

vast number of communities. Many of them have tensions at different points of time. There are tensions even between one Hindu and another Hindu community, for instance, on the question of interpretation of *Ramayana*, in South India there is a great deal of tension between two different castes. There are tensions even amongst the Muslim community between Shias and the Sunnis and riots have practically taken place every year on account of it and obviously there cannot be an RSS hand in the Shias-Sunnis riots and nobody claims it.

Obviously, there are a large number of such tensions. There are as one of the hon. Members here just referred to tensions between the Akalis and the Nirankaris. Again the RSS has got nothing to do with it. I am sure the hon. Members who are rather negatively very fond of the RSS and mention its name almost like a *mantra* every time would also concede that the RSS has nothing to do with it. I would like to see the debate on the subject in a dispassionate way, taking the whole picture into account. It is a question of communal attitude; it is not only the question of Hindus Vs. Muslims but even within Muslims and within Hindus there are various sub-communalisms which ultimately add up to the total communalism in the country. I would, therefore, like this discussion to get away from this kind of pet fault-finding and pet or rather quack prescriptions that periodically come from that side.

The question of Hindus Vs. Muslims is not a question of a large community Vs. a small community. Their argument is that a small community because of its size needs protection and it is unduly apprehensive and insecure in an environment of this kind. Let us take the smallest community in this country, the Parsi community. I know quite a bit of the Parsi Community. My wife is a Parsi. It is not only the Congress (I) leader who has a privilege of marrying a Parsi. I also have that privilege and, I think, there are many others who have that privilege. The Parsi community is the smallest microscopic community in this country, probably less than 100,000. They face no tension with the majority community. The question is why? What is special about the Parsi community? Do they not have their own identity? They very much have their own identity. Do they not have their own religion? They very much have their own religion. Do they not have their own belief? They very much have their own belief; in fact they have a strict belief. There was a

tremendous opposition to anyone of their community marrying outside their community, the kind of opposition there would be when a Muslim marries a Hindu or *vice versa*. But still the fact of the matter is that the Parsi community does not feel any insecurity.

In fact, when the Britishers left India, they asked the Parsi Community whether they would like constitutional guarantees to be put in so that they are protected and they said, "We have no fear from the people of India. We do not want any such constitutional guarantees." And today they are there in all prosperity.

I think, it is not a question of smallness that is really at issue. But surely, the significant fact is that nobody seems to be taking up the cause of Parsis because the Parsi community has no political value. There are only 100,000 people and that means about 40,000 votes. They are all concentrated in Bombay. Obviously, it is not very useful and productive politically to take up the cause of the Parsi community. This, in my opinion, really goes to the heart of the matter as to why, whenever we discuss communalism, we do not discuss communalism within the Hindu Community or communalism within the Muslim community and that we always discuss communalism between Hindus and Muslims because of the political advantage that is to be gained by talking in these terms.

I would again ask, if you consider the question of size, take even a district where the Muslims are in a great majority, are there no riots there? There are riots. Take a district where the Muslims hold important offices like the district magistrate. For example, take Sambhal district where the Muslims constitute 75 per cent of the population there and the district magistrate there, till recently, was a Muslim. But still a riot took place there in which the members of both communities whatever the proportion—I am not very much interested or impressed by the proportion figures—the Hindus and the Muslims died there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue tomorrow.

17.30 hrs.

HALF AN HOUR DISCUSSION

DEMOLITION IN TUGHLAKABAD

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up the Half-An-Hour Discussion. Shri P. Rajagopal Naidu.

SHRI P. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : (Chittoor): Mr. Chairman, Sir, on Friday last, there was a Starred Question with regard to the demolitions in Tughlakabad, Delhi. The Minister differed from the Member and, when a Minister differs from a member, we have to think twice because he is a responsible person and whatever he says, he says with authority.

Therefore, I wanted to know what happened in Tughlakabad Extension and so I went there and visited the colony. I have seen most of the houses. The Minister has said that he has taken the information provided by the Municipal Corporation and has believed it also. Yes, he has to. But the Municipal Corporation, unfortunately, has given wrong information with regard to two things. One is that they have said that they have notified the demolitions, but they have not at all notified the demolitions. The Act says that when you contemplate a demolition, notice should be given. I am not going to read all the Sections, but the Proviso says :

'Provided that no order of demolition shall be made unless the person has been given, by means of a notice served in such manner as the Commissioner may think fit a reasonable opportunity of showing cause why such order shall not be made.'

There is another proviso also and, in this second proviso, there is an opportunity or appeal. It is only after going through the provisions of all the clauses that they can demolish. Therefore, I say that they have not informed the Minister the correct position and they have not acted legally in demolishing these buildings. They were in hurry to demolish the houses and therefore they have not adopted this procedure at all.

The second thing is that they have said that all the houses have been constructed after June 30, 1977. The Minister may ask what is the proof to show that these houses have been constructed prior to June 30, 1977. I can bring to the notice of the Government three proofs. One is that more than hundred householders paid house-taxes. The Minister has also accepted that, and said they have not touched those houses whose holders paid house-taxes. But, when I went there, I found that one House has been demolished. I can even give the name of the owner. It is Ajit Singh Walia, and his Rural Zone No. is 389.

With regard to other houses, the assessment notice forms were given to more

than 400 persons prior to the stipulated date, which the Government is depending upon. The Government assured the residents of the colonies saying that whatever houses were constructed prior to June 30, 1977 or whose construction began before that date, will be regularised. Therefore, what I say is that those 400 to 500 persons whose houses have been assessed and on whom notices were served saying that they have been assessed, must be regularised.

The third thing is that we can find the proof in the demolished bricks themselves. When we see the bricks we will find that they bear the stamps of the years 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978. If they have constructed the houses in 1978, they must bear the 1978 mark. I can say that, in the houses which have been demolished, the number of houses where we cannot find even a brick of 1978 is more than 800. Therefore, I say that this third proof also clearly shows that they have been constructed prior to 1977. With regard to 1978 bricks, I want to tell you one thing. I am telling about 150 houses. They are all poor people. They had raised a portion of it in 1977. If you take out any brick in that, you cannot find 1978. Then with the money they got later, they raised the other portion and they have also constructed the compound. Therefore, in the extension and in the compound, you can see the bricks bearing 1978 mark. The contention is that they started them in 1977 and they have completed them in 1978. These houses are 150.

What I want to impress upon the Government is that they have to take a sympathetic attitude towards this; not only that, as a matter of right also, because of the assurance of the Government, that colony has to be regularised; more than 900 houses have to be regularised.

The Municipal Corporation gave another incorrect information with regard to the houses which are on public land. I have seen that they have marked out the Government land by barbed wire. I have counted the houses. There are only 70 houses in addition to a Harurman temple which has been destroyed and a Gurudwara. They were all carved out with barbed wire. I am not accusing anybody or criticising the Government for what has happened hitherto. What I appeal to the Government and the Minister is to take cognizance of these facts. These are the proofs which I place before the Minister. If he is convinced about them, then let him in-

quire into the matter. If he accepts these proofs, then there is no other go except to regularise the colony. In addition to this, I want to tell him one thing. They have submitted a plan to the Municipal Corporation, and they are considering it. Therefore, they have taken much pains so as to get sanction from the Municipal Corporation.

Therefore, taking all facts into consideration, I request the hon. Minister to see that this colony is regularised. If at all he is having any doubt, he can get it enquired and if what I say is true, then it should be regularised.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT): Sir, most of the confusion seems to be arising from the fact that no differentiation is made between those houses which were constructed on public land and those houses which have been constructed in an unauthorised manner...

SHRI P. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : I was not on that point.

SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT : You said something about demolition by the MCD. The MCD did not demolish; the DDA demolished....

SHRI P. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : I have not said that.

SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT : He said that no notices for demolition were served. I want to make it clear that 282 houses, structures, boundary walls and things of that sort, were demolished by the DDA—which were encroachments on public land, 332 houses, structures, semi-pucca houses, boundary walls, etc., were demolished by the MCD—which had been constructed without any sanctioned plans. You see it is not only the plans of individual cases but also the lay-out plans of the colony which have got to be got sanctioned. It is true there is the announcement of the government that no houses will be demolished which have been constructed before 30th June, 1977 but houses which have been constructed unauthorisedly or if they are encroachments on public land or they have been constructed without any sanctioned plans will not be allowed to remain there. That has been very clear.

Now the hon. Member has mentioned some individual cases. Individual cases he may refer to me and I will certainly have them looked into. The intention and the policy of the government is absolutely clear, that if they are colonies or houses constructed before 30th June 1977, they will not be demolished and if somebody has acted against these instructions or if there have been some cases—the hon. Member said that some houses have been demolished in spite of stay orders—if the department concerned have violated anything of that sort, then they will face the consequences. The decision is that no house constructed before 30th June, 1977 is going to be demolished and if any such demolition has taken place, it is against the pronounced policy of the Government Houses, for which house-tax has been paid, have also been demolished—it was said., Primarily paying house-tax is no bar. There may be an unauthorised construction and proceedings against its demolition may be going on somewhere...

SHRI P. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : I agree.

SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT : But certainly it may at least show that this must have been constructed earlier than 30th June, 1977 and so this should not have been demolished. I agree, but paying house-tax is basically no argument against unauthorised construction. That is what I want to point out.

About bricks, all the 282 houses which have been demolished by the DDA were a construction of after 17th December, 1977 because in this area one small demolition operation had been undertaken on the 17th December, 1977 itself. Therefore, whatever had come up on that part of the land came up only after 17th December, 1977. Therefore, bricks used in these constructions by and large and practically all of them were 1978 bricks. There may be bricks of earlier period in the houses demolished by the MCD but definitely not in those demolished by DDA, according to the information provided to me. They say all these 282 houses came up after 17th December, 1977 and most of the bricks used in this construction were 1978 bricks.

Therefore, I do not think I have to say much about it. Naturally there is no question of confrontation between the Members and the Treasury Benches. If there are individual cases of the sort the hon. Member referred to, I will be glad to have those cases looked into.

SHRI A. R. BADRI NARAYAN (Shimoga): The hon. Minister has been pleased to state that the buildings were constructed subsequent to December 1977. My friend here has urged that the evidence on the

[Shri A. R. Badri Narayan]

bricks shows that they have been all of a prior date and not subsequent to June or December, 1977. This is a matter for you to kindly investigate and if it is found that it has been of a subsequent date, you act perfectly at liberty to take suitable action. What I would urge upon you is: please have the matter investigated as to whether it is prior to June 1977 or subsequent to 1977. That is one matter.

I am saying that there have been many such unauthorised encroachments or construction of buildings, which we are witnessing all over the country. We must go into the question, as to why such unauthorised constructions are coming up in the Delhi area. The municipal authorities have to build lakhs of houses. There has been scarcity of house and so, house have to be built. There is some lacuna, in the shortage of houses; the people have got to live somewhere. I think the Delhi Development Authority has to hasten their pace of construction of houses in the areas.

Further, to prevent such future unauthorised occupations by unauthorised occupants, something must be done. You may be aware that there have been agents and unscrupulous colonisers, who have been selling the lands, as belonging to them. The poor people, the poor buyers, when the man is likely to sell them, purchase them. So, you have got to amend the laws and formulate a proposal for the amendment of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, to make such unauthorised constructions, a cognisable offence. Then only the Corporation will have the powers to arrest such unauthorised or unscrupulous agents who sell those lands; they should confiscate the materials. So, you must go into the causes of this disease and find suitable remedies. There is no use demolishing the constructions of houses by the poor people who have been permitted to do so by some unscrupulous lower officials. Why did they keep quiet? They should have stopped them, in the initial stage itself? Why did they allow them to build houses? I mean this is a lapse on the part of the authority concerned—the Municipal authority concerned. Why do they come at a later stage when the entire house is built up and the families start living there? Do you think it is proper that we should demolish such constructions?

So, I would wish that you must publicise this extensively; there must be a greater publicity about the present policy in regard to unauthorised constructions. There are land sharks. They think that this is their main business. You must prevent them. I think the poor people must also know that they should not build unauthorised constructions.

The Municipality is building houses for them in a manner which has been very slow. You must pull up the Municipalities and other development authorities. They must fill up the lacuna. The poor people build up their unauthorised constructions because they have no place to live. So, you must see that house constructions are made for them so that the people can occupy them.

SHRI B. RACHAIAH (Chamara-janagar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Delhi Municipal Corporation and the D.D.A. no doubt have got the responsibility for an orderly growth of the town and also for the upkeep-maintenance of the city. Therefore, they have resorted to the demolition of the unauthorised constructions not only now but even during the 18 months of emergency. We have seen then some demolitions that had taken place. But, it seems to me that a race is going on between the emergency demolitions and the Janata Government's demolitions.

In this process, I feel, the minorities, that is, the scheduled castes who have no houses of their own or sites of their own who have been allowed to construct their houses, after completion, when they live there, this demolition is allowed to take place.

I feel that if you want to have an orderly growth and if they want a lay-out plan to be sanctioned, to that extent, for the formation of small public places as a public utility place, the demolitions can take place and the remaining houses can be regularised for those people who are there by levying a heavy penalty if they are landless or homeless and if they are really poor coming from the minorities and backward classes, that is, the scheduled castes, according to the government policy of giving sites to the siteless and giving homes to the homeless.

Will the Minister consider my suggestions?

*SHRI K. MALLANNA (Chittdurga): Mr. Chairman, Sir, number of houses have been demolished in Tughlakabad area. This is an unjust and cruel act. This exposes very clearly the double standard that has been maintained by the Janata Government. The Government on the one hand, is permitting the regularisation of the multi-storied buildings built by rich people. On the other, it is encouraging the demolition of houses built by poor people. These houses were built by very poor people and that too in a slum area.

These houses were built out of hardship of down trodden people and many of these have been demolished without any due consideration. No alternative arrangements of accommodation were made before demolishing these houses. This is the reason why I say that the Janata Government has a double standard. Vested interests of the Janata Government are responsible for this act. Action should be taken against the D.D.A. and Municipal Corporation of Delhi officers who are responsible for such demolitions. I oppose this policy of the Government. I would like to know from the Government as to what action they have taken against the persons who have constructed multi-storied buildings? What alternative arrangements of accommodation have been made by the Government for the poor people whose houses have been demolished? Finally, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what action he proposes to take against the officers responsible for demolitions? With these questions I thank the Chair and conclude my speech.

श्री सुबराज (कटिहार) : सभापति जी, इस प्रश्न के सिलसिले में एक बहुत ही महत्व सवाल पैदा होता है। हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी बहुत अनुभवशील व्यक्ति हैं। जिस एपेकेशन मेनिफेस्टो पर यह सर्वनमेंट आधारित है उस मेनिफेस्टो को उन्होंने देखा होगा। जनता पार्टी के एपेकेशन मेनिफेस्टो, पेज 27 पर लिखा हुआ है :

"The callous manner in which jhuggi colonies and pucca buildings in other areas have been razed to the ground in Delhi and elsewhere follow the same arrogant and coercive pattern."

इतना ही नहीं, सभापति जी, इन्होंने एक स्पेशलिटी मेनिफेस्टो निकाला था, जिस पर दिल्ली के लोगों के लिये, उस के पेज 47 पर पारटम 9 में इन्होंने कहा था —

All unauthorised colonies will be regularised. To this end, Delhi Master Plan will be suitably amended.

यह श्राव के सम्बन्ध में पृष्ठना चाहता हूँ—जिस पृष्ठ के अन्तर्गत गिराये गये और सरकार

की यह भावना केवल दिल्ली के लिये ही नहीं, बल्कि राष्ट्रीय पमाने पर जुड़ी हुई दिखाई देती है, दूसरी जगहों पर भी मकान गिराये जा रहे हैं—जहाँ भी ऐसी चीज नष्ट भ्राती है, मैं शर्म से उस रास्ते को छोड़ कर दूसरे रास्ते से जाने की कोशिश करता हूँ। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—ये मकान जो गिराये गये हैं—क्या इन के बारे में जब लोक सभा में प्रश्न पूछा गया, तब यह कहाँ गया था कि ये मकान नवम्बर या दिसम्बर में नहीं, बल्कि उसके कबल के बने हुए थे और यह भी कटेगोरिकली कहा गया था कि "सुरेश कुमार बनारम बी०बी० ए०" के मामले में दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट के चीफ जस्टिस श्री गोस्वामी ने स्टेट-आर्डर 24 अक्टूबर को दिया था? क्या सरकार ने यह भी पता लगाने की कोशिश की कि 1 अगस्त, 1976 को जो डिमाण्ड-नोटिस रेंट देने के लिये दिया गया था, उन में प्राक्युपाइंग हाउस नं० आर-जेड-68, तुलसिकाबाद एक्सटेन्शन का भी डिमाण्ड नोटिस था, जिस का नाम राम बिलास था। 27 नवम्बर को स्पेशलिटी प्रश्न पूछते समय माननीय मंत्री जी को यह सब सूचना दी गई थी। क्या उन्होंने प्राधोपतित यह जांच करने की कोशिश की कि जिस कठोरता से इन मकानों को गिराया गया, क्या वह हमारे मनिफेस्टो के अनुसार था, क्या इस से जनता पार्टी की भयंता नहीं गिरी है? जिन लोगों के मकान गिराये गये—उनको न कोई नोटिस दिया गया और न यह कहा गया कि आप अपने मकान को हटा लीजिये, लेकिन यहाँ पर जबाब में यह कहा गया है कि हम ने लार्ड फार्मेलिटोव को आम्बर किया है।

सभापति जी, मंत्री महोदय अफसरों की रिपोर्ट को यहाँ पढ़ कर सुना देते हैं, लेकिन जिन की बचह से हम यहाँ प्राये हैं और जिस बात को कस हम कब्ज कर ले, प्राय वे तमाम काम हमारे ही नेतृत्व में हो रहे हैं। क्या मंत्री जी ने यह उल्लेख करने की कोशिश की

[श्री. युवराज]

कि जो काम हुआ है वह बहुत ही गलत ढंग से हुआ है और हाई कोर्ट का स्टै आर्डर आने के बावजूद हुआ है ?

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सबर साहब, हमारे जो मोहतरिम मेम्बर प्राचीर में बोले हैं, मैं पहले उन के सवाल से शुरू कर के, बाद में हमारे सवालों का जवाब दूंगा।

SHRI K. MALLANNA : I request you to please speak in English.

SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT : I am first of all replying to the gentleman who had spoken in Hindi. Then I will reply to your questions in English.

SHRI K. MALLANNA : Then you reply in Kannada.

SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT : I will learn from you first and then I will reply in Kannada. I have no bias against any language.

श्री धनरेबिब मेम्बर की इस बात से पुरा-पुरा इतिहास है कि मकान गिराना कठोरता है। लेकिन इन्हीं सदस्यों को मैं यह भी बाद चिलाना चाहूंगा कि इन का वह मुतालबा भी है कि हमारे मुल्क में ला-एण्ड आर्डर की स्थिति कायम की जाय। दोनों बातें एक बख्त में पूरी नहीं हो सकती। क्वॉन्मेंट में, जो जनता पार्टी का इलेक्शन मैनिफेस्टो है, उस का कहीं भी उल्लेख नहीं किया है। इन्हीं के कहने के मुताबिक दोनों बातें की गई हैं। हम ने कहा था कि अन्-थोराइज्ड कालोनोज को रेगुलराइज किया जायगा। इस किस्म की कालोनोज की तादाद 495 थी, उन को जरूर रेगुलराइज किया जायगा, उन को हटावे का सवाल नहीं है। अब यहाँ तक डिफरेंसियल के कन्सेप्ट करने का सवाल है— हमारे मोहतरिम सदस्यों को यह समझना पड़ना। ऐसे इलाके जो सदियों से बने हुए हैं, जैसे तुर्कमान गेट, सराय बलौल, कली महल, उन के विराधे जाने को और इन अन्-थोराइज्ड कन्स्ट्रक्चर या इन्फिन्ड

एन्कोचमेंट को एक ही ताराज में नहीं डाला जा सकता, बल्कि ये दोनों मुस्तलिफ़ नेचर की है। जनता पार्टी अपनी दोनों ही बातों को पूरा कर रही है और आगे भी पूरा करेगी। कठोरता में मुझे कोई यकीन नहीं है। लेकिन जहाँ तक कानून को लागू करने की बात है— उसमें कभी-कभी कठोरता बरतनी पड़ती है।

28 hrs.

Some hon. Member seemed to have gone totally out of the orbit of the question. Our hon'ble friend spoke about the scarcity of houses. I am sorry. But I would not like to disappoint him because the subject relates to me and I will tell him what is the position. First of all I would like the hon. Member to realise what is the dimension of the problem of housing. The dimension is that if we phase out the programme of housing over 20 years we shall be required to construct five million houses each year which we do not claim we will be able to do. But the only claim that we have made is that we will provide the largest possible number of houses which will not only compare favourably to the best of Governments during the past 30 years but it will be four times or five times or sometimes ten times better than even the previous effort. I will just for the sake of information give the figures. During the Fifth Five Year Plan the allocation was only Rs. 600.92 crores for housing. For the Sixth Five Year Plan which has come into existence the allocation is Rs. 1598.0 crores that is a 1/2 times more than the previous allocation. Even then we have adopted some other measures also to increase our housing stocks. We have reduced the plinth area, the size of the houses and the specification has been reduced so that with this limited resources we get the largest possible number of houses. Then we have also invited investment from private sector. Then we have adopted certain steps so that an individual effort is also included in the construction of houses. We in Delhi get round about 1,75,000 persons each year which add to the population of Delhi. These people come from outside. I am not talking of the addition on account of birth rate. I am talking about the addition on account of people coming from outside. We in Delhi have taken up the programme and we are very close to fulfilling it. The best performance in one of the years of the past 30 years has been the construction of about 3500 houses by the D.D.A. our target is about 40,000. I do not think that you can expect anything better than this figure and I agree with the hon. Member that there are 40,000 houses

are not sufficient. If we construct 40,000 houses each year they are not going to be sufficient to meet the demand of Delhiwahlah. There will have to be people who are going to be without houses. There is another exercise which we are entering and that exercise is the development of smaller houses providing counter magnets in these smaller towns the number of which is about 495. In such towns where we have a population of a hundred thousand to two hundred thousands we are providing all the counter magnets so that the population pressure on these about to big cities that we have is reduced. I do not want to go into it in detail. I was saying that steps to remove the scarcity may be impossible. But we have taken steps to provide the largest possible number of houses within the limited resources we have and I do not think that the hon. Member will be able to make any further suggestion. Some hon. Member mentioned about the orderly growth. I am hundred per cent in agreement with the hon. Member's anxiety that these unauthorised constructions should necessarily be nipped in the bud. That is very true. But there are some legal constraints which we are trying to get over. An exercise is going on to find out whether we can really make it a cognisable offence. But even if it is made a cognisable offence the house can be constructed over night. Unfortunately at the moment, the Municipal Corporation of Delhi cannot undertake demolition unless it serves notice under Sections 343 and 344 of the Municipal Act. So one week is enough to construct a compound wall and two rooms which can be done overnight even.

Some hon. Member mentioned about giving proper publicity to our policy in this regard. It is not once, but many times, when this Government throughout the period of 20-21 months, has been making unambiguous statements, absolutely mincing no words, that no unauthorised construction will be allowed after the 30th June 1977. I am making that pronouncement today and the newspapers will carry it tomorrow; the language newspapers will also carry this. We must put an end to this lawlessness somewhere, we must draw a line somewhere.

Some individual cases were also mentioned. One of the cases mentioned by Shri Yuvraj was of one Shri Suresh Kumar. There can be cases where in spite of the stay orders having been served, demolitions might have taken place. It does not indicate any change in the policy. Our policy remains that any unauthorised construction made after the 30th June, 1977 will not be allowed. If some department carries out the demolition in violation of the stay order, they will have to suffer the consequences.

An hon. Member made a mention about certain professional cheats who enter into some sort of wrong activities and sell Government land to people. There has been a test cases of the sort to establish that. One gentleman, an official of the D.D.A. was sent to one such person; the fellow sold him D.D.A. land. In such cases the law will take its own course.

There is one important thing with regard to the unauthorised constructions and that is that the unauthorised constructions and illegal encroachments should be nipped in the bud. I am hundred per cent in agreement with this and we are trying to evolve some methods. We have entered into an exercise where we are trying to make any unauthorised construction as a cognisable offence. It will discourage unauthorised constructions and illegal encroachments.

As far as this Government is concerned we are determined to see that with the available law today all unauthorised constructions whether these have been constructed, a week, a month or two months back, will have to be pulled down.

A suggestion was made that only a part of such houses may be demolished. Sir, when we are undertaking the regularization of these 495 colonies, some sort of development plans have to be undertaken. We are, however, trying our best to ensure that all this regularization is done without the least disturbance; in fact, if possible, without any disturbance. This is however, in relation to those colonies which have to be regularised. This cannot be made applicable in respect of the houses which have come up unauthorisedly.

Some hon. Member mentioned that the Tughlakabad demolitions were an injustice to the people. I hold the contention that if we are keen on an orderly growth in the urban areas, the only way of doing justice is not to permit lawlessness to grow and unauthorised construction is a part of the lawlessness which will have to be checked. I do not know, what the hon. Member means by double standards about the multi-storeyed buildings, and how he can draw any parallel. I am sorry, I cannot find any distinction between the multi-storeyed and other buildings having come up after 30th June, 1977. All unauthorised constructions after 30th June, 1977 will be demolished. Even the multi-storeyed buildings will have to be demolished if constructed unauthorisedly after 30th June, 1977.

28-10 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, December 5, 1977
Agrahayana 14, 1900 (Saka).*