limited number of premises at his disposal and a large number of persons have to be evicted. These limited number of premises can be given only to a handful of persons and the rest of those whom we evict have to go without any shelter. That naturally creates a good deal of dissatisfaction. So I submit that this is not a legal problem. It is a human problem and it is the duty of the Government and the State, which the hon. Minister's able and generous colleague Rajkumari Amrit Kaur realises perhaps more than anybody else, to see that these people are given suitable alternative accommodation. So I would suggest that these advisory committees should be given, if possible, some statutory powers. If it be too late now to demand that, then I submit, that it should be their policy to see that the suggestions of the Advisory Committee, though not legally obligatory on the Government, should be accepted and implemented by the Government. The hon. Minister said before the Select Committee as follows—I am reading from page 19 of the Report.

* "The Minister for Works, Housing and Supply assured the Committee that an advisory body will be set up to advise the Delhi Improvement Trust in matters of:

(a) slum clearance with a view to afford better and cleaner living conditions to the slum dwellers.

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.]

(b) providing alternate accommodation to the persons to be evicted in localities near about their present dwellings”.

Very good so far, but then comes in the rub—

“as far as possible”.

Now, this phrase “as far as possible” may mean everything or it may mean nothing. If worked in a generous and large-hearted manner, with humanitarian considerations over-weighing every other consideration, it means everything. But if it is interpreted in a narrow manner, just to find out some way to escape one's responsibility, it will mean nothing. I therefore, submit, Sir, that it should not be stated that alternative accommodation should be provided “as far as possible”. It should be stated that such accommodation should invariably be given. I do not think I am unreasonable in making that demand, because if the Government, a mighty government, this democratic and socialistic Government, cannot find itself in a position to provide alternative accommodation to any person, how can the poor displaced persons with no resources find it possible to shift to another accommodation? If that is impossible for the Government, surely it is still more impossible for a private individual. Why then do you say “as far as possible”? Is it not your duty, a humanitarian duty and a constitutional duty also, I would say, to invariably provide alternative accommodation to these people? If you cannot do that, then do not shift the man. He is pretty well off where he is, in the slum, bad though it may be. Sir, I have a little experience of the work of Improvement Trusts. I happened to be, not long ago, a member of the Agra Improvement Trust.

I saw to it that we did not acquire any piece of land on which there was any residence, any hut or any house and we did not displace a person unless and until we had made arrangements, pretty well in advance, to offer alternative accommodation to that person. That must invariably be so, and I see no reason why it should not be so even in the present case, more so, because the persons who are going to be affected by and large are persons who have no previous association with this part of the country and are, therefore, in a much less advantageous position than

the permanent original residents of Delhi.

I have not much to say excepting one thing and that is, that this Ministry should see to it that the policy of the Improvement Trust in the matter of acquiring and selling pieces of land for new residential purposes should not be on a commercial basis at all. Of course, if a piece of land in a very rich locality, good locality, is to be acquired and then sold to rich persons, of course. I would not expect them, and it would not be fair for me to expect, or even fair for them or the Improvement Trust, to sell it at a low price to the rich people; the rich people may afford to pay high prices but whatever profit they make out of it, must be utilised to subsidise the other pieces of land which may be allotted to poor persons, not only at a no-profit no-loss basis but at much below the cost. If need be, whatever profits are made out of those plots of land sold to rich persons, should be utilised to subsidise the plots of land which are to be sold to the poor people so that, in the ultimate analysis of things, the net result would not be a monetary gain to the Improvement Trust but a gain to the poor to whom pieces of land are given, either free in some cases, or sold at a very small and reasonable price. That must be the policy of all Improvement Trusts and it is for the Ministry to impress on the Delhi Improvement Trust, and for the matter of that on all Improvement Trusts, whether under their jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of the States, and the States should also be directed in that respect.

One last word, Sir, and I have done. I may virtually be considered to be guilty of repeating, but the point is that in the next Five Year Plan, there is going to be given money for the poor people, middle class people or people having small incomes, to build their own houses themselves. That is good so far as it goes, but then so far as the question of definition of low and middle class people is concerned, it is absolutely incorrect. They say that anybody having a monthly income of Rs. 500 should be considered eligible for the loan from the Government under the category of the low income group. You will agree with me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that a person in this country, having an income of Rs. 500 a month cannot be considered to be a person coming within the low income group. I

would consider him to be a rich person. At one time, we said that we would not be paying to any person more than Rs. 500; that was going to be the maximum but now you are wanting to make a person who is earning Rs. 500 a month to be entitled to all these. If you can afford to pay this loan even to such persons, well and good, but so far you have been handicapped because of financial considerations and so, your first care should be the people living in the slum areas. The first care should be for the people having an income of only about Rs. 60, Rs. 70, Rs. 80, Rs. 100 or Rs. 200. I would therefore, to conclude my remarks, urge on the Ministry and the Government as a whole to seriously consider whether they should not confine their loans for house building purposes only to such persons as have an income of not more than, at the highest Rs. 200 per month.

With these remarks, Sir I conclude, hoping that this Advisory Committee would be properly constituted, that its suggestions would be given proper and due respect and consideration and that at no stage will the Government take shelter behind the plea that they only assured that they shall give alternative accommodation only 'as far as possible': 'As far as possible' should be a dead letter.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, when this Bill was introduced, there was a lot of misgiving about the possible results of this piece of legislation, particularly amongst the displaced persons. I do not know whether that was the reason behind the delay of the Government in coming forward with the Bill before the House. I was not present when the hon. Minister spoke but from the speech of Mr. Kapoor I understand that the hon. Minister has not been able to give the House proper information which justifies the Government assuming this power of summary eviction. The term 'eviction' itself sounds a jarring note in our ears because we have a very sorry experience of the eviction of peasants and workers. About this question of eviction of persons in unlawful occupation of Government or public premises also, we have some experience. Now, nobody justifies that anyone should go and unlawfully occupy any premises or remain there in unauthorised occupation, but the question is, Government has not

given us sufficient facts to justify their assumption that the problem is so big or so voluminous that they require this power of summary eviction. Is it the contention of Government that people in our country are in the habit of unlawfully occupying premises or remaining in authorised occupation of premises? When such cases occur, we have to find out the reason why they occur. These cases occur because the people have no other place to go to. That is the main factor.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): No, that is not the main factor.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Mr. Saksena may speak at his own time. As I said on an earlier occasion, Sir, it is very difficult to predict what attitude Mr. Saksena will take on a particular Bill. One day he may be very critical of the Government and on another day, like a stream which changes its course completely, may give his full blessings to the Bill while other hon. Members find defects in the Bill. So, I shall wait to see what attitude Mr. Saksena takes while speaking on this Bill.

Now, Sir, coming to the particular question, the point is, why do people remain in unauthorised occupation of premises? They do so because they find it difficult to find other places. Sir, we hear so much about slum clearance; yes, the problem of slum clearance should be taken up, but what happens is that people, in the name of slum clearance, are evicted and driven out from their places and it is very difficult for them to get alternative accommodation; whenever they get alternative accommodation, that causes inconvenience to them from many points of view. On many occasions, they are given alternative accommodation at a place which is far from their place of work. Very recently, there was the question of removing the displaced persons from the Purana Qila. Now, nobody wants that they should go on remaining there till eternity. When these people were given the notice to move, they represented many grievances. While living there for a number of years, they had developed social connections amongst themselves; they had occupations which centred near about the area. Now, they were given alternative accommodation in some places scattered all over; they were given accommodation in places which were far off from

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]
 their areas of occupation; the education of their children suffered. For a long time, this agitation went on and I do not know how far this problem was ultimately settled. About the question of clearance of certain slums undertaken by the Delhi Improvement Trust, many references have been made by Mr. Kapoor and I think by Mr. Kishen Chand also. In fact, Sir, when this Bill was introduced, there were many representations to the Select Committee and the Select Committee did go and visit the Ajmeri Gate Extension area and met the slum dwellers and heard many of their grievances also. I also wonder why the evidence tendered before the Select Committee has not been supplied to us. Whatever may be the reason for withholding that piece of evidence—Mr. Kapoor has spoken about the functioning of the Delhi Improvement Trust and I do not like to take much time of the House on this particular question—we know how in this sort of functioning, hardships are caused to the people.

Coming to the question of unauthorised occupation, one person is allowed to occupy Government premises for a certain period of time; after that, he is treated as an unauthorised occupant of that place. But this Rule is interpreted on many occasions in a very arbitrary and mechanical manner. I know, Sir, of a particular case of a railway employee. The Railway employee died on duty due to an accident. His wife was allowed to stay in the quarter for the stipulated period of time for which they are allowed after the death of their husbands. After that she was served with a notice to quit that place. Now consider the feelings of that unfortunate widow. She was living there. She was suffering from tuberculosis. Her husband died on duty as a result of an accident and she had applied for the payment of provident fund and gratuity money. It was taking a long time due to the process through which these things have to go, due to the red tape. But this notice to quit the premises was served on her. Now after some representation she was allowed to stay on there for some time more; a further extension of time was given. But the question is that these rules are applied in such a mechanical and such a heartless manner. This fact Government should be cognizant of; Government should take notice of this fact.

Then, Sir, the main question is this that the best remedy for this problem

of unauthorised or unlawful occupation is to provide accommodation to these people. I fully agree with Mr. Kapoor on this occasion that only after suitable alternative accommodation has been made available they should be asked to shift from that place, not otherwise. It provides that "as far as possible" that will be done, but we know that "as far as possible" may be stretched to either end, and generally that happens is that this "as far as possible" practically comes down to this that no attempt is made to give them proper alternative accommodation.

Now, Sir, we hear so much of the Master Plan. We have read in the papers and there was an exhibition also to which we were invited. Unfortunately, because of my indisposition I could not go to that exhibition. But in my opinion, Sir, what should be the essence of a Master Plan? It should not only be the question of planning the city, the thoroughfares or the streets or the houses; the essence of the Master Plan should be that the people should be settled. They should be given proper accommodation. First that arrangement should be done. Only after that they should be asked to shift from that place. Sir, as Mr. Kishen Chand also said—I was listening to his speech—if it is found that the people who are in unlawful or unauthorised occupation of Government or public premises are recalcitrant unreasonably, action can be taken against them according to the ordinary law without this power of summary eviction. Why are we so suspicious about this power of summary eviction? It is because these powers have been exercised in a manner which has caused hardship to the people and because the root of the problem lies elsewhere. The root of the problem lies in the fact, as I have said earlier in my speech, that people do not find accommodation and because they find it difficult to get accommodation, that is why they are sometimes forced to remain in unlawful occupation and particularly in Delhi, where the accommodation problem is very acute for the poorer people. That is why, Sir, all this suspicion comes and it is expressed through all the hon. Members who have spoken. And, Sir, I think Mr. Kapoor has rightly pointed out to another matter, that when the people are asked to shift from a particular place and that place is acquired and that place is sold at a high price to

rich people, then the profit should go to the compensatory rehabilitation of the poorer people, to giving them proper amenities. The main thing you should remember is that the main factor in slum clearance is to provide them with civic amenities. Therefore, I do not object to it and if the Improvement Trust can sell plots at high prices to rich people, they should be sold. They should sell them at high prices to the rich people, but the profit should be utilised for rehabilitating the people who have been evicted or who have been shifted from that place. Sir, Mr. Kapoor has anticipated the hon. Minister in his assurance that there will be an advisory board, but I find, Sir, in a Minute of Dissent appended to the Report of the Select Committee, that some suggestion were offered, which would have given at least some confidence that these powers will not be used in an arbitrary manner. But the Government did not accept that suggestion and came forward only with an assurance. Now the difficulty with the assurances is this. Assurances are all right, they also sound very good, but the difficulty is the hon. Ministers who give the assurances, they do not execute the whole thing. The whole thing is done through the administration at different levels, and these assurances are not always implemented, and in order to remind the administration about these assurances or to get the grievances redressed it is necessary to go up to the Ministers. Therefore a long process, a protracted process, of suffering and hardship to the people is involved. That is why, Sir, we cannot be satisfied only with an assurance. Now it seems that the Government has made up its mind and I do not know whether really that assurance about the advisory body will be repeated here. Even if it is repeated I do not think that it is quite satisfactory. Still the Government is determined to have it passed by this House also without amending the Bill in such a way as to allay the suspicions voiced here. At least it should be the duty of the Government to see that this power is not used in an arbitrary manner, which has given rise to criticisms, and sufferings to the people in the past.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad that you have given me a little opportunity to reply to some of the points that have been raised in regard to the Improve-

ment Trust by the speakers that have spoken this morning and this afternoon.

In the first place I would like to record my gratitude to them for the very reasonable way in which they have spoken and the reasonable demands they have made and the assurances that they have asked for. Now I would like to assure the Members of this House that the Improvement Trust is no longer a profit-making body. It is true that when it was set up before the last World War, it was set up on the premise that the Improvement Trust should acquire land, then put it out to auction and after having got the largest amount of money for it with that money it had to clear the slums. I am absolutely in agreement with the opinion of this House that it was not a right set up, but I may say that ever since we got our Independence, all this has stopped. 2,000 acres of land that belonged to the Improvement Trust were made over straightaway—that was developed land; the Improvement Trust had spent money on it—they were made over straightaway to the refugees without any money at all, and because I was dissatisfied with the working of the Improvement I appointed the Delhi Improvement Trust Enquiry Committee, known as the Birla Committee, which put up a Report, and one of the Members has asked me as to what action we have taken on this particular report. Now all the recommendations that could be taken action on at once by executive authority, were taken action on. But the main recommendation was for the appointment of one building authority for Delhi, which would eradicate the confusion that has existed over the last several years in the matter of so many authorities building so many authorities planning without any really good plan as a result. The overall result has not been good and accounts for the sprawling nature of the buildings that have come up, of the colonies that have come up without any attention to drainage or sewerage. Simply because the Government realised the difficulties of the refugees, the difficulties that they were facing in the matter of accommodation, very little interference really has been indulged in on the part of the Government. But now the time has really come to put a stop to further haphazard construction and it was with that idea that the main recommendation of the Delhi Improvement Trust Enquiry Committee, that is to say, to have one building

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.]

authority, has been accepted by the Lok Sabha and by this House and a provisional authority is already functioning. On that provisional authority, which is the authority today, which controls all buildings and which really knows exactly where notices are served for eviction or demolition, there are Members of both Houses. There is a Member of the Rajya Sabha, three Members of the Lok Sabha, and the Development Minister of the Delhi State is also a member of that Committee, so that the people's voice is fully represented.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Which Committee is the hon. Minister referring to?

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR : The Delhi Development Provisional Authority for the setting up of which a Bill has been passed by both Houses and which Authority is the first step towards the acceptance of the main recommendation of the Birla Committee Report, that is, to have only one authority in charge of building in Delhi. On this Committee this House is represented; the Lok Sabha is represented and, as I have said, the Delhi State Government is also represented by elected members, so that nothing now is being done without reference to this Committee and this applies just as well to the Improvement Trust. As my hon. colleague said while moving for consideration of this Bill, the powers that are asked for for the Delhi Improvement Trust are very very small. They have got those powers as far as land is concerned; they only want these powers as far as buildings are concerned because whatever we may say, the fact remains that in spite of warnings, unauthorised constructions are going up all the time even after the Delhi Development Provisional Authority came into being in November last. I have given strict orders that no one is to be evicted and nobody is evicted by the Improvement Trust and nobody has been evicted without being provided with alternative accommodation. I would like some of the members, if they would, to come round with me and see what has been done. Only day before yesterday morning I spent the entire morning from half past nine to half past one visiting the slum areas, and visiting the places to which they have been moved. I am told, 'Oh, you have taken them a long way off'. If you come and see the people, living in good quarters, much happier than they were before, you will

know that they would not like to go back to where they were. I entirely agree that this is a human problem and it has to be tackled in a human way and that we must not just turn out a person and let him wander about in the streets. We have got to see to it that he is accommodated, whether temporarily or alternatively, until he comes back to the place from where he was asked to go after the place has been rebuilt or until he is given accommodation elsewhere where it is possible for him to earn his livelihood. Now, many refugee colonies have come up without any reference to what the needs of the people who dwell in those colonies are. And this is what we want to do. If there is a colony where there are no shops, where there are no cobblers, where there are no tailors, where there are no carpenters, where there are no domestic staff, where there are no scavengers, then those belonging to these trades can actually be moved there, because if accommodation is built for them there, they will be able to earn their livelihood and they will really be better accommodated there. Only yesterday I went to a very crowded cobblers' area and I said to them, 'if I find accommodation for you in another place where you can earn your livelihood, where you can have better housing than what you have got now, will you move?' They said, 'yes; we are only concerned with our living'. So I would give this assurance, as I have done on more than one occasion, that alternative accommodation will always be provided and that we will take the convenience of the persons whom we evict or move—I do not like to use the word 'evict'—from one place to another into account and we will see to it that they are able to earn their livelihood in the new place and are better housed and in more clean surroundings. I would like the Members of this House to come round and see what we are doing for the improvement of the slum areas, to sense the gratitude of the people who used to live in utter squalor now having pucca floors, where they now have open courtyards and verandahs, where they have now water taps, and where they now have flush latrines; and how much happier they are today than they were even three months ago since this work has been taken in hand. Everything is being done with a view to easing the situation and not with a view to bring any further discomfort to the people concerned. Now, doubts have been expressed about the advisory board,

which my hon. colleague the Minister for Works, Housing and Supply promised in the Lok Sabha and about which he has spoken. I have no doubt in my mind that if we have, as I hope to have, Members of the Lok Sabha one or two Members from this House also on that Committee and if we take them to these places and show them what we are doing, put all our plans before them and listen to their advice with the consideration that such advice always merits, they will feel convinced that we are not in any way being unkind to the human beings committed to our care. But I do want to plead with all the emphasis at my command that the Improvement Trust—I do not say that it has not made mistakes or that it has not done things which might have been better done, but I do say this—has worked under very hard circumstances, without any money at all at its disposal. It is being perpetually subsidised by the Government. Today where we have moved refugees from Ajmeri Gate, which was mentioned on the floor of the House—to Andha Moghul—for those houses which from the financial point of view or from the reckoning of the amounts spent on them would necessitate a rental of Rs. 24 per month—there are two large rooms, kitchen, verandah, courtyard and a little plot of land in front—we are only charging Rs. 12 per month. There are other places where if you look at it again from the point of view of expenditure incurred on the buildings, we would have to charge Rs. 12 a month, we are only charging Rs. 6 per month, so that we are literally subsidising the poor man's housing. So with these assurances I would plead with this House to pass this Bill and collaborate with us to solve this problem which has become a very vexed and difficult problem.

Sir, I am sorry that Members of this House—all of them—have not been able to see the Interim Plan. It is only an interim plan; it is not a master plan. It was brought into being in order to cry the first halt to the situation that is very very fast deteriorating. We will have to progress on this matter step by step, area by area, at all times taking the people into our confidence, hearing their views and seeing how best we can serve their interests. We are not out to serve individual interests or even governmental interests. We are out in this matter to serve the interests of the public. Thank you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Mr. Deputy Chairman, after hearing this discussion which has been threadbare there is very little new to be said on the subject and I will just say a few words by way of expression of the public views on this important measure. As we have seen since the morning, there is no section of the House which has welcomed this measure. This is apprehended to be unnecessary because we have seen there are two main things as far as this amending Bill is concerned. One is in regard to the summary eviction of the occupants and the other is 'unauthorised occupation'. I would like to say that it may be that administratively the Government is faced with some difficulty, but as it has been stressed in this House, this question is more of a human nature than of any other administrative difficulty. Who are the people who are affected by this measure? In the first instance, they are very poor people who are living in slums and in those undesirable conditions or they are refugees from Pakistan. We have seen that even rich people who came to India as refugees have had to take shelter in any corner or in the verandahs or on the pavements, wherever they could find a little accommodation, and they have lived for years under conditions which were most unhealthy and undesirable. In due course of time, these people have been able to put some roof over their heads. As it is, it seems that the provisions which are sought to be provided in this amending Bill are very innocuous. But in view of the fact that it will affect mainly the poor people and refugees, naturally, it becomes a human problem and the Legislators have to be very careful before they give their assent because they have to deal with the public directly. And, therefore, whatever comes before the House they have to see from the public point of view. I would submit that ordinarily there would be no difficulty in giving assent to this Bill. Firstly, even when they occupied the premises—not even the houses—they had to face real harassment at the hands of the municipalities and also of the improvement trust and others. Now that they have got some shelter over their heads, if they are to be removed from there, they have to be treated very kindly. I daresay, just now the hon. Health Minister in a very sympathetic way, explained the real position and I am sure the conditions would be as she has promised them to be. But even then we will have to take the extreme cases

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

and see that these unfortunate people who were at one time middle class people or even rich people, and are today refugees, do not have to run from pillar to post for even a little space and a little shelter over their heads. If due to some mistake of the authorities, or red-tapism or due to ordinary administrative difficulties, the lower authorities take a strong view of it, then their conditions would become really harassing and very inconvenient. I would, therefore, submit that this summary eviction is a great sting in dealing with such kind of people who are very poor and especially who are refugees. As far as the land is concerned, or the premises are concerned Government already possess the authority and power. Now, they want to extend this authority even to the houses and, therefore, this summary eviction is rather an objectionable thing. I do not know what difficulty the Government feels in not going to the law court whenever any person becomes unreasonable and he has to be removed and he does not want to go. More than one hon. Member has on the floor of the House, stressed this point and I will submit that the sting will be taken out of this whole Bill if this summary eviction provision is removed. In case of necessity, the Government, like any other private individual, can go to the law court.

Secondly, in regard to 'unauthorised occupation, also, this provision has been made in clause 4 (c). This new clause becomes a little difficult to be understood in the sense that a man is unauthorised, although a previous authority had authorised him to occupy that premises or that house. Now, the Government seeks to get the power to even declare that man who at one time had been authorised, to be now unauthorised. This also a very inconvenient provision as far as the poor people are concerned. Well, I know that once Government bring a measure before this House—howsoever unpopular it may be, and every section of the House may oppose it—Government rarely want to retrace their steps. The Government is determined to have this Bill passed. If the House had been left free, probably it would reject it and this amending Bill will never be passed, but by the employment of whip they would be able to pass it. I would, in that case, submit to the hon. Minister that when such occasions arise, when a person has to be evicted,

alternative accommodation should be provided to such an unfortunate person near his place of occupation and near the place where he has got work. Of course, the hon. Health Minister as a lady and also as a humanitarian and because of the portfolio she holds, is very kind-hearted and she has given us a very special assurance that these people will be given every facility and it will be treated as a human problem, even after passing this Bill. She has also told us how under the new conditions people have appreciated the position. But even then, why are these people living in the slums? They are living there because they have no other means. The hon. Health Minister just now told us that they have been given accommodation in a better place where ordinarily they would have to pay Rs. 12. Now, they are charged only Rs. 6 or half the rate. But for such poor people, in the present difficult times, when the living conditions have become so hard and the prices are soaring high, even to pay such small sums is a big burden on them. Therefore, I would submit that in case of the Government's determination to pass this Bill the hon. Minister would kindly see to it that such people are not just thrown out and asked to go anywhere or provided accommodation at such places where it will not be convenient for them to go and attend to their work. Alternative accommodation should in any case be provided to them near their place of occupation and where they could be rehabilitated in some form or other.

With these words, I am opposing this Bill in its present form, but if the Government is determined to pass it then this human problem should be taken into consideration.

SHRI V. C. KESAVA RAO (Andhra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in principle I agree with the Bill. But the question is the method in which the eviction is ordered and is done in the city of Delhi. As regards the slums, over and over again our Prime Minister has been remarking that the slums should be cleared and these people living in the slums should be given some alternative accommodation somewhere and the city should be beautified. With the advent of Independence, the city of Delhi has become a place of attraction and it is the duty of every citizen here to see that the capital city should be as attractive as possible. As regards the eviction of these low income people, especially people

living in the slums, they may be either scheduled caste people or scavengers or the poor evacuees, Government should not be hasty. These Scheduled Caste people and scavengers have really been living in the slums for centuries and I think they would have acquired the occupancy rights also on these lands. When we evict these people, everybody knows how the authorities behave at the time of eviction; not only there is eviction of these people from the premises but sometimes the cost of eviction is also recovered from these poor people. I do not know whether this is the case here in Delhi or not, but generally wherever eviction takes place, the charges of eviction are also recovered from the parties. Sir, nobody contradicts the idea of removing these slums and giving them alternate accommodation. The sites occupied by these people are costly sites and if these lands are sold, the business people and the rich people will pay cent. per cent. more than the cost. Sir, we ought to give them alternate accommodation. Just now the hon. Minister was telling that people are given alternate accommodation and they are charged half the rent of the House in which they lived. Sir, I ask why rent should be collected from these poor people. When these sites are sold, naturally a big profit will come to the Delhi Improvement Trust and with that profit I think they can even purchase lands, least costly lands, and construct houses on them. I do not think the collection of rent from these people is necessary. One-room or two-room or three-room tenements are needed. Such a tenement will not cost more than Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 2,000 to construct. In such a case even if a small plot of land is sold in the city, I think the cost of the new building will be recovered from such sale. So, I request the hon. Minister to consider this aspect.

Sir, we have been giving compensation as well as subsidy to many things, to many industries and in many walks of life. We are spending crores of rupees like this and we are thinking of the Second Five Year Plan in which we have to spend thousands of crores of rupees. We have given shelter to almost all the refugees who came from Pakistan, and I do not think there are more than a few thousands of people still remaining to be given alternate accommodation. We have given loans to the refugees. We have constructed houses for the refugees and we have been collecting some rent from them towards

the cost of building. But these people living in the slums—some are refugees and some are not refugees—they have been here for decades and we want some free shelter to be given to them. I hope that the Minister will agree to give them some shelter somewhere outside Delhi without collecting rent. People living in the slums are either daily labourers or are getting very low income. We are giving grants to mofussil areas to construct houses and for every development project we have been spending money. It is not through any fault of theirs but only to beautify the city that these poor people are being evicted, and it is duty of the Government to see that they are given free accommodation.

Sir, in general, I agree with the principles of this Bill, and I hope the hon. Minister will give due consideration to the ideas put forward by me here and see that these poor people are given free accommodation without being charged any rent. Thank you.

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपसभापति महोदय, इस विधेयक में जो नई धारा जोड़ी जा रही है उसके अनुसार दिल्ली इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट की बहुत सी ताकत बढ़ाई जा रही है और उसे यह भी अधिकार दिया जा रहा है कि वह जिन नई जमीनों को चाहे अपने हक में कर लें। श्रीमन्, मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहती हूँ कि जहाँ राजकुमारी जी के लिए हम सब लोगों के हृदय में इज्जत है, श्रद्धा है, वहाँ इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट अपना विश्वास बिल्कुल खो चुका है, उसके कारनामों से दिल्ली का एक-एक व्यक्ति खूब अच्छी तरह से परिचित है, तंग है और आजिज़ है। इसलिए श्रीमन्, ऐसी अविश्वसनीय संस्था जिससे सब लोग तंग आ चुके हैं, जिसके अन्दर अनाचार और कर्षण भरा हुआ है, उसके हाथ में एक नई ताकत दे देना मैं सर्वथा अनुचित समझती हूँ। इसलिये मैं इस विधेयक का विरोध करती हूँ।

श्रीमन्, दिल्लीमें इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट जैसा बड़ा एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन होते हुए भी वहाँ ६०० कटरे ऐसे मिलेंगे जिनमें इसान बिल्कुल हैवानों की तरह रहते चले आ रहे हैं, जहाँ के लोग निम्नकोटि की जिन्दगी बसर कर रहे हैं और उसे देखकर रोंगटे खड़े हो जाते हैं। श्रीमन्, जिस उद्देश्य से इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट यहाँ पर बनाया गया था उसकी पूर्ति के लिये इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने कुछ भी नहीं किया और न उसके कारिन्दों ने

[श्रीमति सावित्री निगम]

कुछ करना चाहा। यह तो लगभग साल भर से जब से भारत सेवक समाज ने दिल्ली में इन कटरों के सम्बन्ध में एक आन्दोलन खड़ा किया, एक पब्लिक ओपीनियन क्रिएट की तब बड़े-बड़े लोगों ने इन कटरों को देखना चाहा। हमारे देश के सब से बड़े नेता माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी भी इन कटरों की हालत को देखने के लिए वहां पर गये। जब उन्होंने इन कटरों की दशा देखी तब इन कटरों की जो मिनिमम रिक्वायरमेंट थीं उसके बारे में बन्दोबस्त हुआ। जिन कटरों में भारत सेवक समाज ने काम शुरू किया है और जिन कटरों में म्यूनिसिपैल्टी और इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने शुरू किया है, अगर इन दोनों जगह की स्थिति देखी जाय और तुलना की जाय तो मैं चैलेंज के साथ कह सकती हूँ कि भारत सेवक समाज द्वारा जो काम किया गया है उसमें औरों की बनिस्बत २५ प्रतिशत कम खर्चा हुआ।

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR : I challenge that statement. It is completely wrong. आप मेरे साथ चलिए और देखिये कि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने जहां काम किया है और भारत सेवक समाज ने जहां काम किया है, उनमें से कौनसा काम बेहतर है। भारत सेवक समाज ने जहां भी काम किया है वहां पर हमारे आदमियों की सलाह मांग कर किया है। आपको इस तरह का स्टेटमेंट नहीं देना चाहिये।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : श्रीमन्, मैं अदब के साथ कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह तो स्वयं माननीय मंत्री महोदया को पता होगा कि भारत सेवक समाज ने जो कार्य इन कटरों में किया है उसकी कास्ट २५ प्रतिशत कम आई है। इन कटरों में भारत सेवक समाज और इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने जो नालियां बनाई हैं उन्हें कई लोगों ने देखा है और उसके बारे में अपनी राय प्रकट की है। जो लोग वहां गये उनमें से दिल्ली म्यूनिसिपैल्टी के चेयरमैन साहब भी थे, जिन्होंने यह कहा है कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर महोदय स्वयं इस चीज को देखें कि वहां पर भारत सेवक समाज द्वारा जो काम हो रहा है वह बेहतर है या नहीं। वहां जो फ्लश सिस्टम लगा हुआ है वह बेहतर है या नहीं। इसके विपरीत इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट द्वारा जो फ्लश सिस्टम लगाया गया है वह शहर में चर्चा का विषय बना हुआ है।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक बात और करना चाहती हूँ। अभी हाल में जो ग्रेटर दिल्ली का प्लान निकाला है उसने लोगों में अपना आतंक फैल दिया है

इतना भय फैला दिया है कि मैं आपसे विनम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस प्लान के बारे में सारे शहर में खलबली सी मच गई है। यहां के रहने वालों को रात-दिन नींद नहीं आती है। इस प्लान के मुताबिक कई बस्तियां उसके अधीन आने वाली हैं। इन बस्तियों में रहने वालों को कई बार आश्वासन दिया जा चुका है कि जब तक उनके रहने के लिए बन्दोबस्त नहीं कर दिया जायेगा तब तक उनको मौजूदा जगह से नहीं हटाया जायेगा और न जगह ही खाली कराई जायेगी। लेकिन इस आश्वासन के बाद भी बाग कड़े खां, जमुना बाजार और कटरा कुम्हारन के लोगों के पास हर गेज बराबर नोटिस आ रहे हैं कि वे वहां से हट जायें। इस तरह के नोटिसों से वहां के लोग बहुत परेशान हैं और नतीजा यह होता है कि जब ये लोग उन आफिसरों के पास जाते हैं जिसे ये एक्विजन आर्डर आते हैं तो इन गरीब लोगों से रिश्वत मांगी जाती है।

श्रीमन्, मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह कहाँ तक उचित है कि इन बस्तियों से उन लोगों को उठा कर दस बीस मील की दूरी पर डाला जाय जैसा कि अभी मंत्री महोदया ने बताया कि उन्होंने कुछ बस्तियों में किया है। वे कहती हैं कि बड़े सुन्दर सुन्दर क्वार्टर है। यह ठीक है कि देखने में वे बड़े सुन्दर क्वार्टर लगते हैं, लेकिन उनको रमेशनगर, तिहाड़ आदि बस्तियों के रहने वालों की परिस्थिति पर भी विचार करना चाहिये। लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष, माननीय श्री आर्यंगर वहां गये थे और हम लोग भी वहां गये हैं। वहां के लोगों ने रो-रो कर बताया कि वे किस प्रकार १२, १४ मील चल कर रोजी कमाने आते हैं। जहां पहले बीबी बच्चे और सारा परिवार कमाता था वहां एक व्यक्ति का इतनी दूर आकर रोजी कमाना मुश्किल हो रहा है। उनकी हालत आज ऐसी है कि वे कर्ज में हैं और अपनी सारी चीजें बेच बेच कर खा रहे हैं। उनको सुन्दर और साफ सुथरे मकान दिखा कर उनकी रोजी खत्म कर देना न्याय नहीं होगा। इसलिए मैं नम्रतापूर्वक निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि वजाय इसके कि ऐसा प्लान बनाया जाय कि बड़े सुन्दर सुन्दर पार्क बना दिये जाय या फौवारे बना दिये जाय, मैं चाहती हूँ कि इन्हीं स्थानों में इन लोगों के लिये दुमंजिले और तिमंजिले मकान बना दिये जाय जिनमें ये लोग साफ सुथरे रह सकें। यदि इन लोगों को इन्हीं स्थानों में साफ सुथरे मकान दिये जायेंगे तो ये लोग दिल्ली की शोभा ही बढ़ायेंगे। श्रीमन्, यदि लोगों को उजाड़ कर

हजारों की आहें लेकर और हजारों को बिल्कुल बेरोजगार बना कर, हम ग्रेटर दिल्ली का प्लान बनायें, तो मैं सोचती हूँ कि इसमें न देश का भला होगा और न समाजवादी समाज, जिसकी हम रचना करने जा रहे हैं, वही पूरा होगा। मैं फिर श्रीमन्, आपके द्वारा मंत्री महोदया से कहूँगी कि वे इस बात पर गौर करें कि ग्रेटर दिल्ली प्लान के द्वारा जितना उनको क्रेडिट मिलने वाला है, उससे सफ़ाई गुना वे लोगो को कष्ट पहुंचाएंगी और उनको डिसक्रेडिट मिलेगा। आप यह देखिये कि झील कुलंजा में इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट की बस्ती है और उसमें दस हजार मकान हैं। जब हम लोग वहाँ गये तो हमने देखा कि वहाँ पानी भरा हुआ है, दो इंजिन पानी निकाल रहे हैं और लोग परेशान हैं। मैं तो यह कहती हूँ कि जो वस्तियाँ और जगहें १२ इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट के पास हैं यदि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट उनका ही ठीक ठीक उपयोग कर लेता तो भी दिल्ली का भाग्य परिवर्तित हो जाता। अब भी इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट के पास ऐसी जमीनें हैं जिनका लोग दुरुपयोग कर रहे हैं, जिनको किसानों पर उठाया हुआ है और जिनका खुद फायदा उठा रहे हैं। आप जानते ही हैं कि बहुत से राष्ट्र विरोधी लोग इस देश में मौजूद हैं जो कि हर परिस्थिति का फायदा उठाते हैं। अब यह डी० डी० पी० ए० एक नया हौन्वा बन रही है। मंत्री महोदया ने अभी कहा कि इसमें राज्य सभा के मेम्बर हैं, लोक सभा के मेम्बर हैं। मैं यह मानती हूँ। लेकिन उनको किसी बात की कानों कान खबर नहीं होने पाती है। जिनके हाथों में एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है, वे लोग क्या करते हैं इसका नमूना मैं आपके सामने पेश करना चाहती हूँ। आल इंडिया रेडियो में एक एम्प्लाय है जो कि एक मामूली स्टेनोग्राफर वगैरह कुछ है। उनकी एक छोटी सी विल्डिंग १०, १५ छोटे-छोटे कमरों की है। उसमें रेफ्रिजरेटर रह रहे हैं और उसका किराया सब मिलाकर लगभग सौ रुपये मिलता है। एक दिन डी० डी० पी० ए० के लोग वहाँ पहुँचे और नाप जोख करने के बाद यह कहा कि यह मकान गिराया जायगा। जब उन्होंने बहुत दौड़ धूप की तब यह कहा गया कि या तो मकान गिराया जायगा या अगर ३१५ रु० फी० गज के हिसाब से जमा कर दो तो नहीं गिराया जायगा। मैं खुद नहीं समझ पाई कि यह ३१५ रु० किस चीज का लिया जा रहा है। मैंने लिख कर भी पूछा कि यह क्यों लिया जा रहा है, तब मालूम हुआ कि यह बेटरमेंट टैक्स लगाया गया है। फिर यह पुछवाया गया कि बेटरमेंट टैक्स क्या होता

है, लेकिन अन्त में नतीजा यह हुआ कि मेरे मना करने पर भी कि रिश्तत में कुछ मत दीजियेगा, मैं कुछ दिनों के लिए बाहर चली गई और उन्होंने कुछ रुपये देकर अपनी जान छुड़ा ली और फिर न वह मकान गिराया गया और न बेटरमेंट टैक्स लगा।

श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानती हूँ कि जितने हमारे देश के वजीर हैं वे बेहद ईमानदार और ऊँचे विचारों के हैं और उनके हृदय में दया है, लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि उनको न ऐसी बातों का पता ही होता है और न उनके पास इतना समय ही होता है कि वे ऐसी छोटी छोटी बातों पर विशेष ध्यान दे सकें। मैं किसी के ऊपर आक्षेप करना नहीं चाहती, लेकिन जो स्थिति है उसको मैं, श्रीमन्, आपके द्वारा और इस सदन के द्वारा मंत्री महोदया के सामने बहुत ही नम्रतापूर्वक रखना चाहती हूँ। आज आप चाहे जिस जन सेवा केन्द्र में बैठ जाइये, आपको इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट के बारे में ऐसी शिकायतें सुनने को मिल जायेंगी, जिनको सुनकर हैरानी हो जाती है और शर्म से गर्दन झुक जाती है।

अब आप दूसरी बात देखिये। डी० डी० पी० ए० ने कुछ वस्तियों को लिया है। उनमें मालवीय-नगर को नहीं शामिल किया गया है, कालिका जी, जो गवर्नमेंट की बस्ती है और जहाँ सीवेज का तो अभी प्रबन्ध नहीं हुआ है लेकिन बाकी सब चीजें हैं, बिजली है, पानी है, उसको भी शामिल नहीं किया गया है, लेकिन डी० एल० एफ० की जो कालोनीज हैं उनको शामिल कर लिया गया है। यह अंधाधुन्ध मचा हुआ है। राजधानी में इस प्रकार अंधाधुन्ध मचने से लोग बिल्कुल डिमारेलाइज हो रहे हैं। मंत्री महोदया ने कई बार आश्वासन दे दिया है कि एक्विशन नहीं होगा, लेकिन फिर भी बराबर लोगों के पास नोटिस आ रहे हैं। जब नोटिस आता है तो जिस आदमी के पास नोटिस आता है वह गरीब आदमी दफ्तरों में दौड़ने लगता है और दफ्तरों में लोग भूखे मगरमच्छ की तरह बैठे हुए हैं जो यह कहने हैं कि २५ रु० लाओ तो एक्विशन नहीं होगा। इस प्रकार २५ रु० की बात सुनकर वह बेचारा हैरान हो जाता है। हम लोग तो सदैव यही कोशिश करते हैं कि वे लोग बिल्कुल न दें। जब कभी कोई ऐसा मामला हमारे सामने आता है तो हम लोग यही कहते हैं कि दफ्तरों में कोशिश मत करो, एक पैसा मत दो बल्कि कायदे की कार्यवाही करो और लिखा पढ़ी करो, लेकिन, श्रीमन् हम लोग कहां कहां पहुँच सकते

[श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

है जब कि इस प्रकार हर तरफ रिश्त का बाजार गरम हो रहा है। इसलिये मैं चाहती हूँ कि अभी कुछ दिन के लिये यह विधेयक अवश्य स्थगित कर दिया जाय। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट में पहले से कुछ इम्प्रूवमेंट हुआ है, लेकिन अभी इतना ज्यादा इम्प्रूवमेंट करना बाकी है कि ऐसी स्थिति में इतना बड़ा अधिकार इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट को दे देना, सारी दिल्ली की जनता और खास तौर से वह गरीब जो स्लम का रहने वाला है, जिसको हजारों तकलीफें और मुसीबतें पहले से हैं, उसके लिये और हजारों तकलीफें और मुसीबतें सिर पर डाल देना होगा। इसलिए मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि या तो यह विधेयक थोड़े दिन के लिए स्थगित कर दिया जाय या जैसे सुन्दर, मिठे और माधुर्यपूर्ण शब्दों में मंत्री महोदया ने आश्वासन दिया है, उसी प्रकार यह आश्वासन कार्यान्वित किया जाय और जितने भी इम्प्रूवमेंट के या दूसरे आफिसर्स हैं वे भी इसी माधुर्य के साथ, इसी उम्दा तरीके से और इसी विनम्रता के साथ जाकर उन लोगों को समझायें कि तुम्हारा एविकेशन नहीं होने वाला है और हम तुमको मकान देंगे। इधर उधर की बातें कहने से किसी को विश्वास नहीं होने वाला है क्योंकि अभी तक कोई विश्वास का काम नहीं किया गया है और जितने भी आश्वासन दिये गये हैं वे पूरे नहीं हुए हैं।

पहले श्री मावलंकर जी के आदेश से एक कमेटी बनी थी जिसमें श्री टेकचन्द जी आदि थे। उस कमेटी ने साफ-साफ कहा था कि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट की ओर से जो एश्योरेसेज दिये जाते हैं वे पूरे नहीं होते हैं। जमुना बाजार वालों को लाख समझाया गया, बहुत ही मीठी भाषा में हाथ रख कर थपथपाया गया कि तुमको सुन्दर घर मिल जायेंगे, साफ सुथरे घर मिल जायेंगे, लेकिन वे कहते हैं कि ऐसे साफ सुथरे घर आपको मुबारक हों, हमें तो पेट भरने के लिये रोटी चाहिये, हमें तो ऐसा स्थान चाहिये जहां हमारी स्त्री और हमारे बच्चे रोजी कमा सकें और रात में आराम से सो सकें। यदि मंत्री महोदया यह आश्वासन देती कि तिहाड़ में एक सई चमड़े की फैक्टरी खुलने वाली है या कोई दूसरी फैक्टरी खुलने वाली है जिसमें उन लोगों को काम मिल सकेगा, तो वे लोग वहां भागते चले जाते। आज के पूँजीवादी युग में जो सबसे बड़ा इंसटिब है वह पैसे का है। यदि उनको

रोजी मिले तो मंत्री महोदया के कहने पर भी कि खाली न करो वे खाली करके चले जायेंगे क्योंकि वे यह सोचेंगे कि यहां एक रुपया मिलता है और वहां चार रुपये मिलेंगे। यदि उनको वैसे ही सुन्दर और साफ सुथरे मकान दिये गये जैसे कि तिहाड़ में दिये गये हैं या झील कुलंजा में दिये गये हैं या रमेशनगर में दिये गये हैं तो उनकी आहें आकाश पर छा जायेंगी। इसलिये, श्रीमन्, मैं अनन्तापूर्वक फिर यह कहूंगी कि चाहे जिस तरह भी हो मंत्री महोदया को इस प्रकार के अनाचार को तुरन्त रोकना चाहिये। केवल आश्वासन काम करने वाला नहीं है।

उनके सामने बिल्कुल साफ-साफ एक प्लान बना कर रखना चाहिये और कहना चाहिये कि देखो हम चार हजार आदमियों को यहां से उठावेंगे और साढ़े चार हजार आदमियों की रोजी इसी एरिया में दो फर्लांग के भीतर देंगे, उनके लिये ये ये फैक्ट्रियां खोल रहे हैं जिनमें कि ये डेढ़ रुपया रोज कमायेंगे, यह क्लोदिंग फैक्ट्री खोल रहे हैं या यह चमड़े की फैक्ट्री खोल रहे हैं, तभी लोगों को विश्वास होगा और जमुना बाजार वालों को तसल्ली होगी और तभी ग्रेटर दिल्ली का नक्शा फले फूलेगा, वरना इतने आदमियों की आह को लेकर इस ग्रेटर दिल्ली के नक्शे को पूरा नहीं कर सकेंगे और अगर पूरा भी कर लिया तो वह फल फूल गही सकेगा। जब हम लोगों को सतायेंगे और उनको बेघर-द्वार का करेंगे तो आप ही बतायें कि हम लोगों को कैसे मुख और संतोष मिल सकेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का विरोध करती हूँ।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, after the speech made by my colleague, the Health Minister, enunciating the policy that the Delhi Improvement Trust has been following, coupled with the assurance that she gave that in the matter of the movement of these people from unauthorised occupations, alternative accommodation would be provided and secondly, there would be an Advisory Committee to advise the Delhi Improvement Trust, particularly in matters of slum clearance with a view to affording better and cleaner living conditions to slum dwellers and to providing alternative accommodation to the persons evicted in localities near about their present dwelling as far as possible, I thought that, so far as the criticism of the functioning of the Delhi Improvement Trust was concerned, there would

be an end to that, but apparently the hon. the Lady Member had prepared the speech which she wanted to deliver....

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM:
No, Sir, not at all.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:before the Health Minister had spoken and she probably forgot that the Health Minister had touched upon all those points. But she had to unburden herself of the speech (*interruption*) and she spoke rather bitterly about the functioning of the Delhi Improvement Trust. So far as the feeling is concerned, that is most welcome. As for the concern being shown from any quarter for the unfortunate slum dwellers with a view to improving their lot, with a view to ensuring that, if any movement becomes inevitable, it should be to localities where these people can economically rehabilitate themselves, or they should be moved to places where the surroundings are better and then there should also be provision for ensuring their livelihood; so far as this is concerned, Government is at one not only with the lady Member, Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam, but also with the others who have spoken in the same strain. I would, however, with you permission like to state that this concern has been expressed principally with regard to the slum clearance schemes. It has to be remembered that with regard to any slum clearance schemes, a certain amount of movement becomes inevitable, particularly in areas where the pressure on land is the greatest. Obviously, slum conditions will not normally develop unless there is a larger number of people living in any plot of land than what it should normally be. Therefore, in any scheme of slum clearance or slum improvement, if we undertake re-housing—and that area is such that it is meant for re-housing—then even with the best will, it becomes physically impossible to rehouse each and every individual in that locality. Some of the hon. Members including my learned friend for whom I have the greatest respect, Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor—Mr. Mazumdar also said it—have pointed out that nothing should prevent the Improvement Trust from selling lands to people whom they described as rich people, meaning thereby those who can afford to pay higher prices. There is no objection to such people being charged higher prices for any plots of land which are intended to be sold for the construction of business

premises, commercial houses and the like. Now, even if we ignore that concession which hon. Members in their goodness, were pleased to give to the authority which may be charged with the duty of slum clearance, and even if the entire area which is taken over by that authority for slum clearance, is sought to be improved by undertaking re-housing and houses are put up there—even multi-storeyed tenements—even then the position will arise when you cannot house every individual in a particular locality. Therefore, this rider, where it is said that as far as possible attempts will be made to rehouse the slum dwellers in alternative accommodation either at that locality or near-about is, something which is a practical proposition. It is easy to put forward ideas, but when one settles down to sort things out by an actual analysis of the position as it exists on the ground, one is driven to the conclusion that, even with the best will, it is not always possible to effect any slum clearance or slum improvement scheme without effecting some movement.

Then, again, concern has been expressed that in actual practice, this might be interpreted to permit the people entrusted with the administration of this to move people to far-off and distant places. I would submit that it is not very fair to impute that type of thinking to the people who are charged with this administration. After all, they have to carry on the administration in terms of the policies that are laid down. I may assure hon. Members that not only the Ministers take note of the observations that are made by hon. Members, but these speeches and the various points that are urged here are very carefully examined by those who are charged with the responsibility of administration. Any points that are raised during the course of the debate will not be taken as something that is said here in a theoretical way, but every care is taken to weigh those words and, wherever it is possible, to give a concrete shape to the suggestions that are put forward. Ample opportunities are always taken at all levels to derive the maximum benefit out of the contributions that hon. Members make after very thorough preparation and after giving their thought to the various points that come up for discussion. Therefore, it is not proper and fair to charge the Improvement Trust that they will start with this bias, that they will uproot every unfortunate person and will shift him to a place where

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

he will be housed in conditions where there will be economic disruption, etc. That is certainly not the object of undertaking these schemes. The public exchequer in one form or the other contributes towards these rehousing schemes. A lot of money is spent and the rentals that work out are also such that economically they are beyond the pocket of the people who occupy them. So, there is an element of a continuous subsidy in the form of rent. One of the hon. Members said that Government might consider the possibility of not charging any rent altogether. That is something which will be perhaps beyond our means at the moment, but I am citing this only to illustrate that, if this is the way hon. Members want the administration to work, to spend money for the improvement of slums and on the construction of houses, and charge less rent than the economic rent so that the poor people might get some benefit from that, after, all this expenditure is being incurred not to cause misery or uproot people in the dark manner in which the hon. lady Member, Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam, wanted to paint, but really to afford some solace, some relief, to these people who are living in extremely sub-human conditions, in conditions of misery and squalor. It may be

4 P. M. that always in every scheme, the actual picture does not emerge up to the high or rigorous standard that may be set up by certain hon. Members. But I was glad, however, to learn from the hon. Member that the Bharat Sevak Samaj is doing very good work. I want to pay a tribute to the Bharat Sevak Samaj for doing good work and I am sure good work will receive its recognition, perhaps better recognition even though it is not urged in a violent manner. An attempt is made to compare that with another sister organisation, namely, the Improvement Trust. Government and the administration are very much interested in the Bharat Sevak Samaj doing very good work. They are equally interested in ensuring that the Improvement Trust also does good work. There is absolutely no rivalry between the two and to see that Bharat Sevak Samaj was able to effect economies is a very heartening thing to me because it is something in which the Government as a whole, is very much interested. Government has been extending all types of facilities to this ardent band of public-spirited workers, to organise the work under the

auspices of the Bharat Sevak Samaj, not only for slum clearance, but for a number of other social activities. It has to be remembered, Sir, that the effort put in by energetic people like the hon. lady Member herself also has got a money equivalent, although account of it is not taken—quite naturally—in the accounts of the Bharat Sevak Samaj. And probably government organisations like the Improvement Trust, or public organisations like the municipal committee, have not got that advantage, because most of the people who work there either on the propaganda work or the creative work or the organisation work, have to be paid and so, the overall cost of it works out, to a figure slightly higher than in the case of the other. But if we only brood over that thing, then my fear is that we will not make any progress. Let the Bharat Sevak Samaj take charge of a larger number of *katras* if they can handle them. I remember when this point was discussed, the Bharat Sevak Samaj was asked to indicate the areas in Delhi in which they wanted to undertake this slum clearance work. There, assistance has been given by Government to the Samaj for carrying out this work. I do not grudge, nor do I complain about it. On account of the volume of work, the extent of the work, in some places there are difficulties and in some places the work is more difficult and in other places it is less difficult. The work had to be distributed among various organisations, including the Improvement Trust. And my submission is, that it is perhaps a little too early to make a comparison. I would really expect both the organisations, the Bharat Sevak Samaj and the Improvement Trust, to vie with each other to execute the work in the best possible manner and to ensure that as little expenditure is actually incurred as is possible under the circumstances.

Then again, there is one aspect which has been stressed by one hon. Member after another and that is the aspect relating to the refugees. I have all possible sympathy for the refugees. I know that they have suffered a great deal. I also know that apart from what little Government has been able to do, they themselves have faced the situation in a heroic manner and are now trying to reestablish themselves and are now trying to find their roots. It is very heartening and it is very good to learn that they are getting on to their feet. Therefore anything which in any way

uproots them or causes them any hardship is farthest from the mind of anybody.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

This, Madam, is one aspect of the case and Government have consistently been working on that basis. On the other hand, it has also to be kept in mind that the community as a whole, is entitled to certain property and in this particular case, they are the lands and buildings. I do not grudge the refugees or other deserving cases getting some benefit out of them. It has, however, to be constantly remembered that in this particular case, you leave it to the individual concerned to decide as to what particular chunk, out of that community's property he proposes to appropriate to himself. Therefore, some sort of a balance has to be struck, whether you are going to recognise this principle that any person who has taken hold of anything—whether it is Improvement Trust property or municipal property or Government property—should be allowed to stick to that property, or whether we should not examine it from the human angle and see that all his human needs are attended to, but he himself is not permitted to take undue advantage of the mere physical possession that he might have got hold of at one particular moment. On this question of balancing the two things, Government has been modulating its policy. They have gone to a certain extent, even of regularising the possession in certain cases, after charging certain dues which were, more or less, on a no profit no loss basis. In other cases where it was found that the unauthorised construction had been put in a manner which greatly detracted from the general lay-out of the plan or it was so obnoxious or it clashed so much with the general pattern, there the thing had to be vacated and alternate accommodation even in those cases was provided for. Therefore, Madam, in all these matters it is very difficult really to enunciate any set principle, except the general desire that alternate accommodation in all those cases is generally provided for. But to accept that it should be provided for exactly at the same spot, or exactly of the same type or exactly of the same order, I would submit, is something which purely from the practical angle is not possible, even with the best of desires.

I would also like to add that so far as the scope of the present Bill is concerned, it is an extension of the present Act to buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust and the problem does not concern the refugees so much as it concerns others, because generally, the unauthorised constructions which are on land belonging to the Improvement Trust can even today be tackled according to the law as it stands today, because the various judicial decisions are to the effect that the unauthorised building on the land is not a building owned by the Improvement Trust and it can take hold of that land as such. Therefore that problem is already covered. I am enunciating this, not with a view to minimising the difficulties or the hardships that might be experienced by the refugees. I am only trying to clarify the confusion that might have arisen in certain quarters with regard to the scope of the Bill. This Bill is only with regard to buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust,—not the unauthorised buildings put up by the unauthorised occupants on land belonging to the Improvement Trust—which really come within the scope of the amended Act as it is sought to be put through now.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I quite appreciate that position. But we entered into this discussion only to take advantage of it to review the whole position.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am grateful to my hon. friend and I also wanted to take this opportunity to repeat the assurance that Government stands committed to that policy of trying to do their best to provide alternate accommodation even in cases where they are compelled to shift the refugees who might be in unauthorised occupation, provided those cases come within the scope of the assurance given by Shri Gadgil when he was piloting the principal Bill; and at that time, Mr. Kapoor played a prominent part in getting those assurances from Shri Gadgil.

There was one point urged by my esteemed friend, Shri Sapru, relating to the definition of public premises. This is an expression which is clearly defined in the subsequent lines that follow that expression. We were advised that the original expression "Government premises will not be a correct description of all that is sought now to be covered by

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

the definition because, in the body of the definition itself, we have included immovable property belonging to the Central Government, belonging to the Delhi Improvement Trust, belonging to the local authorities in the State, etc. Therefore, we were advised that "Government premises" will not be a correct description of all that is included here and that we should alter that to "public premises" which would be a better phraseology. In this case itself, there is nothing hidden because all that it connotes is clearly laid down before and actually the operative part is the substance in it; whether we call it "Government" or "public", the operative part is not the "Government" or the "public" which has to be interpreted but what it connotes and that having been clearly defined, whether we use the expression "Government" or "public", there is really no substantial difference.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I do not deny that the word "public" is a better expression. All I said was, why is there no mention of the State Government property? The Delhi State must be owning some property. You have specifically mentioned the Central Government; the local authorities you have specifically mentioned and you have also specifically mentioned the Improvement Trust but there is no reference to the State Government and it might be argued that the State Government is not covered by the expression "public premises". That is all.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That is very useful point but now that the States Reorganisation Bill also has become law, Delhi State will become Centrally administered. Even before this, there was authority; in fact, so far as Part C States were concerned, the Central Government really was the legal owner of all properties that may be in the name of such States. It was on that basis that we have been proceeding. However, the point that has been raised by my esteemed friend is quite relevant. There is no explicit mention of property belonging to the Delhi State as such but the advice that has been given to us is that when we use the expression "Central Government" that really includes the property that might be shown in the name of the State of Delhi.

My hon. friend, Shri Kishen Chand, raised the point as to why the Government should have summary powers with regard to eviction and the like. I want to say two things in this connection. Firstly, so far as the right to get possession of such properties is concerned, that is undisputed; it is also a fact that Government is not subject to any rent control or things of that nature. Therefore, what is the thing that Shri Kishen Chand is urging? The Government should go to a Civil Court, pay the court fees and the Court automatically gives me a decree for ejection which I can execute on the following day. Purely from the Government's angle, even leaving aside all other human considerations—as was the expression used by the hon. Members more than once—it would perhaps be much simpler, although it may be a little more costly for the Exchequer, to organise a huge litigation department which would, with regard to any property which is in the unauthorised occupation of any individual, get hold of a plan of that property, pay some Courts fees, if such were payable, institute a suit and then, after a year or two or three or after some time, after some delay, get a decree and get that man evicted.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: On a point of personal explanation, I wanted the due process of law to be gone through. I wanted the courts to decide whether a man was in unauthorised occupation or not. The hon. Minister thinks that he is in unauthorised occupation and it becomes unauthorised occupation. I only wanted the due process of law to be followed.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The entire basis of the Act is the eviction from the premises of persons who are in unauthorised occupation of such premises. If they are not unauthorised, then this matter does not arise at all. That a person who originally enters with authority can never become unauthorised, is something which Government cannot accept. So far as the Government estates are concerned, whether they are at the Central level or at the State level whether it is the Central Government property in the capital or elsewhere, Government has built an estate not for any profit motives; it is principally to assist that class of people who are generally in the employ of the Government that Government has spent this huge amount. It is not making any money over these houses. Actually there

is a great element of subsidy, particularly in the low income group of Government employees. The economic rental for a two-roomed tenement should be of the order of Rs. 30 or Rs. 35 and Government is charging anywhere from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 only. Therefore, when Government has undertaken this vast project of providing Government accommodation to people and Government also requisitions certain property and places them at the disposal of people who are entitled to that accommodation, then to expect that Government should, like the ordinary landlord, be compelled to go to a Civil Court and spend all that money in litigation is not in the interests either of the public or of the Exchequer. Certainly it is not in the public interest that Government should be compelled to do that because, so far as the ordinary landlord is concerned, he has always got that profit element of 20 per cent., or 18 per cent., or 8 per cent., depending upon the locality or the non-availability of houses in any particular locality. He can afford to spend all that because all that is ultimately reflected in the rentals which people have to pay. Therefore, from the overall administrative angle, it will be in the general interests, in the interests of the country and in the interests of the people and of these Government servants, that the overheads on this should be reduced as far as possible. There should be a simpler method of determining as to when the purpose for which an allotment has been made has come to an end and when the person should be evicted. Take, for instance, the case of an ordinary Government employee. If this consideration is accepted, then once I have made an allotment to him, even if he is dismissed from service—the other man is waiting for that house because he must get that allotment to do his own duty—I must go to the Civil Court, file a suit and wait for two or three or four years before I could get hold of that house. I am sure that this could never have been the intention of Government nor could this be the intention of Parliament while considering this matter from the aspect from which I have presented it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Then, why has the High Court of Calcutta held that the whole Act is *ultra vires*?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: In their wisdom they came to that conclusion. I do not grudge it. We will agitate, and

ultimately if the Supreme Court decides it to be *ultra vires*, it is *ultra vires*. That is something quite different. So far as the legality or the constitutionality of a measure is concerned, they are the best interpreters as to whether it comes within the purview of the Constitution; but as to whether administratively it is a sound measure or not, they are not concerned with that, and for that, the Parliament is the custodian of the advisability of a particular procedure. I submit that from the administrative angle, from the national interest, it is very necessary that there should be this simpler method of administering a huge estate and the reason which he gives for curbing the powers is a reason for giving full powers because such an estate grows. Then it means, it has to deal with a larger number of people and if the Government is faced with the abnormal position, if I may say so, in which an ordinary landlord can eject, then I do not think that it is in the interest of anybody.

One point was urged by my friend, Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor with regard to the Low Income Group Housing Scheme. He thought that the ceiling of an income of Rs. 500 per month is rather on the high side. He had a discussion with me outside also, and I told him that this is after all a ceiling, and it is really for those who are in charge of this administration to so administer it that the people who are getting, say, Rs. 200 or Rs. 100 a month or Rs. 150 or Rs. 300 a month, all these categories could be suitably dealt with. Perhaps, with the low purchasing power that the Rupee has to-day I would be inclined to disagree with him when he says that a person who is earning Rs. 500 per month will necessarily be termed a rich man; I have grave doubts on that. At any rate he is a person who, according to the present price structure, is perhaps not a person who can easily build a middle-class house and the sort of assistance which is given to him should not be grudged but, as I submitted earlier, it is only a ceiling and there is nothing which prevents the various Governments, who are administering the scheme really to administer it in such a manner that the pay group which is the hardest hit, gets the maximum relief. So it is more a matter of administration than of policy.

More than one hon. Member has raised objection with regard to the non-availability to them of the evidence that

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

was adduced before the Select Committee. According to the rules of procedure it is for the Select Committee to advise as to whether the entire evidence is to be circularised or whether it is simply to be sent to the Parliament Secretariat. In this particular case it had been forwarded to the Parliament Secretariat and this is mentioned also in the Report of the Select Committee. So nothing prevented the hon. Members who were interested in pursuing the evidence, to see the record of that evidence, and if there was anything in it which was relevant to the discussion, surely they could have looked at it, and then they could make as much use of it as the rules permit and in so far as it might be relevant for the disposal of the present piece of legislation.

An objection has been raised about the Delhi Development Provisional Plan. I thought that the various sections of the House would welcome this effort, which is of a herculian nature meant to take some concrete steps for improving the layout and for giving a particular shape to the future development of Delhi. If there are any objections, they could be put forward in a constructive manner, and I am sure that the planners have no other objective before them except to ensure that, before it is finalised, the Plan takes note of the basic requirements of the city, by way of circulation of traffic and by way of provision of essential amenities—whether they are hospitals, educational institutions, and the other important amenities like health centres or shopping centres and the like.

The problem of re-housing also is very important, and I am sure that those who are entrusted with the preparation of the Plan in regard to this development will certainly take note of the requirements of Delhi and they would ensure that there is a planned expansion both of the residential and commercial as well as the industrial sectors in the whole of the city.

One small point, Madam, before I resume my seat. The procedure which is adopted for getting possession from unauthorised occupants has been described as a summary one. It may be that I used that expression and it had been picked up by the hon. Members from my observations. But I have examined the rules on the point. It is not really so summary as one is prone to think

on a superficial examination. Rules have been framed which lay down the giving of notice; a certain time limit is prescribed, and even after the expiry of that notice, generally some more time is given. So it is summary only in this sense that a regular civil suit is not filed, but short of that, there is a regular procedure laid down under the rules, which are statutory rules, according to which a notice is given, and if that person is entitled to represent in reply to that notice, that representation is examined. If ultimately it is decided against that individual, he has also got, in some cases, a right of appeal to the higher authority. So it is a simpler procedure, not necessarily a summary procedure, and in dealing with a matter of this nature, where it is admitted that the Improvement Trust or the municipal authority or the Government is the owner of the property and it is also admitted that the other person is there without authority, it should be a welcome provision that, instead of dragging both the State as well as the citizen into endless litigation, a simpler mechanism is laid down according to which broad and essential justice is done; only the intricacies of the law may not be there, but it is a very fair and substantial procedure that has been laid down.

With these words I commend this Bill for consideration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Government Premises (Eviction) Act, 1950, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA) : We shall now take up clause by clause consideration.

Clauses 2, to 6 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were also added to the Bill.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.