

not incumbent on the part of the Government to wait for the introduction of the Bill. The Hon. Mover of the Bill himself made it abundantly clear when the Bill was moved that the Government was not bound to wait for bringing the Bill, and any assurance or any other comment by any other Member or by any other Minister I do not think will help us in putting an interpretation against the clear words of the section. We have to go to the clear wording of the section, and according to it the Government was not bound to wait till they got the views of the legislatures and it was open to them to bring forward the Bill at any time as it pleased them.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard, I believe, almost all kinds of views on this important question, and I must take time. I cannot immediately come out with what I have to say. I shall carefully go through the proceedings, refer to the authorities quoted and then give my ruling on this question.

Shri Kamath: Is the Minister not saying anything?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think he has to reply. One of the Ministers has already replied. It is no use taking up the time of the House. I have been saying that we are racing against time, and we have taken $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours over this when we are so much short of time that even in respect of Bills we are not allotting more time.

Shri Kamath: He seems eager to speak.

Mr. Speaker: No explanations are needed. The point, to my mind, is very simple. It ought not to have taken so much time at all. However, as it is an important point, I thought I must be patient and give a hearing to all friends who wanted to say something. So, as I said, I shall be able to give my ruling on Monday, the 12th. In case I come to the conclusion that this is not a substantially identical Bill, and therefore should be permitted, then as I have already made it clear to the House, all further stages

447 LSD.

of the Bill, including the introduction, the consideration stage, the clause by clause reading, and the third reading stage, will be put through immediately that day, because on the 14th we are taking up the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission for discussion, and I do not want that any time should be taken up from that discussion. After all, it is a technical point. The substantial point is the discussion on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission.

Shri Kamath: On a point of clarification. If the ruling goes in favour of the introduction of the Bill in the House, will other pending business be interrupted for the sake of this Bill?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot say that. If there is any pending business, it may go on, and then the rest will come. Or this Bill may be taken up first and intervened, and then the other business may go on.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): May I just ask you a question? Has any formal request been made to you by Government for the suspension of the rule so far?

Mr. Speaker: It is for Government to consider. At least I do not know what mind they have in this matter. But it is open to them to make the request any time.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I have your indulgence before you give your ruling? Has any request been made to you so far, that is, up to the moment?

Mr. Speaker: Not so far. But there are three or four days between now and the 12th. I do not know how they will make up their mind and how they will act; Government know best.

DELHI (CONTROL OF BUILDING
OPERATIONS) BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Rajkumari Amrit Kaur on the 7th

[Mr. Speaker]

December 1955, namely:

"That the Bill to provide for the control of building operations in Delhi, be taken into consideration."

The time allowed for general discussion was 3 hours. One hour and 27 minutes have already been availed of, and there is now a balance of one hour and 33 minutes. I would request hon. Members to be short and to the point, because the time available is short, and I find that there are a large number of Members who would like to speak on this.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Bairhat): After having heard the speech of the hon. Health Minister while moving the motion for consideration of this Bill, we have had an idea of how the Government's mind is working. And naturally, I think this House welcomes the assurance that she has given namely that the refugee buildings which have come up in the past, and which fall within the terms of the assurances given in this House will not be touched.

I feel that this Bill is more comprehensive and I hope it will deal with building and the planning of Delhi beyond controlling buildings that what have already come up, I hope it will really try to plan something, in a very positive manner, and not merely in a negative manner, and plan as to how the future Delhi will look, and how it will provide for its health. What has been needed by Delhi for a very long time is a positive building administration or body which has been demanded from time to time. There has been so much duplication so far that there has been no planning. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister herself has admitted that one of the biggest jobs of the Delhi Improvement Trust was the building of a master plan, which unfortunately has not come into being

up to date. It has been long delayed.

The affairs of planning of Delhi became so bad that in 1951, the Birla Committee was set up. That Committee has made a comprehensive report, in which there are many recommendations which are very good. I do not agree personally to some of them, but generally I would say that on the question of land policy and slum clearance, that Committee has made certain very good recommendations.

They have also made certain very good recommendations with regard to the very nature of the planning of buildings body which might come into existence.

Things did not improve even after that. Even today we do not know what is the attitude of Government regarding the recommendations of the Birla Committee. Actually, matters simmered up to such an extent that in September, 1954, there was a big debate in the Delhi Vidhan Sabha on the question of slum clearance. The question of the buildings and health of Delhi came up on that occasion, and Shri Brahm Prakash said that very soon a centralised authority or a high-powered body would be set up which would be responsible for this. One full year has passed since then.

In the meantime, we have had the Government Premises (Eviction) Amendment Bill, which was referred to a Select Committee. In that Select Committee again the entire matter was gone into. And yet we find that up to date we know nothing further as to the coming into existence of a centralised body which will be responsible for the building and planning of Delhi.

Then came this ordinance in October this year, when we were promised again that a similar authority to deal with planning and development of the urban area of Delhi will come into existence, which will replace the existing multiple authorities operating

in the field. As to when that authority will come into being, I am very doubtful.

Now, this Bill has been brought forward. As far as the hon. Minister's speech goes, it seems to be just of a negative nature something that is going to prevent haphazard growth of buildings whether they are of Government or of private individuals. After I went home yesterday, I again went through the provisions of the Bill, for I know that Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, and I think, all the Members of this House are anxious to see that we really have a Bill which will help in proper planning of Delhi. But I would like to state here that after having gone through the clauses, I do not find this Bill to be quite so simple as the hon. Minister tried to make out.

It is one thing for Rajkumari to have the feeling that she has given an assurance that this Bill will not be used for demolishing certain structures about which every body is anxious; but it is quite another when we come to the clauses, for everything will be interpreted according to the spirit of the law and the clauses that we formulate in the Bill. So, it is necessary for us to go into the very contents of this Bill.

Firstly, I shall take up the question of the authority that is proposed to be set up, namely the Delhi Development Provisional Authority. In this connection I would like to quote from what the Birla Committee have stated in regard to this matter. They have stated that there has been a multiplicity of Ministries and authorities who have been responsible for this, and there has been no single planning and controlling authority. In regard to the setting up of that authority, they make this very important observation, namely that the primary aim of city planning is social, that is, the convenience and utility of the largest number. And they add:

"Public opinion should be well represented on the authority through a non-official majority."

This is exactly what the proposed body is not going to be. The majority, or I should say, all the Members will be officials. Of course, I welcome Rajkumari Amrit Kaur's statement that she desires to have certain representatives of the Parliament or the Vidhan Sabha associated with the work of this authority. And I hope the House would welcome that assurance of hers. But I think it is also necessary to recognise that without the bringing in of more non-official support, we shall not be able to cut through the suspicions and the difficulties that have always lain in the way of the proper planning and development of Delhi. Therefore, my suggestion for the inclusion of some representatives of Parliament and the Delhi Vidhan Sabha should be accepted as far as possible, and this Delhi Development Provisional Authority should have as many representatives as possible of public opinion included in it.

Therefore, I feel also that the Chairman should be either elected by the body itself or it should be left to the Commissioner to select the person who, according to him, will be able to carry out the job which he will be called upon to do in the best manner.

Now, I come to another important part of the Bill—the part dealing with declaration of controlled area. This is very important. Clause 4 declares certain areas controlled areas because the Authority wants proper planning. Now, on paper it looks very good. But actually what have been the difficulties in the past? Actually, the Birla Committee has reported on it, and at many other places also we had seen....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): What is the date of that report?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: 1951. I suppose it was submitted just a few months before we came to Parliament. On para 3 of the report, they have given examples of the long time that has elapsed from the date of notifica-

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

tion to the date of actual taking up of these schemes for slum clearance and development. They even state that large areas have actually been frozen, and have not been built up. I need not waste the time of the House by quoting the actual way this has happened. Sometimes it has taken years: actually lands had been acquired and yet development has not started.

Now, the reasons why we object to this are: First, whilst a certain area becomes frozen, certain lands are notified of acquirement, actually when they are acquired, it is some 10 or 15 years after. During that period, prices have gone up. Poor people who actually used to live in undeveloped areas or even undeveloped areas in the outskirts of Delhi, have had taken away from them large plots of land. But when compensation has been given, according to the Compensation Act, they have been paid money according to the 1938 or 1939 rates in 1950/1951/1952. With the result, that they have really been put to go great inconvenience and to great loss. Poor people have suffered. I would not plead for the rich; if any portion of a rich man's land was taken over, if it was for a public purpose, and if it was actually used for the good of the community, certainly you could use article 31. We have amended that article. I would have nothing to say against it. But I have before me many many cases of villages round about here, where building societies, which have been set up by rich people, and the Delhi Improvement Trust—that is, private as well as public bodies—have been having these frozen areas; at the same time, they have not been allocating land for development. When they sell, they sell to make huge profits. That is why I feel that even in the case of the controlled areas, if those areas are not developed within a particular date, those areas should not be declared controlled areas and should not be frozen up.

Now, I come to what, I think, is the most important part of the Bill—clause

5. I shall take up each clause and show that this Bill is not only negative, that is it not only has the power of the negating building certain hazardous buildings, but that it has certain positive powers. In those positive powers, we want to see a specific policy being indicated whereby we try and avoid the mistakes of the past, so that we really put forward a proper slum clearance or proper town development plan which will be suitable and help forward the Second Plan where, the hon. Minister of Works, Housing and Supply says, we are bringing forward a big plan for development on housing. He says that the Second Five Year Plan is expected to spend about 120 crores of rupees, three times the provision made in the First Plan, for building up of towns and for housing—both industrial as well as low-income group housing. So I feel you have to take the positive aspect of the Bill and see to it that a proper policy is also implemented thereby.

For instance, let me take clause 5(a). Under this, the Authority will have to give directions as to the division of any site into plots for the erection of buildings and the manner in which such plots may be allotted to intending purchasers or lessees.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I realise that many Members want to speak. But unless I am able to give the entire idea, it will be very difficult.

Mr. Chairman: What can be done? Members from Delhi are more interested and they want to speak. Then the hon. Minister also must have time to reply.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We had allotted six hours for this Bill.

Mr. Chairman: That is there. But so far as the general consideration stage is concerned, only one hour and

33 minutes are left. We commenced at about 2-30 P.M.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know what is the total time allotted for general consideration?

Shri Gidwani (Thana): One hour was spent yesterday?

Mr. Chairman: The Speaker has already announced it. The time allotted for general discussion is three hours. Out of that, one hour and 27 minutes have already been taken. The balance is one hour and 33 minutes for the general consideration stage.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yesterday, when this Bill was moved for consideration, the Deputy-Speaker was pleased to say that he would allow half an hour to a speaker. Under that impression, I did not rise before. In order to develop his points, a Member should have at least half an hour.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Probably that decision was altered. When he left, he left me direction, before I took the Chair, that every Member should be allowed 15 to 20 minutes. That was the subsequent position.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: That was between the Deputy-Speaker and the Chairman. So far as the House is concerned, this was the understanding.

Mr. Chairman: We must assess the real position. We started at 2-30 P.M. We have got now one hour and 33 minutes. We have to allocate that time between some hon. Members and the hon. Minister.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I would request that this time schedule allotted for general discussion and clause by clause consideration might be revised by the House. Let there be at least 4 hours for general discussion, and then we can go through the other two stages in the next two hours. If the overall time schedule is adhered to, perhaps nobody will have any objection.

Mr. Chairman: That is right. There is no difficulty, if the overall time

schedule is adhered to. I find from the record that the hon. Deputy-Speaker had said that hon. Members will have 15 to 20 minutes.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Kindly read the previous decision.

Mr. Chairman: We are not so much concerned with that. The whole point is that the time schedule must be kept up. If hon. Members think that they can take one hour from the time allotted for clause by clause consideration, we shall have 2½ hours, out of which 20 minutes are already over. The balance I shall utilise as Members like. I shall give not more than 20 minutes. If more time is taken, fewer Members will be accommodated.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): Let us have four hours for general discussion, 1½ hours for clause by clause consideration and half an hour for the third reading.

Mr. Chairman: It comes to this that for clause-by-clause consideration the House shall get 1½ hours and for the third reading, half an hour.

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): Does that give me any time to reply?

Mr. Chairman: I wanted to ask the hon. Minister how much time she was likely to take, for reply to this discussion.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I think about 20 minutes.

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): May I take it that the next Bill is not likely to come up today?

Mr. Chairman: Probably not; but I cannot give an assurance.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: As I was saying, this Authority will have the power to direct the division of any site into plots for the erection of buildings and the manner in which such plots may be allotted to intending purchasers or lessees. Here again I feel that there should be some sort of specification as to who should be sold the land. Actually, in the past speculators have been able to take

[Shrimati Renu Chakravarty]

hold of land and that they have utilised it only for their own particular purposes. They have used it for profit-making; they have used it in many other ways. There have been very strong strictures made about it even in the report of the Birla Committee where they have said that a great many plots passed, in the first instance, into the hands of persons who are not genuinely interested in building and no restriction was placed at any time on the number of plots which one could buy and no step was taken to encourage the buyers of these plots to build houses.

Our main intention is the building of houses. We feel that we should see that the plots are given to people who are really interested in building and not to speculators. So, a provision which says that actually it should be given to those who want to build houses should also be introduced.

Then, there is the question of the development of townships and colonies. I can give you much material on that but there is no time. I feel that when we are giving powers and directions to an authority, we should see that the directions must be specific, that land must be given on a no profit no loss basis so that these townships and colonies are developed for housing the poor and the low income groups and do not become areas from which people can profit.

There is again the question of restrictions, the conditions subject to which such development may be undertaken. I think they are welcome to have some restrictions about the size etc. That again will come up in slum clearance in which we are all interested. There again we want one definite or specific clause introduced that wherever slum clearance is introduced, there must be alternative accommodation given and that alternative accommodation must be in keeping with the economic livelihood of the displaced so that they are not pushed away 10 or 12 miles and the centre of the city developed as a

centre for the rich and the poor sent to live outside the ken of the people of Delhi. Therefore, I mention these two important things that there should be alternative accommodation and in the clearing of slums we should go in for a planning, planning not for planning's sake but planning for the people and specially planning for the slum dwellers. This question of slum clearance and alternative accommodation must become one of the biggest items of the Second Five Year Plan building schemes, and we should be very clear about development that it should include alternative accommodation and that the tenements which are built must be within the capacity of these people to pay. If you build big houses, the people who are paying Rs. 2 and Re. 1/- for a room will be asked to pay Rs. 10 and Rs. 15 which they cannot just pay. Therefore subsidised tenements for workers and for slum dwellers must be introduced if we really want to have proper slum clearance and really good housing for the poor.

There is the question also of amenities. The authority will have the power to lay down the provision for the amenities of an area. But the fear is that when amenities are introduced, the question of betterment levies and betterment taxes are immediately raised. In the Ajmera Gate area to which we were taken in Delhi we were told that this area is going to be bettered. Very good. But, you see, immediately you are asked to pay a betterment tax which many of the poor people are not able to pay. These aspects have to be taken into consideration. That is why I feel that this Bill is not a negative Bill. This Bill is giving certain powers to the Authority which are necessary but those powers must be circumscribed by certain directions of policy which this House must dictate. What is the view about slum clearance, what is the view we shall take for the low income groups? All these I feel is very important.

Lastly there is the question of appeal when permissions are not given. There must be a right of appeal. In

the Bill there is no appeal after an appeal to the authority. Therefore, the Authority is the final one. I feel that it should not be so. There must be the courts to hear appeals.

With these words in this reading of the Bill, I want the House to consider it and to accept the amendments which we shall propose later.

Sardar Hukam Singh: So far as I am concerned, I feel that the scope of this Bill is a restricted one. We have discussed on the floor of this House the general housing policy of the Government; we have also discussed the activities of the Delhi Improvement Trust. Certainly, there is great room for criticism and we can make out a good case that the Government has not proceeded on lines on which it ought to have done. Of late, when the objective sought to be attained is a socialistic pattern of society, the methods that are being adopted and the ways that are being followed, I certainly feel, would not lead us to that goal. But, is it the general policy of the Government that we are to discuss here or is it the Improvement Trust whose activities and whose authorities we are criticising here.

So far, we are agreed, as I can judge from the speeches that were delivered yesterday and even today, that we all want that there should be a single authority which can control and guide the building operations in Delhi. My friend from Delhi, Shri Radha Raman, Shri Mohanlal Saksena and Shri Nandlal Sharma also said that there should be a single authority. There is a uniform demand for that. It has also been made out that at present there are many authorities such as the Town Planning Committee, the Delhi Development Committee, the Municipal Committee and the Improvement Trust. At least, there are four and all have those powers to sanction plans, to lay out schemes, to allow buildings to develop, and to lay down rules for amenities and other things that are to be provided

for. A complaint was made yesterday that there are sometimes very conflicting views of these different committees. The case of Lodi Colony is also very much in point. One committee allowed a certain plan but the other voiced exception to that. Further, there cannot be any two opinions about this that we must have a single authority in whom are vested all these powers to guide and regulate how these buildings should develop.

As my friend just now has argued, the question of slum clearance must be taken in hand very soon and effort should be made to remove the slums. We are all agreed and also support what she has said. But so far as that aim is concerned about having a single authority, we are all agreed and so does the Bill because it clearly lays down that our objective is to form a single authority to have all those powers. Then, where does the difference come? Complaints have been made that it ought to have come into existence by now and that it has taken a very long time and why should it be delayed even now for a year. The Bill says, so far as the Statement of Objects and Reasons is concerned, that it would be a complicated affair and would take us some time and that the Ordinance had to be passed to regulate those building operations. Therefore, the first objective of this Bill is to replace that Ordinance so that, for the time being, till that legislation is taken up and passed, we may have a single authority, which is our common objective and goal. I agree that it ought to be brought into existence very soon and it has been delayed. But, there is one amendment as well that the period should be shortened and Shri Mohanlal Saksena laid very great stress on that point. I would also appeal that it should be passed sooner. I agree with that. But the question is that there are Bills which are pending for the last three sessions, I say, such as the Motor Vehicles Act. It has taken two years; it was on the agenda; it is being put again and

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

again on the agenda but it is never brought in here and even now it has been pushed out of the list. So, my fears are that even if any legislation is brought, perhaps, it may not be possible for us to pass it. Therefore, there would be no harm in establishing this Authority and giving it a life of one year.

Then, the other points are, what powers should be vested in it and how that should be constituted. So far as these are concerned, there can be difference of opinion. I also appeal to the hon. Minister that she should take into consideration the inclusion of some other interests as well and, perhaps, selfishly, I would also ask that Members of Parliament should be associated with it.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): There is no selfishness about it; it is public interest. Each of us represents seven lakhs of people.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Members of Parliament should also be associated with this authority. They can also contribute something in certain spheres. (*Interruption*). We are elected people, and as my friend reminds me, about seven lakhs of people are represented by each one of us. Therefore, it should be considered whether that Authority can be enlarged to include other persons and, most of all, some Members of Parliament.

3 P.M.

Regarding the powers that should be given to this Authority, it has been argued just now by my sister that the Birla Committee has clearly laid down that large areas have been frozen and have not been developed. This is correct. I also join my sister in making that complaint. But my difficulty is that perhaps that authority may not be to blame for that; it is the Land Acquisition Act that is responsible for that. A notice is issued under section 4 perhaps, and certain years allowed to elapse and then a second notice is issued, several years afterwards under section 9 and the

property is acquired. The rate that is given or the price that is awarded is what prevailed at the time of the issue of notice under section 4. So there is a grievous complaint in this respect by all of us, but it is the Land Acquisition Act that requires to be amended. Perhaps it would be recollected that I brought forward a non-official Bill here for that purpose because that causes great damage and loss to the people and they lose their property many years after. A notice is issued under section 4 and then authorities sleep over it; after several years it is found that the property is taken away and then the price that is awarded is what prevailed when the first notice was issued. So, the public suffers and there is a great discontent about that. I would appeal to the hon. Minister to bring it to the notice of the Government that the whole set-up is to be changed, that it requires a radical change and that the Land Acquisition Act should be amended suitably. It is not the Improvement Trust, it is not the Delhi Municipal Committee that would assess the prices that are to be given or the compensation that is to be awarded. They only refer the question to the Land Acquisition Officer concerned and he is the authority that would assess the compensation that is to be given. Therefore, even if we ask the hon. Minister here to do something, perhaps it may not be possible unless that Act is changed. I would request the hon. Minister to look to that side and see that Government takes into consideration the urgent necessity of amending that Act.

There were many suggestions made yesterday and a reference was made to the Chairman of the Improvement Trust. Shri Mohanlal Saksena gave us very useful suggestions and said that it should not be the policy of the Government that the land should be sold to the highest bidder when our objective is a socialistic pattern of society. Is it not then our duty to provide every man with some land to build on? That should be our aim,

but that is not being done. I join my friend in saying that that is a very useful suggestion which ought to be carried out. I admit, however, that it is outside the sphere of this Bill and it could not be done by this body which is being created. It would not be the function of this body to take that into consideration or to change the housing policy of the Government; that would be for the Cabinet and the Government to do and we now bring it to the notice of the Government that they should pay urgent consideration to this fact also.

It was also said that this Authority should have standard plans with it and it should be able to supply to every man, who desires to build, every kind of plan which might suit him—and there might be different classes of those plans. It appeals to me also that the Authority should have these. I have learnt that the Improvement Trust has got those plans ready and it does supply to persons who wish to have a look at them. Whether they have it or not, it would be for them to know. If they have, it is welcome. If they have not, at least this Authority, which is going to be entrusted with the task of controlling these building operations, must have such types of plans with it. Although I have had no chance of building a house here, certain friends have told me that they have to pay 2 or 3 per cent. of the total cost of construction that is expected to be incurred simply for getting a plan. That is certainly a very big sum and it is wasted. People are not fond of it. Everyone is not anxious to have a peculiar house of his own pattern. So the people go to those architects and planners who have certain patterns and styles ready with them to sell. So, if this Authority is to have them prepared and make them available to every intending builder of a house, certainly it would be a very useful service to society and it would be doing its duty.

Then it was also made out that the Chairman of the Improvement Trust had gone to foreign countries. Shri

Mohanlal Saksena told us yesterday that he had studied his report and nothing had been done so far as that report was concerned. We were unaware of the recommendations he had made. Shri Mohanlal Saksena claimed the privilege of going through that report and I could not follow whether he had said that there were useful suggestions or not. But since then I have tried to get that report and I was able to get a copy of it. I have also gone through it. Really I agree with the complaints which Shri Saksena made. The Chairman also had made certain recommendations, that certain methods should be adopted, that it should not be the aim of the Government to auction the houses to the highest bidder. The first recommendation made is that the social housing should be the aim of national policy; we all agree. If that is the recommendation, I fail to understand why the Government should not implement it. It should be done as early as possible. If that involves the enactment of some legislation, it should be done as quickly as possible. The other recommendations also that I see before me are certainly worth considering and the Government should consider them. I do not know whether Government have taken care to see if these can be implemented soon or not. That, I admit, requires a radical change in our policy, but that has to be adopted quickly and no time should be wasted. The suggestions that are made should be taken up to fit in with the ultimate aim that we have got for bringing about a socialistic pattern of society.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: What about the Rs. 10,000 fine?

Sardar Hukam Singh: There are provisions here which are very strict and hard. It is provided that the magistrate is going to be vested with powers so that all rules, regulations, etc., that are there in our normal law will be overlooked. The magistrates are going to be vested with powers which perhaps have never been enjoyed by them. That looks to be queer to me. When I read that, my conscience certainly revolted. There might

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

be special authorities created, but why do you disturb the common law that we have got and disturb the powers that the magistrates have? There may be some cases perhaps where it might be desirable to give a stern punishment. But first of all, if somebody has not acted as was required of him in building his house, and if he has made a little departure when making an erection, that should not entitle a magistrate to impose on him a punishment of Rs. 10,000 as fine. If he persists, then the fine is Rs. 1,000 a day. That does not rather look that we are going towards the socialistic pattern of society or that we are proceeding to bring up every individual to that standard of equality. Perhaps it would be too hard.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): I rise to support this Bill belated though it is. I congratulate Rajkumariji for fulfilling the promise which she has given to us a few months ago. But with regard to the Bill itself, there are so many apprehensions that must be expressed; although the time at our disposal is very short I would like to bring to the notice of this House some of the salient features.

First of all, the title is "Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Bill". In my opinion there are enough of controlling bodies in Delhi—more bodies than necessary. No doubt there is one difference. These controls are now being exercised by the different bodies such as the Improvement Trust, New Delhi Municipal Committee, the Delhi Transport Authority, the Joint Water and Sewage Board authority, the Land Development Authority and so on. There are so many authorities which possess powers which are contradictory and conflicting. That has been the disease of Delhi. We have been suffering from this disease for the last so many years. We need not talk about that now.

Now at least after the achievement of Independence, we expect a better deal for Delhi. Unfortunately that

has not come yet. Eight years have passed; nothing has been done so far. One Five Year Plan is over; nothing has been done for the improvement of Delhi and its living conditions. There are slums; there are *katras* about 800 in number inhabited by more than a lakh of people without any amenity for human existence. For instance they have not got water pipes, no electric lights, no latrines, no arrangement for sanitation. These are the appalling conditions that obtain today in the city of Delhi which is one of the biggest capitals of the world.

If the purpose of this Bill is to bring up this city to a very high standard and make it one of the modern cities of the world, I think we need a very powerful and a very effective instrument. This instrument is being contemplated and this Bill seeks to bring in a single authority. But I feel instead of calling this "Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Bill" it would have been much better if the title had been "Delhi (Master Plan) Bill". As a matter of fact what is required today is to have a master plan. Let us know where we are. When that plan is ready we go stage by stage and we can fill in the colours when we like. But there is not even a master plan after eight years of independence existence. That is our complaint. What can we expect this body to do? It has got a very short life of two years. Perhaps nothing is going to come out of it. What is envisaged is an official authority. How can officials have imagination to develop a city? Of course they can carry out orders. We must have very efficient officials no doubt but they cannot simply take the initiative. For instance, the British Government used to say: we cannot do so many things; we cannot touch the question of caste system in India; we cannot touch the question of religion; we cannot even touch the slum in the cities because the people may kick up a row; we have not got the representative character in the administration. They were quite correct. But still they did so many things for their own

benefits. But we cannot plead that inability now. Why should we continue that old official system which is outmoded? Not only after Independence but after the Avadi Resolution for a socialistic pattern of society, how can we think of a body to be not only dominated by the officials but also to be presided over by an official? And that too for Delhi? It looks so ridiculous on the very face of it. I can understand it so far as the New Delhi is concerned. Let it be entirely in the hands of officials as it is now. But how can areas other than New Delhi tolerate such official ridden committees, controls, rules, suggestions and schemes? I am at a loss to understand this.

The first thing that has to be done is to conceive of a popular authority. A single authority is very essential because conflicting authorities have brought about these appalling conditions of Delhi city. You all know that so many promises have been made on the floor of this House by hon. Ministers including the Prime Minister that they would see that such and such thing did not happen. But they could not simply do it because the authority to do or not to do is vested in these small statutory bodies. If the Prime Minister says that such and such area should not be cleared, it goes against the law and the statutory authority has got a right to assert and say that that area must be cleared. That means that there is a great confusion—almost anarchy—due to such powers being vested in these authorities. Therefore, we can do very little by way of improvement. When we think of a single authority it must be entirely different from the executive atmosphere because we cannot think in terms of the old Improvement Trust. That has been condemned even by a capitalist like Birla. In his report, he has condemned the Delhi Improvement Trust and he has made some very useful suggestions which are never carried out.

The Chairman of that Trust was sent to Europe to study things. He is

about to retire perhaps. There is no meaning in sending an elderly man like him to foreign countries. Anyhow, he was sent and fortunately he has submitted some report also. But nothing is known about the recommendations and their implementation. It all points to one thing only, namely, the capital of India has been neglected—almost criminally neglected. We know the conditions under which the people in the slums and *katras* are living.

When the great dignitaries of other nations come, we take them round along the beautiful roads. That is good and sensible but if they were to see the real conditions, they will be shocked. Therefore, we should hurry up to improve things. But, how can we hurry up? That is the question. I have told in one of the Select Committees which was discussion the Government Premises (Eviction) Bill that we must take it up on a war footing. If we went to improve the conditions of Delhi we cannot do it with an official-ridden authority at all. So far as the powers of control are concerned there is enough already and I do not think this Bill is necessary. There is no anarchy in a matter of buildings at all today in Delhi. Of course, there is some, I know, instigated by the officials of the Improvement Trust and not otherwise. Only if there is a little vigilance no building, no brick can be put up at a place without proper sanction. But, they are very vigilant to see where they can exploit the situation and encourage corruption. I wonder how we are going to control that department with this official-ridden committee. I say it is impossible. Let us therefore think afresh.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It must be entirely scrapped.

Shri C. K. Nair: I say, the Improvement Trust must go. It already stands condemned from all sides. Again, I do not at all blame the officials. They are all due to the defects of the law and they cannot simply do anything. What they can do is to just

[Shri C. K. Nair]

close their eyes to the horrible corruption that is going on in the department. Therefore, what we have to do is a bit of new thinking.

I am afraid my time is coming to a close but still I would like to put forward a few suggestions. First of all the authority has to concentrate upon a Master Plan; everything else next. Controls are already there. For God's sake let honest officers be put to prosecute the existing controls—of course, we are going to get more controls by this Bill also. Therefore, so far as controls are concerned there is no difficulty. The real difficulty is to make a Master Plan. For a Master Plan they say that the experts will take 5 years to prepare. These are all old ideas. We must transgress those old fossils and try to bring a modern outlook into the problem that is facing us. Let us have a Master Plan even if it takes one year; we won't mind that. I think when an aerial survey is made this can be done even in six months. Let the imagination of non-officials be put in the Committee.

Secondly, the authority should have 2, 3 or even 4 types of building plans or even groups of plans for people of different income groups. The authority must get ready with them and whoever applies for it should be given sanction immediately with the necessary changes that are needed.

The third thing is that there must be a good amount of control over the house building companies that are working in Delhi today. Their standards are very low. Members like Shri Naval Prabhakar have expressed yesterday that these companies are deceiving or duping the people by camouflaging their reality with the great propaganda they make, posters, pictures and things like that. People are caught in their net due to this propaganda. After buying a plot they never care to improve the areas. Even if they improve it is not at all up to the standard. Therefore, their activities have to be controlled.

Then comes the real thing and that is my last proposal. The remedy that I am going to suggest does not lie with the Government. It is impossible for them to do it. Of course, they can control building operations but they cannot undertake building construction. They should give up the very idea of constructing new buildings. It should be left entirely to the co-operatives. That is the spirit of the new age.

An Hon. Member: Private sector.

Shri C. K. Nair: As I have already mentioned the house building companies are in the private sector. They should be controlled properly. They may be encouraged, I do not mind that but let not the standards fall. The real practical thing is that quick results can be achieved through the co-operatives. Let big plots be made available after proper development to be handed over to the co-operatives, of course on the condition that buildings should be put up within such and such a year. With proper development and proper control on the companies that can be done. That is the only way to improve the city of Delhi. If you think in terms of the old authority and organisations like the Improvement Trust we will not be able to break the ice that is very hard in Delhi today.

With these words I support the Bill with the hope that this is going to be one of the steps out of the so many other steps that we are going to take for the improvement of this city.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : यह जो बिल हमारे सामने आया है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि मैं इसकी ताईद करूँ या सारे को ही अपोज (विरोध) करूँ। इसमें एक बात मिलवर लाइनिंग (भय आशा) की है जिसके कि ऊपर मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं इसको सपोर्ट (समर्थन) करूँ, बाकी सारे का सारा इस बिल में सिवाय अंधेरखाते के और कोई चीज नहीं है। जिन मन्बर साहबान ने मेरे से पहले इस बह हिस्सा लिया है उन सब ने फरमाया

हमारी मिनिस्टर साहिबा ने भी फरमाया है कि अब तजवीज यह है कि एक मेट्रल एथारिटी (केन्द्रीय-प्राधिकारी) मुकर्रर को जाये, मैं इस तजवीज की बड़े जोर से नाईद करता हूँ और यही एक मिलवर लाइनिंग (भब्य आशा) है जो इस बिल के अन्दर है ।

इम मे पहले जब कि ऐश्वर्यसेज (आशवा-सन) हाउस में दिये गये, देहली इन्विजन बिल (देहली निष्कासन विधेयक) के वक्त, उस वक्त हजारों मकान और गवर्नमेंट के अन्दाजे के मूताबिक ५२२६ मकानात रेफ्यू-जीज (शरणार्थियों) के गिरा दिये गये । उस वक्त उनको यह तक्रलीफ होती थी कि हम कहां जाकर रोयें और कहां जाकर शिकायत करें । रात के ११ बजे पुलिस के स्कुवेइस (दल) आये और आकर मकान गिराने शुरू कर दिये, लोगों को इसके लिये कोई नोटिस देने की जरूरत नहीं है और लोगों को पकड़ कर बाहर ले जा कर सात मील पर जंगल में छोड़ दिया और वहां किसी के वास्ते छोलदारी थी तो किसी के वास्ते नहीं थी । बहुत मेहर-बानी की जो उनको ३० रुपये दे दिये गये । जनाबवाला, ऐसी सुरतों में बड़ी दिक्कत थी कि अपनी फरियाद लेकर कहां जायें । रिहैबिलिटेशन मिनिस्ट्री (पुनर्वास मंत्रालय) के पास जाते तो कहा जाता है कि दिल्ली स्टेट के पास जाओ और वहां जाने पर उनको कह दिया जाता कि यह राजकुमारी साहिबा के महकमे का मामला है; कहने का मतलब यह कि हमारे मुसीबतजदा लोग इधर से उधर भटकते फिरते थे और उनको यह नहीं पता लग पाता था कि कौन है जो इतनी बर्बादी लाया है और किस अथारिटी (प्राधिकारी) के पास उनको जाना चाहिये । शुक्र है कि आज इस बिल के जरिये एक मेट्रल एथारिटी बनती है जिसके कि पास लोग जा कर शिकायत कर सकेंगे । मुझे तो सिर्फ इतनी मिलवर लाइनिंग इस तमाम

बिल में नजर आती है, बाकी मैं इम बिल में कुछ नहीं देखता ।

जनाबवाला अगर आप पिछले आठ सालों को हिस्ट्री (इतिहास) देखें तो आप दंग रह जायेंगे । मुझे तो उसकी याद दिलाने शर्म आती है । मैंने इमी हाउस में एक मौके पर बतलाया था कि हरपूल बस्ती के मकानों की क्या हालत है और उन में इंसान किस तरह जिन्दगी बिता रहें हैं और कहा था कि अगर दुनिया में कहीं "हेल" है तो वह हरपूल-बस्ती में है वहां पर जाकर उस बस्ती का नक़शा देखें तो आप पायेंगे कि वहां पर कितना "कंजेशन" (घनी आबादी) है । हरपूल बस्ती के एक छोटे से मकान में इतना "कंजेशन" (घनी आबादी) है कि एक एक कमरे में नहीं बल्कि एक एक कमरे के हिस्से में कई कई कुनबे रहते हैं एक ही में बाप भी मां भी लड़का और उसका बौबो भी और लड़की और दामाद भी और कैसे मुमकिन है कि इतने "कंजेशन" में कोई भी इंसान अपनी तन्दुरुस्ती को कायम रख सके शर्म या हया को कायम रख सके । मौरिलिटी को कायम रख सके या कुछ भी कर सके । यह हालत थी और थी ही नहीं आज भी वह हालत दिल्ली में ज्यों को त्यों बरकरार है और जिसको देख कर कलेजा मुंह को आता है और ऐसी हैबतनाक है जिसे कोई शरस बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकता लेकिन पिछले ८ वर्ष से हम इस किस्से को यहां पर देखते आये हैं और एक इंस्टीट्यूशन (संस्था) जिसका कि नाम 'इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (सुधार न्यास) है वह इस दिल्ली का "कर्स" (शाप) है । दिल्ली के अन्दर आज जितनी खराबी होती है जितनी तबाही होती है, उसकी ज्यादातर जिम्मेदारी इस इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट पर है । मैं इस मौके पर उस करप्शन (भ्रष्टाचार) की तरफ तवज्जह नहीं दिलाना चाहता जो इसके अन्दर "रैमैंट" (फैली हुई) है और जिसका कि जिक्र कई

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

दिल्ली वाले मेम्बर साहबान ने किया है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो हालत इस इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट के अन्दर रेफ्यूजीज (शरणार्थियों) की है वह नागुपतादेह (अकथनीय) है। जिस वक्त हाउस में कमेटी मुक्ररर की गई, उस वक्त और हर मीके पर और हर मरहले पर इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट वालों ने यह चाहा कि रेफ्यूजीज को ऐश्वोरेशज (आशवासन) न दिये जायें, उनके साथ वायदे न किये जायें क्योंकि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट उस सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न (समाजवादी व्यवस्था) के सक्त मुखालिफ है और इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट "ग्रैव" (काल) से भी ज्यादा "प्रोडी" (लोलुप) है और वे लोग चाहते हैं कि लोगों से उनके मकान छीन लें, उनकी दीमत छीन लें और उनके पास कुछ न रहने दें और इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट वाले चाहते हैं कि यहां के रेफ्यूजीज के मकानात जबर्दस्ती गिरा दिये जाय और उस सिलसिले में हमको जो ऐश्वोरेशज मिले उन से सक्त नालां हैं और कई सौ मकान इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने गिरा दिये थे। कल हमारी राजकुमारी साहबा ने जिक्र किया इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने कोई मकान नहीं गिराया। मैं थानरेबल मिनिस्टर को कंट्राडिक्ट (खंडन) नहीं करना चाहता हूँ लेकिन अब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप १५ मेम्बर्स की कमेटी आफ ऐश्वोरेशज (आशवासन समिति) जिस को हमारे स्पीकर साहब ने मुक्ररर किया है, की रिपोर्ट को पढ तो आपको पता चलेगा कि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने दिल्ली में क्या क्या किया है। लेकिन सारी ट्रेजडी (खुद बात) यह है कि हमारी राजकुमारी साहबा को बाक्यों का और हमारी तकसीफों का इल्म नहीं है, वह कैसे हमको उनसे से नजात दिला सकते हैं। मैं उनकी खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐश्वोरेशज में

कहा गया था कि जो मकान लिये जायेंगे उन सबका मुआवजा दिया जायेगा। मैं राजकुमारी साहबा से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या एक शस्स को भी मुआवजा दिया गया? कहा गया था कि जो भी जमीन मकान के नीचे होगी उसके बदले में उसके मालिक को दूसरी जगह पर जो नो प्राफिट नो लास बेसिस (बिना लाभहानि के आधार) पर जमीन दी जायेगी। अब कहा जाता है कि १३५०४ मकानों में से ११६ को रेगुलराइज (नियमित) किया गया है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि इतने आदमियों को भी क्या आपने नो प्राफिट नो लासबेसिस पर जमीन दी है? उन ऐश्वोरेशज को प्रोसली इम्नोर (सबथा उपेक्षा) किया गया है और जो कुछ मैं कह रहा हूँ उस का सबत यह है कि जिन आदमियों को जमीनें दी गई उन से ३० रु० पर यार्ड (प्रति गज) के हिमाब से उनकी कीमत वसूल की गई। मैंने शिकायत की तो खुद गवर्नमेंट (सरकार) ने कहा कि इतनी ही कीमत न होनी चाहिये और अब इस सवाल पर गौर किया जा रहा है। चूंकि मेरे पास वक्त नहीं है इसलिये मैं ज्यादा डिटैल्स (विस्तार) में नहीं जना चाहता। अगर मुझे पांच सात घंटे दिये जायें तो मैं इस इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट को करतूतों को आप के सामने रखता कि उन्होंने कितने मजालिम गरीब आदमियों पर हाये हैं।

इसके बाद मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि रिफ्यूजीज के जो मकानात थे ऐश्वोरेशज कमेटी के सामने वादा किया गया था कि उनको कायम रखा जायेगा। चीफ कमिश्नर साहब तशरीफ लाये और हुकम दिया कि मकानात कायम रहेंगे, उन के आर्किटेक्ट (वास्तु शास्त्री) ने हुकम दिया कि वह मकान कायम रहेंगे लेकिन एक तरकीब

से टाउन कमेटी के पास कागजात भेज दिये गये ताकि वह रिपोर्ट का दे कि उन मकानों को कायम नहीं रखा जा सकता। असलियत यह है कि जो मकान रिफ्यूजी का होता है उस के नीचे जो जमीन है उससे इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट नीलाम करके आमदनी करना चाहता है। इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट वालों के दिमाग में यह नहीं आता कि इनसानियत का तकाजा है कि वह लोगों को मकान मुहैया करें और लोग अपने मकानों में रहें। नहीं मालूम कि उन के दिमाग में क्या समया हुआ है। शायद वह विलायत की सैर कर के आते हैं और हमारे मिनिस्टर साहबान को भी विलायत की हवा लग गई है जिस की वजह से उन के दिमाग में तरह तरह की बातें आया करती हैं। जहां पर रिफ्यूजीज के मकान थे उन मकानों को इस हाउस में दिये गये ऐंश्योरेन्सेज के बखिलाफ जमीन के बराबर कर दिया गया। ऐंश्योरेन्स कमेटी ने जब सारी चीजों को देख कर कहा कि चूकि दिये हुये ऐंश्योरेन्सेज को तोड़ा गया है इसलिये रिफ्यूजीज को बड़ी तकलीफ हुई है और सिफारिश की कि झंडेवाला में और पटेल नगर में उन रिफ्यूजीज को जगह दे दो जिन के मकान तोड़े गये हैं। पूरी जमीन नहीं दे सकते तो आधी जमीन दे दो। उन की हेसियत के मुताबिक उन से मुआबजा ले लो या नो प्राफिट नो लास बेसिस पर ही दे दो। लेकिन आज तक वह जमीन पड़ी हुई है, एक मकान की भी जमीन किसी रिफ्यूजी को नहीं दी गई। यह आप का मोशलिस्ट पैटर्न है जिस के ऊपर इतना जोर दिया जाता है। मैं कहां तक जनाब के रूबरू धिक्कारतें करूं। अगर मैं ए टु जेड (विस्तार में) उन को बतलाऊं तो दफ्तर

के दफ्तर भर जायेंगे, लेकिन मेरे पास वक्त नहीं है।

एक साल हुआ देहली एक्शन बिल (दिल्ली निष्कासन विधेयक) के मुताबिक एक कमेटी बनी थी, मैं उस का चेअरमैन था। हम ने लोगों की गवाहियां ले कर अफसरान से कहा कि आप मेहरबानी कर के हम को एक कंग्रिहेन्सिव प्लान (विस्तृत योजना) दें। उन जगहों के बारे में जहां पर गरीब आदमी स्लम्स (गंदी बस्तियों) में रहते हैं और जिन के लिये आप कहते हैं कि आप और कहीं ले जायेंगे, जो पेशेवर हैं उन को ऐसी जगहों पर जमीनें दी जायेंगी जहां पर कि वह अपनी रोजी कमा सकें, और इस के लिये हम बिल पास करेंगे। हम ने कहा कि आप ने जो ऐंश्योरेन्सेज हाउस में दिये हैं अगर आप उन को पूरा करेंगे तो हम आप को इस के लिये पावर्स (अधिकार) देंगे। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि हम ने सन् १९५१ में जो पावर्स गवर्नमेन्ट को दीं उनको ग्रीसली एंब्यूज (बुरी तरह गाली देना) किया गया। यह मेरी नहीं कमेटी आफ ऐंश्योरेन्सेज की राय है जिन्होंने कि गवाहियां ले कर इस का फैसला किया है। हमारे गैडगिल साहब ने उस वक्त कहा था कि जो सरकारी अफसर हैं वह अपनी पूरी कर्पसिटी (अधिकार) से और लेटर और स्पिरिट (शब्द और भाव के अनुसार) में अपने फरायज को अंजाम देंगे और किये गये वादों को पूरा करेंगे। मैं कई दफा हाउस में कह चुका हूं कि गैडगिल साहब जैसा हमदर्द मनुष्य मिलना मुश्किल है, लेकिन उन की सारी प्रामिजेज (वचनों) को खत्म कर दिया गया। कल जब राजकुमारी साहबा फरमा रहीं थीं कि हम किसी मकान को गिरायेंगे

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागवत]

नहीं तो मैंने जान बूझ कर कहा था कि हम मिनिस्टर्स की प्रामिजेज (बचनों) को और ऐश्वोरेन्सेज (आशवासनों) को ग्रैन आफ साल्ट (नमक के टुकड़े) के साथ लेते हैं क्योंकि एक नहीं कितने ही ऐश्वोरेन्सेज मिनिस्टरों ने दिये हैं लेकिन सब के सब अगर उन्होंने नहीं तो उन के अफसरान ने तोड़ डाले। हमारे सामने ऐश्वोरेन्सेज की इतनी बंधुरमती (अप्रमान) की गई है कि हम मिनिस्टरों के ऐश्वोरेन्सेज को अब उतनी अहमियत नहीं देते जितनी कि पहले देते थे। कल राजकुमारी साहबा ने फरमाया कि मकान नहीं गिराये जायेंगे, मैं उन की बात का यकीन करने को तैयार हूँ कि उन के हुकम से मकान नहीं गिराये जायेंगे, लेकिन यह मैं नहीं मान सकता कि मकान गिराये ही नहीं जायेंगे। इन ऐश्वोरेन्सेज मैं ज्यादा मजबूती नहीं होती है।

चुनाचे मैं जनाब की तबज्जह उन ऐम्बेन्डेन्ट्स (संशोधनों) की तरफ दिलाता हूँ जो मैंने मुव (प्रस्तुत) किये हैं। जैसा कि राजकुमारी साहबा फरमाती हैं कि वह हमें ऐश्वोरेन्स देती हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह उन को इस ऐक्ट में ही लिख दें ताकि उन के पीछे कानून की ताकत हो जायें। उस के बाद मैं उन को मान लूंगा। मैंने पिछले आठ दस वर्षों में देखा है कि सारे ही महकमों के मिनिस्टर्स सेक्रेटरीज (सचिवों) के इशारों पर चलते हैं। जहाँ तक इस बिल का सवाल है, यह छोटा सा बिल जो सवा वर्ष के लिये रखा गया है यह भी हम को खत्म कर सकता है। मैं आप से अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा कि श्री सी० के० नायर ने पूछा कि इस देश में यूटिलिटी (उपयोग) को देखा जाये या आरकीटेक्चरल टेस्ट को देखा जाये। यहाँ पर मकानों की कमी है, आप ने सवा वर्ष तक मकानों का बनना बन्द कर दिया है यह

कह कर कि हैपैजर्ड वे (अनियमित ढंग से) ये मकान बनाये जा रहे हैं। जब यह हालत है तो दो ही तरीके आप के पास हैं। या तो आप बने हुये मकानों को बने रहने दें या उन को गिरा दें। मुझे उम्मीद है कि आप उन मकानों को गिरायेंगे, इस के इलावा आप के पास कोई चारा नहीं है।

मैं आप की तबज्जह इस बिल की दफा ५ (एल) की तरफ दिखाना चाहता हूँ जिस में लिखा है :—

"any other matter which is necessary for the proper planning of any controlled area and for preventing buildings being erected haphazardly in such area."

डाइरेक्शनस में यह लिखा हुआ है। लेकिन यह तो एन्ड है। पढ़नी चीज जो कही है वह क्या है :

"any other matter which is necessary for the proper planning of any controlled area".

They can certainly order demolition of any building under this clause.

इस के बिना जनाब मुलाहजा फरमायें। दफा १७ में है

"The provisions of this Act shall have effect notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in any other law."

सारे पिछले लाज ही खत्म कर दिये, ऐश्वोरेन्सेज का तो कहना ही क्या है। मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे बहुत से लोग, खुसूमन इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट, इन ऐश्वोरेन्सेज का तोड़ कर फेंक देना चाहते हैं। मैं इसका मौका उन को नहीं देना चाहता। मैं राजकुमारी साहबा से अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर वह उन रिपयूजीज को बचाना चाहती हैं तो जाँ ऐम्बेन्डेन्ट्स मैं ने दिये हैं कि

ऐश्योरेन्सेज को कायम रक्खा जाय। उन को कबूल कर लें। पिछली दफा जब बिल पेश हुआ जिस को शायद श्री बरगोहेन साहब ने पेश किया था, तो उन्होंने उन को कायम रक्खा था। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब भी वह ऐश्योरेन्सेज कायम रहें, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि ऐश्योरेन्सेज को तोड़ते हुये न इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट को शर्म आती है न हया। न उन को रिलक्टेन्स (अनिच्छा) होता है न रिपेन्टेन्स (पश्चाताप)। जो ऐश्योरेन्स नहीं दिये जाते वह न दिये जायें, लेकिन जो दिये जाते हैं उन को इस तरह से तोड़ना और उन को बेहुरमती करना जायज नहीं है।

सरदार हुकम सिंह ने दस हजार रुपये जर्मनी का हवाला दिया। मैं पूछता हूँ कि उस जर्म के वास्ते जो इस बिल में रक्खा गया है हिन्दुस्तान में कहीं भी दस हजार रुपये का जर्मनी है? फिर इतने बड़े जर्मनी की सजा किम के देने के लिये है? मैं कहता हूँ कि बिल की दफा ३ देखिये। उस में कौन से लोग होंगे?

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittoor): Capitalist State.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब : मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि म्यूनिसिपल ऐक्ट जितने हैं वह कैसे हैं? पंजाब का म्यूनिसिपल ऐक्ट दिल्ली में लागू रहा है। उस में यानी ऐक्ट ३१ आफ ११ (act III of 1911) के नीचे दिया हुआ कोई हुकम अगर wanton, capricious and oppressive है तो कोर्ट उन को हटा सकता है। लेकिन अब हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने उस को भी हटा दिया। इस बिल को नातिक कर दिया, म्यूनिसिपल ला के बदले नातिक कर दिया। इस के सेक्रेटरी कौन होंगे? इस के सेक्रेटरी होंगे प्रेजिडेंट ग्राफ दि कस्टर्ड इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट (अपमानजनक सुधार न्यास के प्रधान)। उन की मेन्टलिटी है और

हमेगा मे रही है कि इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट के मातहत जितने भी गरीब आदमी हैं उन को मुमीबत में छोड़ दे। कहते हैं कि हम स्लम्स को हटा रहे हैं। वहां के रहने वाले गरीबों को जगह दी जाती है उस जगह में आठ दस मील दूर और फिर कहा जाता है कि हम स्लम्स (गंदी बस्तियां) हटा रहे हैं। आप स्लम्स को हटा रहे हैं लेकिन उन पर बसने वाले गरीबों को रिपयूजीज (शरणार्थी) बना रहे हैं। मैंने कहा कि प्लैन (नक्शा) लाओ, उस को मेम्बर साहबान देखेंगे और अगर प्लैन अच्छी होगी तो हम हुकूक देंगे। लेकिन आठ बरस से दिल्ली में प्लैन नहीं तैयार हो सका। प्लैन के नाम से मुझे एक वाक्या याद आ गया। जब हाउस के अन्दर ऐश्योरेन्सेज दिये गये तो हम ने दिल्ली स्टेट को हुकम दिलवाया कि सारे ऐश्योरेन्सेज को पूरा करें। उन्होंने वादा किया, इस इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट ने वादा किया और लोगों से कहा कि तुम नक्शे लाओ मकानों के। एक एक शल्ल ने ४०, ४० रुपये खर्च कर के अपने प्लैनस दिये। हजारों प्लान इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट को दिये गये और कहा गया कि हमारे प्लान पास करो लेकिन आप यह मुन कर हैरान होंगे कि आज तक पता नहीं कि उनका क्या बना है और कहाँ यह पड़े हुये हैं, शायद कहीं किसी लम्बर रूप या डस्ट बिन में पड़े हुये हैं या कहीं रद्दी की टोकरी में पड़े हुये हैं जो इश्योरेन्स (आस्वासन) दिये गये थे उन पर अमल नहीं किया गया। इसके बजाय जो कुछ हुआ है उसमें बहुत ज्यादा सक्ती की गई है। डैमेजिज (क्षति) वसूल करने के लिये एक एक मुहल्ले में मौ मौ आदमियों को जेल में भेजा गया है। इम कद्र जुल्म इन गरीबों आदमियों के ऊपर हुये हैं कि इन को ब्यान करने से मेरा क्लेजा मुंह की तरफ आता है और जब मैं उस चीज की तरफ देखता हूँ तो मुझे इतनी तकलीफ होती है कि जिस को मैं ध्यान नहीं कर सकता।

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागवंत]

इसके बाद जहाँ तक इस आधोरिटी के कम्पोजीशन प्राधिकार (व्यवस्था) का ताल्लुक है इस बिल के अन्दर ऐसी प्रावीजन (उपबंध) की गई है कि इसको कोई भी कबूल नहीं कर सकता। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या वजह है कि हाउस (सभा) हर कोई मँम्बर जब यह कह रहा है कि आफिशल एलिमेंट (सरकारी तत्व) को आप हटा दो और इसके अन्दर आप नान-आफिशल एलिमेंट (गैरसरकारी तत्व) को आने दो, तो आप इसको क्यों कबूल नहीं करते हैं। अगर मेरा बस चले तो मैं इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट को इसके पास फटकने न दूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह आधोरिटी ऐसे कांस्टीट्यूट (निर्माण) की जानी चाहिये कि इसके अन्दर नान-आफिशल एलिमेंट जरूर प्रिडामिनेट (बहु संख्यक) करे। इसकी वजह यह है कि हम देखते हैं कि पिछले आठ सालों में कोई खास काम दिल्ली की इम्प्रूवमेंट का नहीं हुआ। जो भी मकानात बने हैं वह बड़े बड़े आदमियों के लिये बने हैं और गरीबों के लिये कुछ नहीं किया गया है। यह लोग दुखी हैं लेकिन इन की तरफ कोई ध्यान दिया नहीं जा रहा है। जहाँ तक इस बाड़ी को कांस्टीट्यूट करने का सवाल है मैं नायर साहब से एभी करता हूँ कि यह इमेजिनेशन (कल्पना प्रधान) वाली बाड़ी (निकाय) होनी चाहिये, जो लोगों को प्लाट्स दे, जमीन को ठीक करके ठीक कीमत पर दे, नो-प्राफिट नो-लास बेसिस (बिना हानि-लाभ के आधार पर) पर दे। मैं देखता हूँ कि एक भी मकान किसी रिफ्यूजी को इस बेसिस पर नहीं दिया है और मैं समझता हूँ कि आगे भी नहीं दिया जायेगा। आज नाम तो लिया जाना है सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी (समाज की समाजवादी व्यवस्था) का लेकिन जो काम होता है वह इसके बिल्कुल मुसतलिफ। जब तक दिल्ली के अन्दर ज्यादा मकान

नहीं बनाये जाते, जब तक लोगों को प्लाट्स नहीं दिये जाते, जब तक सस्ती दरों पर उनको मसाला मकान बनाने के लिये नहीं दिया जाता, जब तक आप उनकी डिफिकल्टीज (कठिनाइयों) को महसूस नहीं करते तब तक मैं समझता हूँ आप अपने मकसद में कामयाब नहीं हो सकते। आपने सवा साल की बात कही है, मैं कहता हूँ कि आप १० बरस दे दीजिये, आप कामयाब नहीं हो सकते। आप उसी दिन कामयाब होंगे जिस दिन आप इसमें नान आफिशल एलिमेंट (गैर सरकारी तत्व) को प्रिडामिनेट (बहुसंख्य) होने देंगे और इसको एक बाड़ी आफ इमेजिनेटर्ज (कल्पना प्रधान निकाय) बनायेंगे। आप चाहते हैं कि दिल्ली को एक बहुत खूबसूरत शहर बनायें, यहाँ से कंजेशन (जन संकुलता) को दूर करें। लेकिन उसके लिये आप लोगों को चाहते हैं कि एक याँ सवा बरस तक वह बैठे रहे और फिर उनको फायदा होगा। वे लोग आपकी इस आकिटेक्चरल ब्यूटी (वास्तुकला सौंदर्य) को देखें, आपके इस एस्थेटिक टेस्ट (सौंदर्य अभिरुचि) को देखें या अपनी जरूरत को देखें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग कंजेशन में रह रहे हैं, कंमे भी मकानान में रहे हैं, वे बे आरामी से रह रहे हैं, लेकिन मकानों में रह तो रहे हैं। यहाँ पर आकिटेक्चरल ब्यूटी या एस्थेटिक टेस्ट की बात नहीं है, सवाल तो उनके लिये मकान मुहैया करना है, उनको प्लाट्स देना है और हर तरह से उनकी मदद करना है। यह सवाल तभी हल हो सकता है जब राइट टाइफ (ठीक ढंग) से इस बाड़ी को कांस्टीट्यूट (निर्मित) किया जायेगा। आप से मैं अज्ञ करना चाहता हूँ कि जो अभी राजकुमारी जी ने कहा कि कुछ मँम्बर पार्लियामेंट (संसद सदस्य) के ही और कुछ विधान सभा के हों यह कैसे हो सकता है और वह कहती हैं कि या तो दो मँम्बर यहाँ के ले लो या दो विधान सभा के ले लो, इससे

काम नहीं चलेगा और बात नहीं बनेगी। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप चीफ कमिश्नर (मुख्य आयुक्त) को न रखें, उनको आप रखिये, मैं उनकी मुखलिफत नहीं करता। आज जो चीफ कमिश्नर हैं वह निहायत हमदर्दी से मामलात को देखते हैं और रिफ्यू-जीज की तकलीफ को समझने की कोशिश करते हैं और उनको दूर करने की भी कोशिश करते हैं। लेकिन जो इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट है वह जो कुछ भी चीफ कमिश्नर साहब करते हैं उसको तोड़ने की कोशिश करता है। लेकिन जो अपसरों को आप रख रहे हैं इस से काम नहीं चलेगा। आज तक वह कुछ नहीं कर पाये हैं और आगे भी नहीं कर पायेंगे। आपको चाहिये कि आप ज्यादा तर मेम्बर पब्लिक (जनता) के रखें, पार्लियामेंट के कुछ मेम्बर इसमें लें और साथ ही विधान सभा के कुछ मेम्बर भी लें। इस बाड़ी का जो कम्पोजिशन (रचना) है वह ठोक होनी चाहिये। आप इसमें इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट का कोई अपसर न लें और जो आप उस के चेयरमैन (प्रधान) को सैक्रेटरी (सचिव) की हैसियत से ले रहे हैं, उसको तो आप हर्गिज न लें। इन अपसरों के दिमाग जिस हद तक बनने थे वह बन चुके हैं और वह आज तक कुछ नहीं कर पाये हैं। मैं किसी की परस्ने-लिटी (व्यक्तित्व) के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहता लेकिन मैं यह अर्ज जरूर करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि आगे से कुछ हो तो आपको जो सजेशन (सुझाव) इस हाउस में दिये गये हैं उनका खयाल रखना होगा और इस बाड़ी का कम्पोजिशन (रचना) ऐसा करना होगा जिस से कि लोगों का इस पर कानफिडेंस (विश्वास) हो और उनको इतमिनान हो सके।

इसके बाद अगर आप क्लाज ३ को देखें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि जो कुछ भी कर दिया जायगा और जो दूसरा बिल आयेगा उससे पहिले जो कुछ भी किया जा चुकेगा

वह पक्का हो जायेगा। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इतनी पावर नहीं होनी चाहिये बल्कि जो हमेशा हर एक कानून में दर्ज होता है कि अगर कोई आर्डर म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी (नगर-पालिका समिति) का या इस बाड़ी का अप्रेसिव हो, कैप्रिशस (व्यर्थ), वालटन हो गैर-कानूनी हो उस पर अमल नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं उस बिल के लफज देखता हूँ कि इसमें इतनी कमियाँ हैं, यह इतना इम्परफेक्ट (अपूर्ण) है, यह इतना मिसचीवस है कि मैं बयान नहीं कर सकता और यही वजह है कि मैंने इस बिल के बारे में तकरीबन २५ एम्बेडमेंट्स (संशोधन) का नोटिस (सूचना) देनी पड़ी है। बिल को तो मैं सपोर्ट (समर्थन) करता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक आथोरिटी (प्राधिकारी) हो लेकिन जो इसकी नॉनपेजंज (उपबन्ध) हैं और जो दूसरी चीजें हैं वह बहुत ही नातसल्लीबख्शा हैं।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (करनाल) :

बहुत असें से इस बात का जिक्र होता था कि एक डिवेलेपमेंट आथोरिटी (विकास प्राधिकारी) हो और हमारे दिलों में कुछ ऐसा सवाल हो गया था कि कोई भी तकलीफ हो हम यह समझने लग गये थे कि इस आथोरिटी के आने के बाद वह हल हो जायेगी। अगर घरों की कमी की बात है तो हम समझते थे कि इसके आने के बाद वह दूर हो जायेगी, अगर स्लम क्लीयरेंस (गंदी बस्तियां दूर करने) की बात है तो हम समझते थे कि वह इसके आने के बाद दूर हो जायेगी, अगर म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी (नगरपालिका समिति) और दूसरी म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी का आपस में कोऑर्डिनेशन (समन्वय) नहीं है तो हम समझते थे कि यह हो जायेगा अगर अनऑथोराइज्ड (अनियमित) मकान बनने की बात है तो वह खत्म हो जायेगा। इस तरह से बहुत बड़ी बड़ी उम्मीद हम को

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

इस अधोरिटी से थीं। आज इस बिल को देखकर मुझे बहुत मायूसी हुई है क्योंकि जो दिल्ली में घरों की कमी का किस्सा है यह एक ऐसा दर्दनाक किस्सा है कि अगर उसको हकूमत न करती तो बहुत अच्छा होता। यह तो ऐसा है जैसे किसी फफोले को छू देना। दिल्ली के अन्दर मकानों की जो कमी रही है वह इतनी ज्यादा रही है कि, सभापति महोदय, आपको यह सुनकर ताजुब होगा कि १९४३ से लेकर १९४७ तक मैं और मेरे बड़े भाई अलग अलग रहे क्योंकि हमारे पास इतना बड़ा एक मकान नहीं था जिसमें कि हम दोनों इकट्ठे रह सकते।

इसके बाद अलग अलग अधोरिटीज से हमारा ताल्लुक पड़ता है। इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट है, यह एक अधोरिटी है, फिर म्युनिसिपल कमेटी है और इसी तरह से दूसरी चीज हैं और मुझे तो ऐसा मालूम पड़ा कि किसी के पास कोई पावर (अधिकार) नहीं है और यही वजह है कि हर एक यह कहता है कि हम मुनासिब तौर पर काम नहीं कर सकते हैं। एक मिनिस्टरी (मंत्रालय) भी है जो इसके साथ डील करती है और वह है हाउसिंग मिनिस्टरी (आवास मंत्रालय)। जहाँ तक किराये का ताल्लुक है रेंट कंट्रोल ऐक्ट (किराया नियंत्रण अधिनियम) के मातहत, हाउसिंग मिनिस्टरी उसके साथ डील करती है। हम तो, सभापति महोदय, यह समझते थे कि कोई ऐसी अधोरिटी आयेंगी जो इन सब प्राब्लेम्ज (समस्याओं) के साथ डील करेगी। सिर्फ जगह खाली करवाना और बिल्डिज (मकानों) को कंट्रोल कर लेना यह दिल्ली के प्राब्लेम नहीं है। ऐसा देखने में आया है कि जब कोई जगह इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने खाली करवाई तो सवाल आया कि उन लोगों को जगह कहाँ दी जाये तो उनके पास पैसा नहीं था, कोई प्राविजन नहीं थी और मैं मानती हूँ कि उनकी अच्छी

निमत होने के बावजूद उनके पास कोई इंतजाम नहीं कि वह इन चीजों को देख सकते। जब मकान दिये गये, तो लोगों से पाच रुपये के बजाय पच्चीस रुपये किराया लिया गया। दो साल तक वे लोग वहाँ रहे और फिर किराया बारह रुपये किया गया। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे पास फाइनेंसिज (पूँजी) का इन्तजाम नहीं है, पैसा नहीं है।

मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस प्रकार की नैगेटिव एप्रोच (नकारात्मक दृष्टि) से यह काम नहीं हो सकता है। जरूरत इस बात की थी कि दिल्ली में एक ऐसी अधोरिटी (प्राधिकारी) कायम की जाती, जो मकानों की कमी, अन-अथाराइज्ड कस्ट-क्वांश (अनियमित भवन निर्माण) और ट्रांसपोर्ट (परिवहन) वगैरह सब मसलों पर गौर करती और उन्हें हल करने के लिये कदम उठाती। आज हालत यह है कि जिम जगह स्लम्ज क्लीयर (गंदी बस्ती) दूर की जाती हैं और मकान खाली कराये जाते हैं, वहाँ के लोगों को छः सात मील से नजदीक मकान नहीं मिल सकता है। जो लोग इन स्लम्ज में पिछले सौ साल से रह रहे हैं जिन्होंने कौड़े की तरह इन गन्दी नालियों में जिन्दगी बिताई है, उन स्लम्ज को क्लीयर करने का सवाल आने पर उन लोगों के लिये वहाँ कोई जगह नहीं है। उन को दिल्ली से सात आठ मील दूर फेंक दिया जाता है और इस तरह उन को पंद्रह, बीस, पच्चीस रुपये बस पर खर्च करने पड़ते हैं। जरूरत इस बात की थी—जैसा कि कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने ग्रॅमॅडमॅन्स (संशोधन) के द्वारा सुझाव दिया है—कि यहाँ पर एक अधोरिटी बनाई जाती, जिस का स्ट्रक्चर (रचना) नान-आफिशियल (गैर सरकारी) होता। मुझे यह नहीं कहना है कि हमारे आफिसर्ज में काबलियत या नेकनीयती नहीं है, लेकिन मुझे यह जरूर कहना है कि वे कुछ कर नहीं

सकते हैं। इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट से मेरफ़ बड़ा ताल्लुक रहता है और जो काम में वहां ले कर जाती हैं, वे सब हो जाते हैं, लेकिन इस के बावजूद हम को पता ही नहीं लगता कि हकूमत पटवारी करता है, इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (सुधारन्यास) का चेयरमैन (सभापति) करता है या सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट (केन्द्रीय सरकार) का सेक्रेटरी (सचिव) या मिनिस्टर (मंत्री) करता है। इस को लॉकेट (तलाश) करना बड़ा मुश्किल है। आफिसर्ज (पदाधिकारी) अपने नैक्स्ट आफिसर (समी-पस्थ पदाधिकारी) के खिलाफ कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं उनके लिए ऐसा करना बहुत मुश्किल होता है। अक्सर ऐसा होता है कि जब हम छोटी छोटी बातों से डील (निगम) करते हैं, तो आफिसर हम से कहते हैं कि यह बात गलत है, लेकिन आप इस को मिनिस्ट्री (मंत्रालय) से टेक-अप (सम्पर्क) कर नीजिये या नैक्स्ट आफिसर से कह दीजिये। अपने से ऊपर के आफिसर से कोई बात मनवाना उन के लिये बहुत मुश्किल होता है। मैं जानती हूँ कि हमारे बहुत से आफिसर्ज पढ़े-लिखे और काबिल हैं— हमारे बहुत से आफिसर्ज कई मिनिस्ट्रज से ज्यादा काबिल और पढ़े-लिखे हैं। न्यागी जी और आविदअली माहब कहते हैं कि वे बहुत कम पढ़े-लिखे हैं। लेकिन फर्क यह है कि पब्लिक का—जनता का अपने नुमायंदों पर भरोसा रहता है। पालिसी (नीति) के मामले पर हम उन से बहस कर सकते हैं, झगड़ा कर सकते हैं और गरीब आदमी को उन के दरवाजे पर ले जाते हैं। जो लोग अज्ञानता और गरीबी में फंसे हुये हैं, वे किस आफिसर का दरवाजा खटखटा सकते हैं? दिल्ली कांग्रेस कमेटी के लोग आफिसर्ज के दरवाजे पर चपरासी की तरह खड़े रहते थे, लेकिन हम को कोई नहीं पूछता था। यह तो डेमोक्रेसी (प्रजातंत्र) का सिद्धान्त है कि जिस व्यक्ति ने पालिसी के फंसले करने हैं, वह पब्लिक का नुमायंदा हो, नान-आफिशियल (गैर सरकारी)

हो और अगर किसी दूसरे नान-आफिशियल को नहीं लेना है, तो सेंट्रल (केन्द्र) या दिल्ली का मिनिस्टर (मंत्री) हो। वह उस पोजीशन (स्थिति) में हो कि वह ऊपर के आफिसर्ज और गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ फंसला कर सके और अगर जरूरत पड़े तो पोलिटिकल पार्टीज (गजनेतिक दलों) को एप्रोच (पहुँच) कर सके।

सभापति महोदय, मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि ग्रथारटी (प्राधिकारी) के पास बहुत पावरज (अधिकार) हों। जहां तक आर्डिनेंस (अध्यादेश) का ताल्लुक है, वह ठीक था, उस के जरिये आप किसी चीज को चार या छः महीने के लिये रोक लीजिये। लेकिन जिस वक्त आप कोई कानून बना रहे हैं, उस वक्त कोई ऐसी ग्रथारटी बनाने का कोई लाभ नहीं है, जिसकी कोई पावरज नहीं है और जो सिर्फ रोकने के लिये है। क्या मकानों के बारे में सिर्फ यही समस्या है कि अन-अथाराइज्ड स्ट्रक्चर बनने हैं? आखिर उन को कौन बनाता है? मैंने देखा है कि कई लोग इस प्रकार अन-अथाराइज्ड मकान बना कर फायदा उठाते हैं और बड़े बड़े मकान बना लेते हैं। आज आप दिल्ली की गलियों में गरीब आदमियों की अनगिनत झोपड़ियां देखेंगे, जो कि लगातार बनती जा रही हैं। उन लोगों के लिये रहने की कोई जगह नहीं है। छः महीने पहले दिल्ली हकूमन ने सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के पास एक आर्डिनेंस भेजा जिसका मकसद यह था कि जिन किरायादारों को मकानों से निकाला जा रहा है, उन के एविकशनज (निष्कासन) रोक दिये जायें। आज दिल्ली में पचास हजार से ज्यादा आदमी कानून के खिलाफ बैठे हुये हैं, जिन को मालिक मकान किसी भी समय निकाल सकते हैं। उन को रक्षा के लिये रेन्ट कंट्रोल एक्ट में एक छोटी सी अमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) की जरूरत है। दो तीन दिन हुये, मैंने एक सवाल के जवाब में सुना कि गवर्नमेंट इस प्रकार कोई कानून पास नहीं करना चाहती है या कोई आर्डिनेंस नहीं लाना चाहती है। उन में

[श्रीमती सुभदा जोशी]

से कई लोग कोर्ट के आर्डर (आदेशों) के खिलाफ़ मकानों में बैठे हुये हैं। उन के पास कोई और जगह नहीं है। वे स्वीटिंग (अनाधिकृत स्थान पर रहना) कर नहीं सकते हैं और मकान मिलते नहीं हैं। हम लोगों को उन आदिमियों को कहना पड़ता है, जिन को उठाने के लिये कोर्ट (न्यायालय) के आर्डर (आदेश) हो चुके हैं, कि अगर तुम जेल में जाने के लिये तैयार हो, तो बैठे रहो, हम तुम्हारे लिये कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं। आज दिल्ली में कोई भी डिपार्ट-मेंट ऐसा नहीं है जो कहे कि इन लोगों को प्राबलम्ज (समस्याओं) को हल करना हमारा काम है।

आज उन लोगों को मालिक-मकान निकाल सकते हैं। इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (सुधार-न्वास) अपनी जगह खाली करा सकता है। वे कहीं कोई स्ट्रक्चर (भवन) बना नहीं सकते हैं और वे कहीं जा भी नहीं सकते हैं। आप इन बातों का तो कोई इलाज न करें और ब्राकी चीजें कंट्रोल (नियंत्रित) कर दें, यह बात हमारी गमझ में नहीं आती है। जरूरत इस बात की है कि हमारे सामने एक कम्प्रिहेंसिव प्लान (विस्तृत योजना) आये। आप ने देखा होगा कि आज से कई साल पहले—१९५१ में— बिड़ला कमेटी ने कहा था कि यहां पर बेशुमार मकानों की जरूरत है—अगर मिडल क्लास (उच्च मध्य वर्ग) के लिये ६० हजार, मिडिल क्लास (मध्य वर्ग) के लिये भी ६० हजार, लोअर मिडिल क्लास (निम्न-मध्य वर्ग) के लिये १२० हजार, पूअर क्लास (दरिद्र वर्ग) के लिये १८० हजार और पूअररेस्ट क्लास (अत्यन्त दरिद्र वर्ग) के लिये भी १८० हजार मकान बनाने चाहियें। दिल्ली स्टेट गवर्नमेंट (दिल्ली राज्य सरकार) ने कहा है कि नैक्स्ट फ़ाइव इअर प्लान (आगामी पंचवर्षीय योजना) में ६० हजार मकान बनाने चाहिये। वे

मकान किन के लिये चाहियें ? मेरा कहना यह है कि जब तक आप इन लोगों के रहने का इन्तज़ाम नहीं करते, तब तक इस प्रकार के कंट्रोल से बचाये लाभ के हानि ही होगी। मैं चाहती हूँ कि मंत्री महोदया हमारी अमैंडमेंट्स (संशोधन) पर गौर करें और एक ऐसा कम्प्रिहेंसिव बिल (विस्तृत विधेयक) लायें, जिस में इन तमाम बातों को डील किया जाये। आज स्लम्ज को क्लीयर (गंदी बस्ती दूर) करने के बारे में हमारे सामने कोई पालिसी नहीं है। स्लम्ज को क्लीयर करने का मतलब तो यह है कि जो लोग उन गन्दी जगहों में रहते हैं, उनकी हालत सुधारी जाये और उनके लिये अच्छी रहने की जगह का इन्तज़ाम किया जाये। लेकिन इस बिल का तो यह मकसद नज़र आता है कि उन लोगों को अपनी आंखों से ओझल कर दिया जाये, कहीं छिपा दिया जाये, ताकि वह नज़र न आयें।

अजमेरी गेट का बहुत ज़िक्र हुआ है। वहां के लोग कैसे बैठे हुये हैं ? मैं यहां की कांग्रेस की प्रेज़िडेंट (प्रधान) हूँ, लेकिन मैं ने एक पब्लिक मीटिंग (जनता की बैठक) करके उन लोगों से कहा कि यहां से कोई भी नहीं उठेगा, हम सब जेल में जायेंगे। जब हुकूमत, मिनिस्ट्री (मंत्रालय) और आफ़िसर्स (पदाधिकारी) की तवज्जह उस प्राबलम की तरफ़ दिलाई गई, तो सब ने माना कि उन लोगों को उठाना नहीं चाहिये। लेकिन अगर वे इस तरह से एक दिन हुकम मानने से इन्कार न कर देते, तो वे कहाँ जाते ? अगर हाउस (सभा) के मेम्बर्स (सदस्य) जा कर उन लोगों को देखें, तो वे तज्जुब करेंगे।

4 P.M.

यह निहायत ज़रूरी है कि इस बारे में हमारे पास एक कम्प्रिहेंसिव स्कीम (विस्तृत

योजना) हो। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि स्लम-क्लीयरेंस का मतलब यह हरगिज नहीं है कि वह जगह इम्फ्रूव कर के दूसरों को दे दि जाये। उस का मतलब तो यह है कि जो लोग वहाँ बैठे हैं, उन्हीं के लिये उसी कास्ट (मूल्य) पर—उसी कीमत पर—मकान बनाये जायें। अगर एक—मंजिला मकान नहीं तो छ—मंजिला मकान बनाये जायें, लेकिन उन लोगों को शहर में ही रहने दिया जाये। अगर किसी के पास फ्लैट (निधि) या ज़मीन नहीं है, तो उस को शहर के बाहर जाना पड़ता है। मेरी शिकायत यह है कि कॉन्स्टीच्यूशन (संविधान) के अमेंडमेंट का दिल्ली के लिये फ़ायदा उठान का कोई नक्शा हमारे सामने नहीं है। शहर के बीच में जो जमीन है उनका एक्वायर (अर्जन) करके स्लम क्लियरेंस किया जा सकता है और वहाँ के रहने वालों को दस दस मील बाहर भेजने की ज़रूरत नहीं है। तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि एक कम्प्रीहेंसिव स्कीम बनायी जाये, उसमें हमारी पालिसी (नीति) हो, उसमें हमारे नान-आफिशियल्स (गैर सरकारी) हों, उसका नान-आफिशियल चैयरमैन (गैर-सरकारी सभापति) हो, और उसमें हमारे पास, हमारे डिस्पोजल पर रुपया पैसा हो। उस आथॉरिटी (प्राधिकारी) को सिर्फ निकालने का ही और कंट्रोल करने का ही अस्तियार न हो बल्कि उसको मकान बनाने की भी आथॉरिटी हो। जो इस तरह के स्ट्रक्चर (भवन) बन रहे हैं, कहा जाता है उनको लोग लालच के कारण बना लेते हैं। हमारे यहां कायदा है कि जो नई बिल्डिंग बनायी जायेगी उस पर रेंट कंट्रोल (किराया नियंत्रण) नहीं होगा। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि लोग अपने पुराने किरायेदारों को निकाल कर मकान में थोड़ी सी तबदीली करवा लेते हैं और कहते हैं कि यह नई बिल्डिंग (भवन) है। इन सब बातों के देखकर हम लोग चाहते हैं कि कोई कम्प्रीहेंसिव स्कीम आवे और

इस तरह से पीसमील कानून (टुकड़ों में विधि) न पेश किये जायें। ये जो टुकड़े टुकड़े करके बिल पेश किये जाते हैं इनका नतीजा यह होता है कि उनमें सारी चीज नहीं होतीं। पहला बिल आता है उसमें कहा जाता है कि इसमें यह पावर (अधिकार) नहीं है। दूसरा आता है उसमें भी कहा जाता है कि यह पावर नहीं है। हो सकता है कि कोई तीसरा बिल भी आ जाये और उसमें भी कुछ पावर न हो। हम जानना चाहते हैं कि जो ग्रसली प्राबलम्स (समस्याये) हैं उनको हल करने के लिये कौन सा बिल आने वाला है। इसलिये मेरी दरखास्त है कि आपने जो आइनेन्स (अध्यादेश) पास किया है उसको तो रखिये लेकिन इसी बीच में एक कम्प्रीहेंसिव स्कीम लाइये जिससे कि दिल्ली के प्राबलम हल हो सकें। हम समझते थे कि इस बिल से हमारे जो वेसिक प्राबलम्स (मूल समस्यायें) हैं वह हल हो जायेंगे, लेकिन इसमें ऐसी कोई चीज नजर नहीं आती। इसमें तो सिर्फ एक रोक देने की पावर है। इसमें यह भी दिया गया है कि प्लान किया जाये, लेकिन यह नहीं दिया गया कि अगर कोई कोलोनाइज़र (बस्ती बसाने वाला) ठीक काम नहीं करेगा तो उसको कोई ठीक करेगा या नहीं और अगर कोई ठीक नहीं करेगा तो क्या जो लोग वहाँ बैठे हैं उनको वहाँ मकान बनाने की इजाजत मिलेगी या नहीं। ये तमाम चीजें इस बिल में होनी चाहिये।

एश्योरेंसेज (आश्वासनों) के लिये मुझको यह कहना है कि एश्योरेंसेज ठीक हैं और उनकी कीमत है। लेकिन जो बिल लाया गया है, यह ज़रूरी है कि उसमें वे चीजें हों जिन के बारे में कि एश्योरेंसेज दिये गये हैं। एक चीज को बार बार कहना और उसके लिए बार बार एश्योरेंसेज देने के क्या मानी हैं? एश्योरेंस तो उस बात के लिये दिया जाना चाहिये जो कि

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

पालिसी मैटर (नीति का विषय) हो और वक्त की कमी की वजह से बिल में न लाया जा सका हो, या कोई बात अचानक पैदा हो जाये और बिल में न लायी जा सके, उसके लिये एम्प्लॉयर्स दिया जा सकता है। लेकिन जो चीज बार बार सामने आती है उसको तो कानून में लाना ही चाहिये। इस कानून में हमारी पालिसी हीनी चाहिये, इसमें पैसे का इन्तिजाम होना चाहिये। इसमें मकानों के किराये का इन्तिजाम होना चाहिये, इस बात का इन्तिजाम होना चाहिये कि जिन लोगों को हटाया जाये उनको कितनी दूर ले जाया जाये, उनके लिये ट्रांसपोर्ट (परिवहन) का इन्तिजाम होना चाहिये। इसमें यह होना चाहिये कि कितने लोगों को उन जगहों पर बसाया जायेगा जिनको स्लम क्लियरेंस करते वक्त हटाया गया है। तो ये तमाम चीजें इस बिल में पहले से होनी चाहिये थीं। हम इस तरह का बुडन स्ट्रक्चर (लकड़ी के भवन) नहीं चाहते।

सभापति महोदय, आप से मैं एक मामला बयान करना चाहती हूँ कि जिसको सुनकर आप हैरान होंगे। मुझे तो इतने साल यहाँ आये हो गये, पर मैं किसी महकमे के बारे में नहीं बोलती और कभी कुछ नहीं कहती। लेकिन आप सुन कर हैरान होंगे कि यह इस तरह का ढांचा है जो कि कुछ अच्छा काम नहीं कर सकता। हमारे यहाँ इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट की जमीन पर कुछ मजदूर रहते थे। उनमें ठेकेदार उस जमीन का १५ रुपया महीना किराया लेता था। वह मामला आठ साल तक चला और उसके बाद यह फैसला हुआ कि उस जमीन का किराया पांच आना महीना होगा। यह सिर्फ छोटा सा सवाल था। एक ठेकेदार इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट को तीन आना महीना देकर उन लोगों से उसी जमीन का १५ रुपया महीना किराया लेता था।

मवाल सिर्फ यह था कि वे मजदूर ट्रस्ट के भीधे किरायेदार बना दिये जायें। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस स्ट्रक्चर में ऐसे छोटे छोटे मामलों को हल करने में इतना इतना समय लग जाता है। हम आशा करते थे कि कोई ऐसी आथारिटी (प्राधिकारी) होगी जिससे हमारी सब तकलीफें दूर हो जायेंगी लेकिन उसके बजाये यह बिल लाया गया है। स्वराज्य मिलने से पहले हम मोचते थे कि जब हम आजाद होंगे तो हमारे मारे कष्ट दूर हो जायेंगे। स्वराज्य के पहले अगर पड़ाई नहीं होती थी तो हम अंग्रेजों की शिकायत करते थे, अगर बीमारी होती थी तो अंग्रेजों की शिकायत करते थे, अगर गरीबी थी तो उसके लिये अंग्रेजों की शिकायत करते थे, और सोचते थे कि आजाद होने पर हमारी सब तकलीफें दूर हो जायेंगी। इसी तरह से हम मोचते थे कि जब यह आथारिटी बनेगी तो हमारे मारे प्राबलम हल हो जायेंगे। पर, मैं समझती हूँ कि इस तरह की आथारिटी में जो कि बनायी जा रही है यह मामले हल नहीं होंगे, बल्कि जो इसको कंट्रोल के अन्तिधारण दिये जा रहे हैं इनसे तो उन मामलों का हल और भी दूर हो जायेगा। मैं आर्डिनेन्स के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, लेकिन उसके बाद यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि इस तरह का बिल लाया जाये, बल्कि ऐसा बिल लाना चाहिये जिसमें इन सब चीजों का हल करने का इन्तिजाम हो और हम दिल्ली वालों को उम्मीद दिला सके और उनसे कह सकें कि अब दिल्ली का भाग्य खुलने वाला है। पर इस बिल से तो मुझे सल्ल मायूसी हुई है और मुझे इस बिल को देख कर अफसोस होता है।

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury (Nabad-wip): It is a very laudable effort that this Bill has been brought because we all feel that an actual comprehensive committee is needed. Everyone knows that in all towns, speaking for Delhi or Calcutta, what the municipa-

lities, corporations, improvement trusts etc.; are up to. They have never really been the godfathers or the fairy godmothers of any town. So, when we see that a Bill like this is being brought to create a central authority which will control all these bodies, it is a very good thing. But I am surprised to see that this central authority seems to consist of the cream of all these institutions. There is the Ministry of Health, of course. That is welcome. There is the Delhi State Government. That is also I suppose quite all right. But there is the Delhi Municipal Committee's President; then there is the Chairman of the Improvement Trust—all these societies have not had a very good name for themselves. Everybody knows of the harassment that the public has had through many of these societies. I, for instance, know myself that in Calcutta the corruption and bribery that goes on in many of these societies is really reprehensible. Yet this committee contains no lawyer who can look into these malpractices. Unless you have some lawyer who is able to detect these things, how can a body like this work?

In Calcutta, I can give the example of a case in which the person has not been able to get a plan sanctioned at all for over a year, because refuses to pay a bribe, and hence the sanction has been held up. As my hon. friend Shri Gandhi said the other day there are some types of criminals who are "sporting criminals" who leave something behind them with which to catch them, but the people who take bribes and indulge in corruption are like thin air. They leave nothing behind. You cannot catch them. They also have very clever lawyers to defend them.

There is a news item in today's paper that a corruption case has failed. Now, a corruption case fails because the lawyer has been able to get the man out of it. But, may be he was not guilty. I do not know.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The case may be false.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: It may be false, but still I mean we know what lawyers can do.

Sardar Hukam Singh: If the guilty escapes, hang the lawyer.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: Lawyers can do anything. It is without prejudice, because where would we be without lawyers!

In connection with slum clearance. I would like to mention three or four points. One is that assurances given to the refugees in the discussion of the Delhi Premises Eviction (Amendment) Bill of 1950 should be fully fulfilled. Secondly, the occupants of any building that is demolished should be given alternative accommodation. That is a thing that we must consider with all earnestness, because when you drive people out of premises, you must give them some place to stay. I have seen these evictions happen in towns myself, and the horrible plight of people when they are just told that they have to get out because it has been acquired by Government, and it is going to be improved. But improved for whom?—not for the poor people who were living there in utter misery. They are going to be thrown into still greater misery.

Thirdly, the developed areas that are improved into townships and colonies, the land there should be sold at reasonable rates. Also, when slums are cleared, first the buildings should be made to accommodate the people who had been cleared and the tenements should be made available for the people who were occupying the area, so that the real basis of slum clearance is served, because then you use the buildings for those for whom you cleared the place. We want not only gardens and developed premises round a town, but we want the people really to benefit.

Another point I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister is this. In clause 5 it is said that the Authority has the power to issue a notification in respect of "the architectural features of the elevation or fontage of any building to be erected on any site". But funnily enough there is no

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury]

architect in that body, who is going to look to the architectural features. Secondly, as a woman, I hope, the hon. Minister will consider the question of extending the period of notice under clause 8. We find in clause 8 that the notice given for entry into any premises in not less than twenty-four hours. Even twenty-four hours' notice may mean a great deal of hardship. There may be an ill person, or there may be a new-born baby in the house. Therefore, I would submit that this clause should be modified so that the minimum period of twenty-four hours is considerably extended.

In this connection, I would like to bring to the notice of the House the position in Sweden, where they have a mixed economy like ours, and where a certain amount of private enterprise is allowed, and Government enterprise also works along with it. Private enterprise is not bad, but surely there should be some control over the landlords who build houses for rent; the rent control should be enforced rigidly, because rent is a racket in India; and only the low income groups and the middle class families know what an amount of time they have to spend sometimes in getting a house, and what amounts are extracted from them.

May I cite the instance of Sweden, which may also be possible in India, if only the hon. Minister would approve of it? In Sweden, a certain amount of Government subsidy is paid to each family when it is housed. A family with three children gets a reduction of 30 per cent., a family with four children gets a reduction of 40 per cent., a family with five children gets a reduction of 50 per cent, and a family of six, seven and eight children gets a reduction of 60 per cent, 70 per cent and so on. Till the Hon. Minister's family planning scheme goes into full swing, I think Government could subsidise the families in India on those lines, when they build the tenements and allot them to these

people, for families of six, seven and eight children do exist in India.

[SARDAR HUKAM SINGH in the Chair]

Therefore, some such subsidies should be given when they are accommodated.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareli Distt.—East): The hon. Member to your right has got ten children.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: Then, he should get cent per cent reduction.

I welcome this Bill as it is the first step towards cleaning up our slums in cities. At the same time, I earnestly hope that Delhi, the capital of India will be beautified, will be made better and will be made more healthy, but not at the expense of some of the poorer people for Delhi and India, belong to them also!

Shri Raghavachari: I am not a resident of Delhi....

An Hon. Member: Yet, you are in sympathy with us.

Shri Raghavachari:...except for the last few years. I find that this Bill is nothing peculiar to Delhi. It is simply a municipal legislation, with which most of us in the south are familiar, for we have in our parts the Town Planning Act which extends to all municipalities, and which contains many of the provisions which are to be found in this Bill. We have seen the Town Planning Act and the municipal administration with all these powers in action.

What we find is that invariably a number of subordinates come in, people who can deal with plans, permits, permissions, constructions and so on. When there are half a dozen departments like this, invariably it happens that every stage is a block, and the papers do not move up. In view of this kind of experience, we have provided in our Acts that if the licence that is asked for is not given within a particular time-limit, then the li-

cence is supposed to have been granted, and the man can go on with the construction. But in this Bill there is no such provision at all. I, therefore, feel that it will take an unduly long time to go through the different stages, and the powers sought to be taken under this Bill will simply block all progress. That is what is bound to happen. I would not like to repeat what my other hon. friends have stated, about such matters as palms and greasing and so on. All these things are bound to occur in matters of this kind.

There is one thing that this Bill aims at accomplishing and that is this. We have been seeing almost everywhere in Delhi all kinds of housing colonies rising up. In the buses, in the platforms and in the newspapers, we are seeing advertisements almost every day, such as 'selling on attractive terms' and things like that. Surely to that extent, there is need for a controlling body, and that is quite welcome.

But the point is that you would make Delhi a beautiful place; by trying to prevent further nuisance, possibly you can achieve something. But is there any power in this Bill under which you can undo the dirt, the nuisance, the slums which are to be found at present? I have not found any such power at all in this Bill. Of course, if that were there, then surely the volume of opposition would have been much more. Nevertheless, I am concerned here with the provisions of this Bill; I have examined them carefully, but I do not find anywhere any right to pull down or demolish any slum or any irregular structures. These things are an eye-sore; these are the plague spots in Delhi, and therefore, they ought not to be allowed to exist or continue. But I find that there is no power given to do away with them. If there was provision for that power here, then the same general difficulties that we have been hearing would have been pointed out, and the volume of opposition also would have been greater, as I already observed.

I was surprised to find one particular provision in clause 19. Sub-clause (1) of that clause reads:

"The Authority, with the previous approval of the Central Government, may, by notification in the Official Gazette, make regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act."

So, for all the purposes of this Act, the Authority has been given the power to make the rules. But a further proviso has been added that:

"...the Central Government may make the first regulations under this section..."

So far, it is all right, for one is expected to hope that the Central Government would make decent or sensible rules. But we find that this precaution is nullified completely by the latter portion of the proviso namely:

"...and any regulation so made may be altered or rescinded by the Authority in exercise of the powers conferred by this section."

If the Authority can alter the rules, then why should the Central Government take upon themselves the botheration of making the first rules at all? I am really unable to understand why this further proviso has been put in namely that the Authority can alter or rescind the rules made by the Central Government. Surely, if they feel called upon to make any change, then they must do with the permission of Government. Otherwise, what will happen is that whatever you may do today will be nullified by them tomorrow.

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): Which clause does the hon. Member refer to?

Shri Raghavachari: I am referring to clause 19. The complaint that is being made by our friends who have very personal and intimate knowledge of the affairs in Delhi is that all these departments are now joined and put into one Authority. Each Member has his own catalogue of

[Shri Raghavachari]

complaints about each one of them. But we find that all of them have been combined here. We have read in our books:

एकैकमप्यनर्थीच कम यत्र चतुष्टयं

If each by itself is enough to bring about *anartha* or damage and delusion, you can understand what the consequences will be if all the four join together. Each one of the authorities has a series of complaints against it. Now, all of them are going to be combined into one.

Mr. Chairman: Would they not neutralise each other?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): Provided they are conflicting.

Shri Raghavachari: When good and bad come together, there is some hope of neutralisation. But when bad persons join together, things become worse generally. Of course, I am not saying that things would happen in that way, but my fear is that when people with intimate knowledge complain against each one of these departments, things may become worse if they are joined together.

That is why I specifically referred to clause 19 under which you are giving power to the Authority to set at nought all the rules that you make. Today you may make some rules; tomorrow morning, the Authority rescinds them. The third day, the Government have no power. That is one thing which strikes me as I read this Bill. Some friends referred to many of the assurances given—what it would do. But this Bill as you yourself submitted when you had an opportunity to speak, is a restricted affair. No doubt, the exploitation by certain interests which are making plenty of money by selling away in this colony and that colony will to a certain extent be controlled. That is something. But there are very many other things. I would make one suggestion. The whole of Delhi—there is no provision here to that effect—the whole of Greater Delhi must be

notified and there must be certain plans drawn up, detailing which road will go which way and so on. There must be a picture. If a road abuts a particular place, the owners of that place may be called upon, under the rules, to submit their proposals. Then you will approve those proposals. In fact, in town planning committees and municipalities, we do that. Any private land, even agricultural land—in the vicinity are brought in. There will be a bigger plan, saying this road will continue in this way and so on. Otherwise, what happens is this. When we went to Kashmere Gate, we found slums. Such a state of affairs will arise here also.

I also saw in this Bill certain inappropriate use of words in clause 5—site, land, plots and so on. Any number of buildings may be built. They are only concerned with the artistic appearance from outside. How it looks inside, what he builds inside—on that there is absolutely nothing said here. A man may build rooms of 4' by 3'.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: This shall not apply to any internal construction.

Shri Raghavachari: Exactly. That is what I have been stressing. The man might build rooms of 4' by 3' size. Poor people, who have no accommodation, go in and stay there. We know under the Municipality laws, only one residential house is allowed to be built; that is at the time of obtaining permission. After that, every room is made into a residential house. Have you got any power to prevent it? No. You have no control on anything he does inside the building by way of construction. In this way all kinds of small rooms, partitions and slums can be found in each building. No provision to control it is to be found here. Human nature being what it is, when there is no accommodation, when there is no place, it is overcome in this way. The best thing would be to see that a large extent of land is acquired, plots are laid out and they are sold

cheaply. There should be improved communications. Merely passing laws like this will only prevent the progress of house-building activity in Delhi. I am sure many of those people who are now adventurously building will be stopped by the provisions of this Bill, and no more progress will be made, and crowding and overcrowding will continue and people will be in a worse position than they are today. Therefore, the real solution to the problem lies in the Government acquiring the land, making more provision for colonies available cheaply. You must have an overall plan for the whole of Delhi and then you can try some beautification of these towns, rather than simply feeling satisfied that you have some legislation.

Last year we passed the Food Adulteration Act. Are there any prosecutions? Has adulteration stopped? It is going on as merrily as before. The Municipalities and the States have the power. But nothing has happened. We can say, 'Well, we have passed the Food Adulteration Act and India has got this and that'. But adulteration goes on. Similarly, this law will be passed and congestion will still go on, accumulation and crowding and slums will go on. I wish, therefore, that the Government give more attention to an overall picture and then make a plan and make provision for plots for poor people. Otherwise, the present state of affairs will continue.

Mr. Chairman: Sardar Iqbal Singh. I would request the hon. Member to shorten his speech as much as may be possible, because I am informed that the hon. Minister would like to have an hour.

सरदार इकबाल सिंह (फाजिल्का सिरसा) : सब से पहले मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह अधारिटी (प्राधिकारी) बनाना तो बहुत ठीक है, लेकिन जिस ढंग से यह बनाई जा रही है उस के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम उस को अपने पुराने तर्जुबों के मताधिक

देखें तो हर एक आदमी के दिल में एक निराशा भी आयेगी। इस अधारिटी के बनने के बाद भी दिल्ली के मकानों का और दिल्ली के लोगों का मसला हल नहीं हो सकता। जिस तरह से इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट (सुधारन्यास) ने दिल्ली में, खास तौर से रिफ्यूजी कालोनीज (शरणार्थी बस्तियों) और उनमें रहने वालों के साथ, ज्यादाती की है, जिस तरह से रिफ्यूजीज के साथ चाहे सरकार कहिये, चाहे सेन्ट्रल पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० (केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग) कहिये, चाहे दिल्ली म्यूनिसिपल कमेट्री (नगरपालिका समिति) कहिये, चाहे इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट कहिये, इन्होंने शर्तबन्ध किया है, उन के मकान गिराये हैं जिन को उन्होंने बड़ी मेहनत से बनाया था, उस की एक लम्बी कहानी है जिस को कि हमारे बुजुर्ग टाकुर दास जी भागवत ने बताया है। उन की बात को सुनने के बाद हम को यह आशा नहीं होती कि जिस ढंग की अधारिटी बनने जा रही है उस से कोई हमारा मसला हल हो सकेगा। पिछले आठ सालों में मकानों के गिराने में भले ही तरक्की हुई हो, बनाने में कोई खास तरक्की नहीं हुई है। यह कहना कि मकान बनाने में तरक्की हुई है हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है। आज अजमेरी गेट एक्स्टेंशन तो बन सकता है, लेकिन गरीब आदमियों के लिये और छोटे आदमियों के लिये, जिन की आमदनी ५० या १०० रु० महीने के दरम्यान थी, या इससे कम थी, कितने मकान बनाये गये? क्या उन के लिये कोई मकान दिये जा सके? मैं समझता हूँ कि भले ही पहले कुछ कामयाबी हुई हो, लेकिन जो अधारिटी आप बनाने जा रहे हैं उस का कामिस्ट्रयूशन (निर्माण) इस किस्म का है जिस में जनता को कोई आवाज नहीं है। अगर हम में आप पब्लिक के नुमाइन्दे लेते तो भी मैं मान सकता था कि कुछ न कुछ तो वह आपको सुनायेगे कि हमारे साथ यह ज्यादातियां हो रही हैं। लेकिन आप ने हम अधारिटी के बनाने में भी सरकारी अफसरों को, दिल्ली म्यूनिसिपल कमेट्री के प्रेजिडेंट, या दिल्ली सरकार के दो नुमाइन्दों को ही लिया है।

[सरदार इकबाल सिंह]

लेकिन मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो रिफ्यूजी कालोनीज (शरणार्थी बस्तियाँ) हैं, जिन के लिये पार्लियामेंट में और पार्लियामेंट के बाहर भी आवाज उठाई जाती है कि उन को लोकल अथारिटीज (स्थानीय प्राधिकार) मिलनी चाहिये, खास तौर से दिल्ली की कालोनीज के लिये, उन के लिये आप क्या कर रहे हैं ? जिन के मकान आप बना रहे हैं हो सकता है उन कालोनीज के कुछ नुमाइन्दे आप के साथ शामिल हो जायें, लेकिन जिन के मकान आप गिरा रहे हैं, दूसरों के लिये मकान बनाने के वास्ते आप जिन गरीबों के मकानों को ढा रहे हैं, उन की आवाज बलन्द करने वाला आप की अथारिटी में कौन होगा ? मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक हम रिफ्यूजी कालोनीज का कोई आदमी या कोई नुमाइन्दा नहीं लेंगे तब तक आप असली मंजिल पर पहुँच सकेंगे इस में शक है।

इस के साथ ही मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। दिल्ली में काफी मकान बनाये गये। उस के बाद कुछ आदमियों ने चाहा कि स्लम क्लिअरेन्स (गंदी बस्ती दूर) हो, और अब तक इसके बारे में कोशिश हो रही है। लेकिन स्लम क्लिअरेन्स के लिये जब तक कोई मास्टर प्लैन (बड़ी योजना) नहीं बनती चाहे सरकार बनाये चाहे इम्प्रूवमेन्ट ट्रस्ट बनाये, जिस को कि एक कंफ्रिडेंसिब प्लैन (विस्तृत योजना) कहा जा सके, जिस के मुताबिक यह कहा जा सके कि इस के मुताबिक दिल्ली १५, २० या ३० साल तक बढ़ सकती है, तब तक हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता है। आज जो अथारिटी (प्राधिकारी) बने हैं वह इन्डेपेन्डेन्ट (स्वतन्त्र) हों, किसी के भी मातहत नहीं हो, जिस के रास्ते में कोई रुकावट न पड़े हो। अगर उक्त को सरकार भी बनाये तो उस में ऐसे आदमियों को रखें जो कि यह कह सकें कि हम को इस तरह 'पर डेवेलपमेन्ट (विकास) करना है। आप चाहे उस को पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर बनायें या उस के बाहर

जा कर बनायें, लेकिन उस के बनने के बाद ही हमारा काम चल सकता है और कोई मास्टर प्लैन बन सकता है। लेकिन इस बिल में जो अथारिटी है, वह मास्टर प्लैन नहीं बना सकती। इस लिये मैं यह तो समझता हूँ कि अथारिटी (प्राधिकारी) होनी चाहिये, लेकिन अगर आप ऐसी अथारिटी बनाते हैं जिस के लिये आप खुद समझते हैं कि वह एफेक्टिव (प्रभावी) तरीके से काम नहीं कर सकेगी, तो आप का मकसद हल नहीं हो सकता।

इस के बाद मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो रिफ्यूजी कालोनीज (शरणार्थी बस्तियाँ) बनी हैं उन पर जो डिवेलपमेंट (विकास) के खर्च की बात है उसका कोई हिसाब ही नहीं है। आपने ५,०००, १०,०००, १३,०००, १५,००० वगैरह के मकान बनाये और जो डिवेलपमेंट (विकास) का खर्चा है उसके बारे में मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब यह अथारिटी बने व लोग आपस में बैठकर अपने साथियों से यह तय करें कि क्या कुछ लेना है और आगे से भी प्लाज को उसी के मुताबिक एकमीक्यूट (कार्यान्वित) करें।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि आप ने जर्मनी की बात कही है। मैं मानता हूँ कि एक आदमी जिस ने लाखों रुपये खर्च किये हैं और मकान बनाये हैं उस पर अगर आप १०,००० जुर्माना करते हैं तो कोई हर्ज की बात नहीं है। लेकिन एक आदमी जिसने २,००० रुपये लगाकर मकान बनाया हो उस पर अगर आप १०,००० जुर्माना कर दे तो वह कैसे उस जुर्माने को अदा कर सकेगा। वह आदमी तो बरबाद हो जायेगा और मुझे पता नहीं कि वह इतना भारी जुर्माना किस तरह अदा कर सकेगा। इस वास्ते जुर्माना करते वक्त आपको चाहिये कि आप उसके घर की तरफ भी देख लें।

जो नई कालोनीज बनीं और उनमें जिन लोगों ने मकान खरीदे उनमें आज तक जिन

एमेनिटीज (सुविधाओं) को मुहैया करने का वायदा किया गया था, मुहैया नहीं की गई हैं। उनमें लाइट का इंतजाम नहीं है और दूसरी चीजें नहीं हैं। अगर एक तरफ इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट का स्कैंडल (गोलमाल) है तो दूसरी तरफ एक और भी स्कैंडल है जो प्राइवेट (गैर सरकारी) तरीके से कालोनीज बनने के कारण सामने आया है। यह नये नये नगर जिन के बारे में अखबारात में इश्तहारात छपते हैं यह मेरे खयाल में दूसरा स्कैंडल है। मैं समझता हूँ कि तब तक कोई कालोनीज नहीं बननी चाहिये जब तक कि वह स्टैंडर्ड के मुताबिक न हों और जितनी भी एमेनिटीज (सुविधाएँ) हैं वह उनमें मुहैया न कर दी जायें। जो खरीदने वाले हैं वह तो अखबारों में जो कुछ भी छपता है उसकी बिना पर इन कालोनीज में जगह खरीद लेते हैं लेकिन उसके बाद जब वह मकान बना लेते हैं तो सारी उन्नत उनको पछताना पड़ता है। उन कालोनीज में कोई रहता नहीं है और जब वे लोग अपने मकान या अपनी जमीन बँचना चाहते हैं तो वे बँच नहीं सकते हैं। ऐसे तो उनसे ले लिये जाते हैं लेकिन कोई एमेनिटीज मुहैया नहीं की जाती है। इस वास्ते अगर आप ज़ुर्माना रखते हैं तो बड़े बड़े आदमियों के लिए जो कि लाखों रुपया खर्च कर के कालोनीज बनाते हैं उनके लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा रखिये लेकिन जो छोटे आदमी हैं उनके लिए इतना ही रखिये जो कि वाजिब हो और जो वे लोग अदा कर सकें। यह ज़ुर्माना उतना ही होना चाहिए जिससे कि दिल्ली में मकानों की कमी को दूर करने के लिये जो मकान बन रहे हैं उनके बनने में कोई हिंडरेंस (अड़चन) न पड़े।

जहाँ तक इस अध्याप्टी को बनाने का ताल्लुक है मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसको इस ढंग से बनाया जाये जिससे कि लोगों को उस पर कान्फिडेंस (विश्वास) हो और दिल्ली में ज्यादा मकान भी बन सकें।

Mr. Chairman: Shri Dhulekar is the only hon. Member who now wants to speak.

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South): I will take 3 minutes.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): Shrimati Uma Nehru wants to speak, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I have been looking towards this side and wanted to see if the hon. lady Member has a desire but she did not stand. I looked towards her thrice. How can the Chair know whether the hon. Member in spite of her having sent a chit wants to speak or not. I know the name is here. How can the Chair know that the desire is still there or she has given up that idea?

Shrimati Uma Nehru (Sitapur Distt.—cum-Kheri Distt.—West): Excuse me, if the desire had not been there, I would not have written to you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr Dhulekar will take three minutes, he says.

Shri Dhulekar: I have with great attention heard the observations of the hon. Members. I would submit that this Bill is certainly a fit Bill to be sent to a Select Committee, though not for a long time, for an hour at least so that the Select Committee can sit and improve upon the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member must remember now there is no such motion.

Shri Dhulekar: So, I am placing this suggestion in order that I may press a further suggestion which will meet the wishes of the Members who have already made observations. I would submit that all the hon. Members have pointed to the composition of the Authority and have almost unanimously objected that all the members of this body are officials. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that it is not too late and she can move an amendment that 4 non-official members or representatives may be added to the Authority or that they may be nominated by the Central Government taking into consideration the observations made by the hon. Members who have objected to this Authority.

[Shri Dhulekar]

Some Members have said that there are no lawyers; others have said that there are no citizens and still others have said that there are no architects. I would add that there is no doctor

An Hon. Member: An Ayurvedic doctor.

Shri Dhulekar: There is no question of ayurvedic or any other. The Health Ministry is represented and I believe it is with regard not to the health aspect but to the financial aspect of the development that is going to be made in Delhi. Therefore, I would say that if 4 members are added to this Authority representing the views of the hon. Members who have submitted suggestions for the enlargement of this body, I would submit the object of taking it to a select Committee would be served.

Mr. Chairman: I hope the hon. lady Member would also be able to finish in five minutes.

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू : कल से इस वक्त तक इस हाउस में बराबर व्याख्यान हो रहे हैं और मैंने उनको बड़े गौर से सुना है। यहाँ भाषण जोशीले भी हुए हैं, कानून से भरे हुए भी हुए हैं और इनमें तरह तरह की बातें कही गई हैं। इन सब तत्करीनों के सुनने के बाद मैंने यह सोचा कि आखिर हम म्यूनिसिपल कमिटी (नगरपालिका समिति) का जिक्र कर रहे हैं, इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (सुधार न्यास) की बात कर रहे हैं और जो दूसरे महकमे हैं उनकी चर्चा कर रहे हैं तो क्या कारण है कि यह जो सारी चीज है यह क्यों नहीं ठीक तरीके से चल रही है। इसको सोचने के बाद मेरे सामने एक बात आई और वह यह कि यह सब चीजें इस वैसे तो रही हैं क्योंकि हमारे सामने कोई सोशललिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ प्लान (योजना का समाजवादी स्वरूप) नहीं है। अगर हम ने कोई ऐसा प्लान (योजना) तैयार किया होता

जो कि सोशललिस्टिक पैटर्न (समाजवादी पद्धति) पर आधारित होता, यानी केवल नाम मात्र के लिए नहीं बल्कि असलियत में वह सोशललिस्टिक होता और प्लान बनाने के बाद अगर हमने अपने पालियामेंट के मੈम्बरो (संसद सदस्यों) को भी कान्फिडेंस (विश्वास) में ले लिया होता तो मैं समझती हूँ एक निहायत सुन्दर और खूबसूरत प्लान हमारा होता। इस के साथ ही साथ मैं समझती हूँ कि जितना खूबसूरत यह प्लान होता उतनी ही यहाँ दिल्ली की इमारतें भी खूबसूरत होतीं और उभी तरह से इन इमारतों को प्लान किया जाता। मुझे यह कहना है कि हमारी मिनिस्टर साहिबा को काफी तजुबा है और वह चीन भी जा आई हैं, रूस भी हो आई हैं और विलायत में भी काफी घूमि हैं। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि जिस वक्त कांग्रेस की सरकार ने हुकूमत सम्भाली उस वक्त उसने एलान किया कि सोशललिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी (समाज की समाजवादी व्यवस्था) कैसा होना चाहिए। इस में तीन बिजें होती हैं जं जिन्दगी की जरूरियात को पूरी करती हैं और वह तीन चीजें हैं हाउसिंग (आवास), फूड (खाद्य) और क्लोदिंग (बस्त्र)। अगर सरकार इन तीन चीजों को पूरा नहीं कर सकती है तो फिर जो गड़बड़ों हम देख रहे हैं कि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट यह कर रहा है, म्यूनिसिपैलिटी (नगरपालिका) यह कर रही है यह होती रहती हैं। यह चीजें जब सामने आती हैं तो कहना पड़ता है कि काम ठीक तरह में नहीं हो रहा है और तरह तरह की तोहमतें लगाई जाती हैं। अगर काम ठीक नहीं हो रहा था तो हमारा यह फ्रज था कि हम उनको बन्द कर देने। लेकिन हम अभी तक तो बैठे रहे और आज आखरी वक्त पर जब यह बिल हमारे सामने आया है हम चारों तरफ से सुन रहे हैं कि जितने भी महकमे हैं यह निक्ममे हो रहे हैं और इन्हीं में ठीक तरह से काम नहीं किया है, यह ठीक नहीं है। मैं चाहती

हूँ कि जब मिनिस्टर साहिबा जवाब दें तो मुझे यह बतायें कि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट जो है इसके माने क्या हैं। आखिर इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट का काम क्या है? क्या उसका काम जमीनों बेच कर सरकार के लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुपया लाना ही है या और भी कुछ काम है?

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मकान गिराने का काम है।

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू : मिनिस्टर साहिबा हम को यह बात अच्छी तरह समझायें। मेरे भाइयों ने यहां पर इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट के बारे में जो बातें कही हैं, अगर वास्तव में वे बातें हुई हैं, तो वे बहुत दुखदाई और तकलीफदेह हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि जब इतनी तकलीफदेह बातें हुईं और जनता को इतना नुकसान पहुंचा तो मिनिस्टर साहिबा ने क्यों नहीं इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट को बन्द कर दिया? याद रहे कि इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट म्यूनिसिपल कमेटो और दूसरी इस प्रकार की संस्थाएँ मासिस के सामने बहुत ही छोटी छोटी चीजें हैं। मासिस का सवाल ले कर ही हम लोग यहां पर आये हुये हैं और उसको हमें पूर्ण करना है। मिनिस्टर साहिबा भी हम में से ही हैं यानी वह भी कांग्रेस की नुमायंदा हैं, इस लिये मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि वह इस तरफ पूरा ध्यान देंगी। कल ही किसी ने कहा था कि यह बिल पंद्रह मिनट में ही खत्म हो जायगा, लेकिन इस बिल को देख कर हम महसूस करते हैं कि इसके लिये पंद्रह मिनट कम समय है—इस के लिये ज्यादा समय मिलना चाहिये।

इस सम्बन्ध में मेरे दो तीन सुझाव हैं। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि चेयरमैन कोई नान-आफिसियल (गैर सरकारी) ही होगा। आफिसियल चेयरमैन (सरकारी सभापति) नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं मिनिस्टर साहिबा से कहुँगी कि मेहरबानी कर-
447 L.S.D.

के वह इस के मुताबिक एक प्लान (योजना) बना कर जल्दी से जल्दी—जून तक—हमारे सामने ले आयें, क्योंकि इस में और देर करना नुकसानदेह है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूँ कि ज्यादा अच्छा होता कि जो भी कानून, रूल्ज (नियम) कायदे मिनिस्टर साहिबा बनाना चाहती हैं, वे इस पार्लियामेंट के सामने आते। मुझे अपनी मिनिस्टर साहिबा पर पूरा विश्वास है कि वह सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी (समाज की समाजवादी व्यवस्था) का आदर्श सामने रख कर गरीबों को हर तरह की सङ्कलित सुहैया करने की कोशिश करेंगी। यहां के लोगों के जीवन का इतिहास बहुत बुरा है—वह कहानी बहुत बड़ी व तकलीफदेह है। जब भी मैं दिल्ली को बड़ी बड़ी कोठियाँ और कम्पाउंडज को देखती हूँ तो मेरा दिल दहल उठता है। शुरू शुरू में मैं ने गरीब रिपब्लिकियों को चीखड़े लिपटी झौंपडियों में रहते देखा था। उस वक्त मैं सोचती थी कि हम बहुत पापी और गुनाहगार हैं, जो इन कोठियों में रहते हैं।

इम बिल का मैं समर्थन करती हूँ और मुझे पूरा यकीन है कि मिनिस्टर साहिबा खुलासे से इस वाद-विवाद का जवाब देंगी और समझायेंगी कि किस तरह यह काम होगा।

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I do not know whether I can finish my speech within ten minutes....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister can have as much time as she likes.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I have listened as I always do with the greatest respect to all the speeches that have been delivered on the floor of this House in regard to this innocuous measure. Many of the speakers perhaps were not present when I introduced the Bill and all that I can say is that, judging from the speeches which have been made, they are, to a large extent, irrelevant to the issue. This ordinance was

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

asked for by me because I was getting more and more unhappy, more and more alarmed at the way building was going on in Delhi, with no proper authority to control it, instead of beautifying Delhi, as Members have said, I had no authority whatsoever to stop any building anywhere with the result that Delhi was becoming a city of slums. I went in despair to the Prime Minister after having explored every avenue by which to do something about this and I asked if I might have an ordinance issued whereby haphazard construction, which was going on without any reference to any planning in Delhi, might be stopped. The matter was referred to a Sub-Committee of the Cabinet, that met day after day, and then the matter went to the Cabinet and after that, it has come before this House. The ordinance was issued, and this Bill has been brought before the House.

Most of the hon. Members that have spoken as they often like to do and as they have done on more than one occasion on the floor of this House against the Improvement Trust.

Before I proceed any further, I would therefore just like to say one or two words about the Improvement Trust. The Improvement Trust has been called greedy. I would like the House to know that the Improvement Trust, when Delhi was absolutely invaded—if I may use that word—by an influx of refugees, made over free of charge, 2,000 acres of land, which was its property, which it had acquired and by the sale of which it was to have acquired further money for the clearance of slums. Thereby it actually cut its hands for further improvement. But I said at that time that the Improvement Trust must come to the rescue of the refugees of Delhi and this land must be surrendered without any charge to them. This land was therefore given over. Now I am told

that the Improvement Trust is responsible for no lights where the refugee colonies have been built, no drainage and no sewage. It is none of the Improvement Trust building. The land was made over. At that time I pleaded that the Improvement Trust might be allowed to develop and later put up two-roomed, three-roomed, four-roomed and five-roomed buildings for the refugees which I would have liked to be given to the refugees on a lend lease system and then they could have owned the property. My voice was a lone voice and it was not heard. The Rehabilitation Ministry said "We will do everything". They did it and concentrated only on shelter. Water, drainage, sewage, etc., were left out—and so, that is not the fault of the Improvement Trust. I wish to defend the Improvement Trust. I have said that no Trust, no committee, no organisation that is manned by human personnel can ever be perfect. And I do not say that the Improvement Trust is perfect or that it may not sometimes have made inadvertent mistakes, but I do claim for the Improvement Trust that it has never broken any assurances that have been given on the floor of this House.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:
Question.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava invariably says so; he was Chairman of a Committee and he never bothered to listen to what the Improvement Trust had to say.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is entirely wrong and unfounded.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I will not have any interference now. The Improvement Trust does not claim undue damages. Assurances were given that damages up to 31st August 1949 should be written off. The Improvement Trust wrote off all claims for damages upto 31-12-1949—four months more.

An Hon. Member: What happened afterwards?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I am not concerned with what happens afterwards. I am only saying that it has never broken the assurances; it has never evicted anybody from anywhere without giving alternative accommodation. As far as possible, it has tried to get the rules by which it is governed altered in favour of the refugees. Rents that it had to charge because of the expenses on the buildings have been reduced. Never have we not given alternative accommodation; never have we demolished buildings, as I said. There were allegations of corruption. In one or two instances—I believe I am right in saying that there were two such cases—the officials concerned were actually sacked. On the Improvement Trust, there are two members from the Delhi Municipal Committee who are elected representatives and there is also a non-official member and so it is not a body which is wholly unrepresentative of non-officials.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: It has done very good work.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Thank you. (Interruptions.)

Mr. Chairman: Let the hon. Minister proceed.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I do not know whether that remark is meant in sarcasm or whether it is real.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: Absolutely real.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: With all its limitations, as I said, it has given 2,000 acres of land free to the refugees. (Interruptions.)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has said that she is not giving in.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I am not giving place to anybody now.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Does it mean that she can make any sort

of a remark? There have been assertions that nobody had been evicted.

Mr. Chairman: Let the hon. Minister proceed. Should she not have an opportunity?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is not only denying. It is giving a very good certificate to a body which is very corrupt.

Mr. Chairman: She is denying certain allegations that have been made on the floor of this House. (Interruptions.)

An Hon. Member: Other Members are not allowed.

Mr. Chairman: This dispute and counter-allegations cannot go on indefinitely. These assertions have been made and now the Minister is having a chance to reply to them. We cannot take this up and settle what the truth is and what not. It will be for the hon. Members to draw inferences. But we cannot have a duel here and settle these things finally. Let us hear what she has to say.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: As I have said, I will only give one or two instances. Take the instance of 2,000 acres of land that have been given to the refugees. I was told—I have been told so often—that notices for demolition were issued by the Improvement Trust. There is nothing of the kind. Notices were issued by the Deputy Commissioner because demolition was necessary for laying a new road as part of a Government scheme and alternative accommodation was given. Evictions in other places have been done by the Trust in pursuance of its schemes but every time alternative accommodation has been given. The Delhi-Ajmeri Gate scheme is a slum clearance scheme. No one has been evicted without providing alternative accommodation given to them within the city—Karol Bagh, Subzi Mandi area, etc.

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

The total number of houses that have been built by the Trust has been given as 416. In the other places of unauthorised construction, the refugees have been accommodated in the Improvement Trust's layout. I have already spoken about the damages that they have written off. I do not wish to go more into this but I do wish to take this opportunity because time and again this body is slanged for no rhyme or reason. You yourself, Mr. Chairman, said that the Land Acquisition Act was a hindrance in the way of the Improvement Trust. I shall certainly look into that question and see whether something cannot be done.

Having said this much about the Improvement Trust, I wish to come back once again to my plea that most of what has been said is literally not relevant to the issue of this Bill. This Bill is an interim measure to enable the Government to stop any further damage to Delhi city. It was I, with my love for Delhi and the refugees that have come to Delhi, with my desire to have Delhi as a model city, to clear away slum areas and not to allow health conditions to deteriorate, who appointed the Birla Committee to make recommendations as to the way in which the Improvement Trust, with its hands literally cramped because of what it had to do, could improve. The Birla Committee made excellent recommendations. Every recommendation of the Birla Committee that I could act on in my executive capacity. I acted on within three months of the receipt of that report. For the remainder, no one regrets more than I that the one development authority necessary for Delhi has not come into being. By that time the Delhi State had come into being and I had to bring the recommendations of the Improvement Trust before all the Ministries of the Government of India which were concerned with it and also to the notice of the State Government. In spite of repeated reminders, I did not get replies from the State Government.

That has been the main cause for the delay.

Having got the replies and having got the concurrence of everybody from whom I wanted it, I brought the matter up before the Cabinet. It has been before the House also. The appointment of the Delhi Development body—one instead of several that exist today—has been accepted by the Cabinet. As I have said, the Bill is now in the process of being framed in the Law Ministry. But until it is framed I have no power to stop the deterioration that is going on and therefore I had the ordinance issued in consultation with the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, and all I want is that this interim Authority shall stop further deterioration. As I said yesterday, this interim Authority is not concerned with what has been constructed or even with what is already under construction or whether it is authorised or unauthorised or whether it is Government or non-official. So the question of its doing anything adverse to anybody does not really arise. It is only a preventive measure that is being taken. I say to you, those who love Delhi and want Delhi to remain as a city worth while, to allow us to plan for Delhi and welcome this measure with open hearts.

I have already asked for three town planners to come and draw up as quickly as possible—I hope within a very short time—a skeleton plan for Delhi so that we may proceed according to their plan. I do not think that it has been understood by the Members that this one development Authority will also come very quickly.

I have only asked for this interim authority to function till the end of next year—that is just one year from now. It has been suggested by some that I should shorten that time. I cannot possibly do it because I cannot bring in the Bill for the appointment

of the real authority so soon. I hope to bring in the Bill during the Summer Session so that there will be no need for this interim Authority to exist beyond 31st December next year.

One hon. Member said that there would not be any possibility because the time of the House was always so limited and that I should ask for an extension upto the end of 1958. If I have to have an extension I will certainly come up to the House again and explain my inability to bring forward that Bill but I do want very much to bring this Bill as quickly as possible and I do not want to feel that I can wait longer than necessary.

I submit again that the apprehensions that have been expressed by many hon. Members are not really justified. I want a quick and efficient handling of any situation that may arise in what is purely a preventive measure and therefore I would like to set up the committee which I have suggested. But since hon. Members would like me to associate more non-officials I myself will accept that two representatives to be elected from amongst the Members of the Lok Sabha and one by the Rajya Sabha should join this Committee, in addition to the two representatives from the Delhi State who are already there. That will give you, in addition to the President of the Delhi municipality, six non-official members on the Committee which I consider is a reasonable number. I do not want this Committee to become unwieldy.

5 P.M.

Now, one amendment is that two representatives be elected from amongst themselves by members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha. In the original Bill there are two members to be representatives of the Delhi State. I wrote to the Chief Minister of the Delhi State and he nominated Shri Brahm Prakash and Shri Subhadra Joshi on that Committee.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: It is Shrimati Subhadra Joshi.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I mean Shrimati Subhadra Joshi—"Shri" applies equally to women.

But, if it is the desire of the House that the members representing Delhi should be elected from amongst themselves by the members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha I do not mind it. But, I wish to make it quite clear that, that will not mean 4 members; it will mean either 2 members from the Vidhan Sabha or 2 members representing the Delhi State.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: The Vidhan Sabha will be going in any case.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Well, then if you will agree we will leave the original Bill as it is and have 2 representatives of the Delhi State; but we will include two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by the Members of Lok Sabha and one Member from the Rajya Sabha. As I have said I want the single planning and development authority to come in as quickly as possible. A Bill is being prepared and I hope to bring it before the House very soon.

There are other apprehensions that have been expressed that orders on applications for buildings take such a long time. I will see to it that every step will be taken to ensure that orders on applications for buildings are issued with the least possible delay.

I do not accept the suggestion for a non-official to be the Chairman of the Committee. It must be the Chief Commissioner. It is only an interim Bill and we have to act speedily and effectively.

Shri C. K. Nair: What is the constructive work this authority is to undertake?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: You have got the Bill before you. There is not much constructive work which the authority has to do. This interim authority is only to stop further deterioration in Delhi.

Shri C. K. Nair: So, it has to do only controlling.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister may continue and address the Chair.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I am sorry, Sir, these interruptions divert my attention.

It is not our intention to prevent building activity or even demolish buildings because in demolishing buildings the authority will only, quite naturally, act with great circumspection.

There was as reference to Delhi notified areas where no development has taken place. As I have already explained there have been limitations which the Improvement Trust has not been able to cope with.

Now, the normal powers—this point I want to bring before the honourable House—of the municipalities remain and built-in areas within the municipal limits have not been declared as controlled areas. Therefore, built-in areas within municipal limits will not be under the purview of this authority but will be regulated by the various local bodies under the normal building bye-laws so that the fears expressed by one hon. Member, that even repairs and alterations to buildings within municipal limits will be hampered, just do not arise.

I am aware of the plea made by one hon. Member that many of the displaced persons' colonies do not possess the normal amenities. This is one of the many results of haphazard construction and therefore it is that I am bringing this measure in and as far as possible we will try to provide amenities.

Much has been said about slum clearance. That again is another question not relevant to this measure. I may assure the House that I shall take a keen interest myself not only in this interim authority but also in the matter of seeing what can be done to rid Delhi of its terrible slum areas.

Another Member raised a question of removal of tanneries. This question will certainly be taken up after the Master Plan has been prepared by the organisation which I have set up already.

With regard to Yamuna waters this comes under the purview of the Delhi Joint Water and Sewage Board, but necessary action is being taken.

Shri C. K. Nair: May I know by what time the Master Plan is going to be ready?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: The skeleton plan, I hope, will be ready within six months or even less. I am pushing it as far as I possibly can.

Now, much has been made of assurances. I am given to understand that the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply will probably lay a statement before the Sabha about this. I do not propose to anticipate his statement but I may say that matters in regard to assurances also have been grossly exaggerated. Anyhow, the House will have an opportunity of seeing this statement and seeing whether any blame can be thrown upon anyone. I shall leave it at that.

I have been asked also not to give powers to the magistrates as I have given in the Bill. Well, now a Magistrate of the First Class has powers under the Code of Criminal Procedure to impose fines not exceeding Rs. 1,000. But, in order that a First Class Magistrate can impose the enhanced punishment I have made the provision that he may be able to do so. Very recently I did the same in the matter of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act. I very humbly submit that these fines will really only effect the rich people. Poor people are not going to build against the law because now everything is controlled. It is not the poor, it is the rich people who might offend and I say that unless you have proper deterrent punishments the mischief will go on.

One or two other points have been made. One point was made by Shri-mati Subhadra Joshi who spoke and has left the House—that is why I say one has to judge the interest in the Bill by the people who speak and then leave the House. The Ordinance mentioned by her was quite a different one, again not relevant at all to this Bill. It was sent to the Home Ministry and it had nothing to do with the Health Ministry at all.

In regard to the rules, any change made by the authority in the regulations can only be made with the approval of the Central Government and under sub-clause (3) of clause 19 the regulations have to be placed before the Houses of Parliament. The Parliament is a supreme body so that if any changes have ever to be made in the rules the Parliament will be perfectly able to do it.

One hon. Member made a reference to the proviso under clause 8 saying that 24 hours time is to be given before a building is entered into. This is not going to cause any hardship. No one is going to be evicted and for demolition actually 2 months' notice has to be given.

Therefore I submit that most of the—in fact all the—amendments that have been sent are really not relevant to the measure before the House and I am sorry that, apart from adding two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by the Members of Lok Sabha and one from Rajya Sabha.....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister can say about the amendments when the particular clauses are taken up.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur:.....I am unable to accept any of the amendments. I need not repeat what I said yesterday that this is a purely interim measure and is something that is extremely necessary if Delhi is not to become a city of slums and I plead that the House do accept it.

Shri C. K. Nair: May I seek one clarification? We are told that there is a master plan under preparation.

Are there any non-official elements associated with that body which has been appointed for that purpose?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Non-officials do not understand anything about town-planning. They cannot be associated with it. But any plan that will come now will come before this Committee on which there are plenty of non-official members. They can study it and make any suggestions. But the actual Planning for a town or an urban area must be done by town-planners.

Shri C. K. Nair rose—

Mr. Chairman: No further questions. I shall put the motion to the vote.

The question is:

“That the Bill to provide for the control of building operations in Delhi, be taken into consideration”.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.—(The Delhi Development Provisional Authority)

Shri Radha Raman (Delhi City):

I beg to move:

Page 2—

for lines 13 and 14 substitute:

“(a) a Chairman to be nominated by the Central Government who shall be a non-official;”.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I beg to move:

(1) Page 2—

omit lines 25 and 26.

(2) Page 2—

after line 26 add:

“(g) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Parliament;

(h) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha.”

Shri D. C. Sharma: I beg to move:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Parliament;

(h) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Delhi Vidhan Sabha.”

Shri Mohanlal Saksena (Lucknow Distt-cum-Bara Banki Distt): I beg to move:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) all the Members of Parliament from Delhi State, *ex-officio*.”

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I beg to move:

Page 2—

for line 32 and 33, substitute:

“(5) The Secretary of the authority shall be appointed by the Chief Commissioner on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit and”

Mr. Chairman: Amendments moved:

(1) Page 2—

for lines 13 and 14 substitute:

(a) a Chairman to be nominated by the Central Government who shall be a non-official;”

(2) Page 2—

omit lines 25 and 26,

(3) Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Parliament;

(h) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha.”

(4) Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Parliament;

(h) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Delhi Vidhan Sabha.”

(5) Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) all the Members of Parliament from Delhi State, *ex-officio*.”

(6) Page 2—

for line 32 and 33, substitute:

“(5) The Secretary of the authority shall be appointed by the Chief Commissioner on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit and”.

Shri Dhulekar: The hon. Minister has also to move some amendments, as she just now said.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I am accepting the proposal that two representatives be elected from amongst themselves by Members of the Lok Sabha and one from the Rajya Sabha.

Mr. Chairman: That would be a new amendment. It might be drafted suitably and then handed over to me so that I might put it to the House.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Will you grant us time to move amendments to that amendment? We have no notice of that. I would like to move an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Pandit Bhargava has expressed his desire to move an amendment to the proposed amendment by the hon. Minister. If that comes.....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I must see that amendment before I put in my amendment to that amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Would the House like me to hold over the discussion of this clause and postpone the discussion for tomorrow, or shall we continue the discussion and then afterwards decide? In the latter case, I am afraid we might have to go over the ground once again tomorrow.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: It would be better to postpone it.

Shri Pataskar: There will be no difficulty. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's amendment says:

"two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Parliament".

What is wanted is, two representatives should be elected.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister can give an amendment then.

Shri Pataskar: I can give one.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I think a new amendment was proposed, to which I should like to move an amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Let us proceed now.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Then, am I to understand that the new amendment is not going to be moved?

Mr. Chairman: Let it come and then we shall see about any amendment to that amendment. Now, I call upon Shri D. C. Sharma. We have had sufficient discussion, and therefore, I would request hon. Members to confine themselves to points they want to make and be as short and sweet as possible.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I wish to speak on clause 3, sub-clause (2) to which I have given amendment No. 15. I think this amendment is in a way the same as the amendment proposed by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava and Shrimati Renu Chakravartty. But I have fundamental objection to the constitution of this Authority as such. When I look at the composition of the Authority, I think we are not living in the year 1955 but in some period even before the Montague-Chelmsford reforms came into being. This Authority is heavily weighted—I should say overweighted—in favour of officials.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member feels that by his amendment the weight is being lightened, the hon. Minister has accepted most of it.

Shri D. C. Sharma: No, Sir. The hon. Minister, I think, is only going to have two representatives from amongst the Members of the Lok Sabha and one from the Rajya Sabha. I do not see any reason why the Delhi Vidhan Sabha should be blacked out. Of course, Delhi Vidhan Sabha may cease to exist after some time, and it is quite possible.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has made it clear that she has no objection to follow that suggestion but then, in that case, she may not be able to get representation for this House, I think.

Shri D. C. Sharma: This is a very strange way of meeting our wishes. She will take two members from the Delhi Vidhan Sabha provided no Members from this House are coming forward! I cannot be a party to that kind of arrangement.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. Member has not followed the exact position. The hon. Minister has said that she is prepared to concede two members to Delhi State—whether they be members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha or others. If it is insisted that they must be members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha she has no objection, but then she would not be able to accept or maintain the old provision that there must be two representatives from the Delhi State. There can be two representatives of the Delhi State. Whether they should necessarily be members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha or not is the only point that has to be decided.

Shri Pataskar: This is the form in which the hon. Minister is prepared to accept the amendment, if hon. Members agree.

Page 2—

after line 26, insert:

"(g) three Members of Parliament, two to be elected by the Members of the Lok Sabha from among themselves and one to be elected by the Members of the Rajya Sabha from among themselves".

Shri C. K. Nair: Please read sub-clause 2(c) of clause 3.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: What is the objection of the Minister to accept my amendment:

"all the Members of Parliament from Delhi State, ex-officio".

Mr. Chairman: The only thing that was said was, the members representing Delhi should be two and not four.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: Why?

Mr. Chairman: That is the reaction of the Government. Reasons can be advanced that it could be four. It is for the House to decide whether there should be two or four members to represent Delhi.

Shri C. K. Nair: In sub-clause (c) of clause 3(2), it is said:

"two representatives of the Delhi State Government to be nominated by that Government".

Instead, if the hon. Minister says: "two representatives of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha to be nominated from amongst themselves", it would be better.

Mr. Chairman: That would be decided by the House, if the hon. Minister puts up such a proposal.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If an hon. Member gives an amendment and if an amendment to that amendment is moved, then some time is fixed for it also. The time is the same for the Government as well as other hon. Members. The hon. Minister is now allowed to make an amendment to my amendment. May I know what is wrong about the new amendment proposed by Shri Nair...

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing these very amendments. Let us see how the House reacts.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I have objection to the composition of the Delhi Development Provisional Authority and I have given my amendment in order to revise the entire structure of this body. We have just passed the University Grants Commission Bill

by which we have given the power of the purse to that body. There we have provided that the number of non-officials should be greater than the number of officials. I think 5 members will be non-official and 4 will be official. But here all the big guns are to be found: The Chief Commissioner of the Delhi State, the President of the New Delhi Municipal Committee who, I think, is a nominated person, the President of the Delhi Municipal Committee who is an elected person and the Chairman of the Delhi Improvement Trust. I say, this is one of the most reactionary bodies that the Government of India can think of. I am sorry that in this democratic House, we are going to be a party to an Authority like this. I say that this should be entirely overhauled. The Chairman should be a non-official.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member must bear in mind that this is not the general discussion; he should confine himself to the amendment.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I do not see any reason why there should not be two Members from the Delhi State. I would also say that the dwellers in the slum areas are going to be affected most and I would support my friend, Mr. Naval Prabhakar that there should be a Harijan representative on this Authority. Unless we do that, their interests cannot be safeguarded.

Mr. Chairman: Which is that amendment which says that one Harijan should be nominated?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Since you are going to elect some persons from the Lok Sabha; one of them may be a Harijan Member.

Mr. Chairman: That is a subsequent affair. I repeat that the hon. Member should confine himself to the amendments that we have got before us.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I say that this Authority should be democratised. I am saying this because when the hon. Minister is going to bring forward a

new amendment, it should cover the basic points that have been urged on the floor of the House. The basic points are that the Chairman should be a non-official; there should be a representative of the dwellers in the slum areas.....

Mr. Chairman: Again, the hon. Member is going outside the scope of the amendments before us. The hon. Minister has indicated that according to the amendment she is going to bring forward, there will be three Members of Parliament—two from the Lok Sabha and one from the Rajya Sabha. The hon. Member may keep this in mind and proceed.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I say that this body should be democratised to the fullest possible extent.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: We are discussing an amendment that I shall put before the House; I say that the rest is irrelevant.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: I have moved an amendment suggesting that the Members of Parliament from Delhi State should be *ex-officio* Members of this Authority. My reason is that we are going to apply this Act to the whole of Delhi State. If two Members from Lok Sabha and one Member from Rajya Sabha are elected, my fears are that they will be representing only particular constituencies and not the whole of the State. If you have all the Members from Delhi State as *ex-officio* members of this Authority, then every sector, every corner of Delhi will have a voice in it. If you look at the constitution of this Authority, there is the Chief Commissioner of the Delhi State, the Chairman of the Improvement Trust, the representatives of the Finance Ministry, Housing Ministry and the Health Ministry. All these are officials and they will be changing. You want men who will move among the people and who will work with the people, because it is the people who know where the shoe pinches and not officials. A suggestion was made by my friend,

Shri Naval Prabhakar, that there should be reservation for a Harijan member. I do not want that. If you accept my amendment, everybody will be represented. You have not pay them any T.A. or D.A. They look after their constituencies and they will be in a better position to know the difficulties than the five persons I have mentioned. The representative of the Health Ministry may be Mr. Raja today and somebody else tomorrow. What I want is that we must have representatives from Delhi and Delhi alone. As far as the Chief Commissioner is concerned, I want that he should disappear from the administration of the Delhi State. I want a Minister for Delhi Affairs in the Central Government and no Chief Commissioner. I will talk about it later on. What I want is that so far as this Authority is concerned, if you have a non-official Chairman, there will be no harm. I would not like that there should be a majority of those persons who have no stake in Delhi and who are not going to be in Delhi all the time and who are merely birds of passage.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): The money comes from the whole of India; not from Delhi State alone. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Chairman: We will not be able to proceed with the discussion if the debate assumes such a shape. I would request hon. Members to have some patience and to exercise some restraint. Let the hon. Member finish his speech; others also will have their chance. This applies to the Parliamentary Secretary also.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: There is another difficulty. Supposing among the two representatives from the Delhi State, Shri Radha Raman is elected, he will be representing only one sector of Delhi and not the whole of it. So, I have suggested that all the Members of Parliament from the Delhi State should be there as *ex-officio* members, because they would better represent the wishes of the

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena]

Parliament in training rules and also understand the difficulties of the people. With these words, I commend my amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Chairman: I wish again to bring to the notice of hon. Members that we have placed an overall limit within which we have to finish. Therefore, they will please bear this in mind and it would be better if they put forward their points and shorten their speeches.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I have moved amendments 1, 13 and 17. I understand there is an amendment to my amendment.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: It is not an amendment to your amendment. It is an independent amendment.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: You were pleased to say that an amendment to an amendment is being allowed.

Mr. Chairman: I simply suggested that. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is taking objection to a new amendment and he says that he would have to move an amendment to that amendment. In that case, I will have to hold over this clause. That is why I wanted if the Government were prepared to move an amendment to Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's amendment and perhaps that might facilitate matters. If the Government wishes to move an independent amendment, I will have to give time to the Members who feel that they want to move an amendment to that amendment. Then, the clause will have to be held over and kept in abeyance.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: It will be better to hold over this clause for tomorrow.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: May I suggest a way out? If the hon. Minister is pleased to accept my amendment, there will be no difficulty.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am very sorry that we are driven to a contingency when we may have to adjourn consideration of this clause to tomorrow. I was anxious that the matter should not be postponed. I feel there is difficulty.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will have to suggest a solution.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If an amendment to an amendment is not allowed and if a new amendment is brought forward, the Members of the House have got a right to move an amendment to that amendment. At the same time, when it is not allowed to the Members to move an amendment on the day the clauses are taken up, it is unreasonable to suppose that the Government have got the right to come with an amendment at any time.

Shri Pataskar: The point is, the hon. Minister has made it clear that she is prepared to accept two representatives of the Lok Sabha....

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am not giving way to anybody.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister should wait. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is not giving way. He wants to have his say.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If the hon. Minister takes this attitude that she is not ready to hear anybody and that she is not giving way, hon. Members are also entitled to do the same thing.

I submit, I have moved amendment No. 1. I find that amendment No. 15 moved by Shri D. C. Sharma is also the same. The idea behind this amendment is quite different from the one which the hon. Minister has. So far as the composition of this body is concerned, Members from all sides of the House have said that they wanted to have a non-official majority. It is therefore necessary that we should have two Members from Parliament, two Members from the Delhi Vidhan Sabha, both of them being elected.

We have just heard the Minister that some Minister from the Delhi State has been nominated, and another nominated from the Lok Sabha. I do not know how the Delhi Vidhan Sabha is represented. I am anxious that the Vidhan Sabha may not be deprived of the right to have their Members on that body, if necessary.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur rose—

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am not giving way. I do not want to hear the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: He feels that he has not been given an opportunity to interrupt and put a question. Therefore, we shall have to listen to him.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Subsequently, we shall hear the Minister. These are my amendments. You will have to listen to me also 25 times.

Mr. Chairman: I would hear 50 times.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is very kind of you. What is good for me is good for the hon. Minister and all Members of the House. I do not want the Minister to be able to say that she is not giving way when interjected.

Mr. Chairman: He has said that. Why should he have any grouse?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I want to take up the same attitude as she keeps towards the Members.

Mr. Chairman: Let us proceed with the discussion.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I was submitting that the original idea was, so far as clause 3 is concerned, we wanted to have a body in which non-official Members dominated and their views are heard: For the last 8 or 9 years, we had nothing but a body which was dominated by officials and Ministers and other people. They were in charge of this business and they have mismanaged the whole thing. They have bungled. They have done nothing for the country.

We find that we are driven to the conclusion that none but a body with a non-official majority will be able to do this work. Otherwise, the desired work will not be done. The Members should be elected. I do not want any nomination from anybody. I do not want that anybody should be nominated from this House. I do not want an official-ridden body. You have been pleased to say that even to a non-official amendment, an official amendment is allowable. I would beg of you to consider all the amendments that have been just now proposed.

One amendment was that the Chairman must be a non-official. I am not of that view. I want the Chief Commissioner to be the Chairman. I want effective work. His authority must be there and he may be able to do the work. At the same time, I feel, that if the Chief Commissioner is not there, this Authority may not work well. All the same, if the amendment is to be allowed, I may be allowed to just double the Membership from this House and double the Membership from the Vidhan Sabha. You will be pleased to see that in amendments 13 and 17 I have proposed that the president of the Improvement Trust may not be even a Member there. That is my proposition in amendment No. 13. So far as the Secretaryship is concerned. I am dead opposed to that. That is amendment No. 17. I have given the reasons. I do not want to say anything which may displease Rajkumari Amrit Kaur. It is not my habit to displease anybody. At the same time, I cannot allow this statement to go uncontradicted that the Improvement Trust has not broken any of the assurances. I am very sorry that the Minister should say so. There was a Parliamentary Committee Assurances and there is the report of the Committee. Fifteen Members of this House who went into this question have held that every assurance was broken. The Improvement Trust is the greatest criminal in this respect. If the hon. Minister is pleased

hav

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]
to contradict me, I would respectfully ask her to appoint a Committee so that they may go into the question again. She referred to the Birla Committee. Now, a new Authority is going to be there. I do not want such a corrupt body as the Improvement Trust to be allowed to continue. Therefore, I submit that any person who had to do anything whether as Chairman or as anybody else with the Improvement Trust to be on this body. I want new blood, new imagination, and a new outlook to be brought to bear upon in this matter. Therefore, the officials who have bungled should not be allowed to persist there. Similarly if he becomes Secretary, I do not know whether this body will work at all. I do not want any Improvement Trust man to be the Secretary. I am not against any person. I have nothing to say against anybody personally. You know, Sir, for the last 15 years the land has been there for which notification has been issued and it has not been acquired. How the Improvement has bungled and how it has been making money at the cost of the poor people we know. My criticism that it is a greedy body is taken exception to. If a Committee were appointed, I would prove to the satisfaction of everybody about this matter. As a matter of fact, this body must go. I therefore submit that the hon. Minister may be pleased to accept all the three amendments. At the same time, I would go further and beg of you to allow me to move an amendment, if you are going to allow the Government amendment to double the membership of these bodies that is Parliament. The proposal is that two Members from Lok Sabha and one Member from the Rajya Sabha may be taken. We proposed four. I wanted the deletion of the President of the Improvement Trust so that it may become a non-official body group only of non-official members coming on it. Now, the proposal is 3, two from here and 1 from the Rajya Sabha. Then, Members from the Vidhan Sabha may not be taken. It

means, instead of 4, there will be 3. I would rather like 4 Members from this Parliament and four from the Vidhan Sabha. I may be allowed to move this amendment.

श्रीमती शिवराजवती नेहरू (जिला लखनऊ-मध्य) : मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि अगर हर एक काम नान-आफिशियल (गैर सरकारी लोग) ही अच्छा करते हैं, तो फिर आफिशियल (सरकारी कर्मचारियों) को क्यों रखा जाता है? अगर उनको हटा दिया जाय, तो सरकार को बहुत बचत हो जायेगी। मेरा ख्याल है कि हमारे आफिसर्स (पदाधिकारी) बहुत अच्छे और उम्दा वर्कर्स (कर्मचारी) हैं। इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (सुधारन्यास) का जो हाल यहाँ पर बयान किया गया है, तमाम दुनिया में ऐसी संस्थाओं का यही हाल है और सब में बुराइयाँ पाई जाती हैं। इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (सुधारन्यास) के चेयरमैन (सभापति) रिटायर्ड आफिसर्स (सेवा-निवृत्त) एक लम्बे अर्से तक काम किये हुये और एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) को बहुत अच्छी तरह समझे हुये होते हैं। लेकिन न जाने क्या बात है कि अगर अच्छे से अच्छा और निहायत ईमानदार आदमी भी इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट के चेयरमैन हो जायें, तो उस बेचारे की बदनामी हो जाती है। तो इसके अन्दर उन लोगों का कुसूर नहीं है जो आफिशियल चेयरमैन (सरकार की ओर से सभापति) होते हैं। अगर आप समझते हैं कि आफिशियल चेयरमैन ज्यादा खराब होता है, और आप नान आफिशियल चेयरमैन (गैर सरकारी सभापति) रखें तो उसमें भी उतनी ही शिकायत पैदा हो जायेगी। यह तो कुछ इन संस्थाओं का कुसूर है। इन संस्थाओं में जो मेम्बर (सदस्य) रहते हैं उनके कहने पर चेयरमैन चलता है। इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट में भी मेम्बर (सदस्य) रहते हैं। वे नान आफिशियल होने चाहिए। वे नामिनेटेड (नाम निर्देशित) नहीं होने चाहिए। वैसे तो इस सारे काम की जिम्मेदारी उस मिनिस्टर पर होती है जिसके

ग्रन्डर (अधीन) इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (सुधार न्यास) या म्युनिसिपैलिटीज (नगरपालिकाएं) काम करती हैं। वे किसी खराब अफसर को देखें तो उसको हटा सकते हैं। आप चाहें तो इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्टों और म्युनिसिपैलिटीज को हटा दें लेकिन देश में जो ये संस्थाएँ काम कर रही हैं उसको करने के लिए आपको कोई न कोई दूसरी संस्था रखनी पड़ेगी। और जो नई संस्थाएँ रखी जायेंगी उनमें भी यही सब तकलीफें पैदा हो जायेंगी।

कहा जाता है कि दिल्ली विधान सभा के सारे मेम्बरों को इसमें रख लिया जायें। मेरा कहना है कि जो आफिशियल्स आप रखते हैं आप उनको पे (वेतन देना) करते हैं और यह उनका फर्ज है कि वे देश को सुधारें और इम्प्रूव (सुधार) करें। जिस लगन से वेलोग काम करते हैं उस लगन से वे लोग काम नहीं कर सकते जो कि वेतन नहीं पाते आफिशियल नहीं हैं। कहावत है कि "टू मैनी कुक्स स्पाइल दी पाई"। आप सारे आदमियों को इस में रख दीजिये, तो नतीजा यह होगा कि जो चीज बनने वाली है वह भी खराब हो जायेंगी। हमारे देश का तो यह हाल है कि दो आदमी भी मिल कर काम नहीं कर सकते एक आदमी की राय अगर पूरब होगी तो दूसरे की पच्छिम होगी। इसलिए मैं कहती हूँ कि ज्यादा आदमी नहीं रखने चाहिए। अगर आप इस काम को ज्यादा आदमियों के हाथ में देंगे तो जो काम ६ महीने में पूरा हो सकता है वह दस बरस में भी पूरा नहीं हो सकेगा।

Mr. Chairman: Shri Radha Raman.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): According to the convention of the House, if the Minister is willing to accept an amendment, the Chair may permit an amendment to be moved. May I ask your permission.....

Mr. Chairman: I have called another Member. Let him finish. Then, let us see.

श्री राधा रमण : मैं ने सदन के सामने संशोधन रखे हैं.....

Mr. Chairman: I would remind him that we have very little time, and therefore he should try to be brief.

Shri Radha Raman: I will be very brief.

मैं ने इस सदन के सामने दो संशोधन रखे हैं, एक तो है नम्बर १२ और दूसरा है नम्बर १४ इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ बहुत ज्यादा बहस करने की ज़रूरत नहीं है एक बार नहीं हजारों बार यह मामला सदन के सामने आ चुका है। और इस सदन के मेम्बरान ने हमेशा इस बारे में अपनी यह राय जारी की है कि जितने भी काम जम्हूरी उम्मीदों के मातहत होते हैं उनमें ज्यादातर पब्लिक के नुमाइन्दे रहते हैं।

Mr. Chairman: I must bring one fact to the notice of the hon. Member, that amendment No. 14 has not been moved.

Shri Radha Raman: I moved No. 12 and No. 14, both.

Mr. Chairman: Fourteen has not been moved. There is a clear indication on my paper. I called out one by one.

Shri Radha Raman: All right. I will speak on No. 12.

When I stood up I thought I was moving both No. 12 and No. 14.

Mr. Chairman: I have also a note. I called out one by one.

श्री राधा रमण : तो मैं यह प्रश्न कर रहा था कि यह ब्याल एक बार नहीं पचासों बार सदन के सामने आ चुका है और उसली तौर पर मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सदन का कोई भी मेम्बर (सदस्य) ऐसा नहीं होगा जो इस बात को महसूस न करता होगा कि इस किस्म की संस्थाएँ बनती हैं उनमें नान आफिशियल चेयरमैन का होना बहुत जरूरी है। और मैं ने यही एक चीज इस संशोधन के माफत रखी है। मैं इस बात पर इसरार नहीं करता कि वह चेयरमैन इलेक्टेड (निर्वाचित सभापति) हो

[श्री राधा रमण]

बा जिसको सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट न चाहे वह हो । मैं तो इस संशोधन में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट (केन्द्रीय सरकार) को यह भ्रष्टियार दिया है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट जिस को चाहे चुन ले मगर वह एक पबलिक मैन (जनता का व्यक्ति) होना चाहिए जिसके दिमाग में और दिल में पबलिक के लिए काम करने की बहुत ज्यादा गुंजाइश हो और जो पबलिक से ताल्लुक भी रखता हो । यह उसली तौर पर एसी चीज है जिसे हम एक बार नहीं हजारों बार मंजूर कर चुके हैं । मेरी समझ न नहीं आता कि माननीया मंत्रिणी महोदया इस संशोधन पर, जो कि हार्मलेस (हानि रहित) है और जो बहुत रेडीली (शीघ्रता से) एक्सेप्टेबल (स्वीकार्य) होना चाहिए, ऐतराज कर रही है । मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अगर सरकार चाहती है कि दिल्ली में यह जो अप्रारिटी (प्राधिकारी) कायम की जा रही है, इस पर लोगों का विस्वास हो और यह जनता के सहयोग से कुछ काम कर सके और उस नतीजे को हासिल कर सके जो कि आपके सामने रखे गये हैं, तो यह निहायत जरूरी है, और इसके बगैर काम नहीं चल सकता, कि इस अप्रारिटी का जो चेयरमैन बनाया जाये वह नान आफिशियल हो ।

श्री श्री नारायण दास (दरभंगा मध्य) : यह चेयरमैन वैतनिक होगा या अवैतनिक ?

श्री राधा रमण : वैतनिक ।

श्रीमती शिवराजपती नहरू : वैतनिक होगा तब तो फिर वही बात ही गयी ।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let there be no direct fight.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): I entirely disagree with the hon. Lady Member who has vigorously tried to defend the officials. I feel that it is really casting a reflection on the non-officials and also on others who render selfless service to such organisations. I myself have been associated with many of these organisations since my childhood and I

can say definitely that the non-officials have done a very good job and much better than the officials have done, without any payment or anything, and there has never been any reflection of any kind cast on their honesty. There might have been some cases which might have come to the notice of the lady hon. Member which she should keep to herself.

I feel very strongly that the Chairman, as has been pointed out by previous hon. Members, should be a non-official, must be a non-official. We know that glaring instances of corruption, the glaring instances of bungling have been cited in this House by our hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava which have not been refuted by the hon. Minister, and I think it is high time we should not continue to have such kind of things here in spite of such glaring instances which have been cited. Therefore, I feel that the Chairman must be a non-official. At the same time, I would also suggest that over and above the four members of Parliament—three from the Lok Sabha and one from the Rajya Sabha—there must be two members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha. It would be very unjust on the part of this House if we do not have two members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha, though it is true that the Vidhan Sabha may cease to exist after some time. (Interruption.)

Mr. Chairman: Let us proceed. I would request hon. Members to exercise patience. The hon. Member may continue addressing the Chair without looking to the interruptions.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: The interruption is so great...

Mr. Chairman: I will see to it that the hon. Member may continue his speech.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I would suggest that the two representatives of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha should also be there because they are also elected representatives of this State and if

they are not represented in such an important body which is going to look after the interests of Delhi, it would be very unfair. Therefore, I would again request the hon. Member to accept all these amendments which have been so strongly voiced by Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman: I think we have had enough of discussion.

श्रीमती शिवराजवती नेहरू : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं अब इनका जवाब देना चाहती हूँ क्यों की इन्होंने मुझ पर ऐतराज किया है।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. No, no. Every statement is not to be replied to, and the lady Member cannot claim the privilege that she must reply. Shri Samanta wanted to say something.

Shri S. C. Samanta: There is a convention in the House that at any time if the Minister is willing to accept an amendment, then the Chair will be kind enough to allow it to be moved. With your permission, I want to move an amendment to Amendment No. 1.

Mr. Chairman: Then, the concurrence or the approval of the Minister must have been conveyed to me beforehand. If at the last moment these are to be moved, certainly the House would find it difficult to tackle them.

Shri S. C. Samanta: The Minister is willing to accept.

Mr. Chairman: At least I should have been taken into confidence as to what is the amendment.

Shri S. C. Samanta: My amendment is:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by the Members of Lok Sabha;

(h) one representative to be elected from amongst themselves

by the Members of Rajya Sabha.”

Shri Shree Narayan Das: What is the difference in this amendment?

An Hon. Member: They are elected.

Mr. Chairman: Already, an amendment has been passed on to me by the hon Minister. I am allowing that. I am also allowing the amendment of Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava in the modified form. I think he wants to raise the number from two to four.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yes.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I beg to move:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) three members of Palia-ment, two to be elected by the members of the Lok Sabha from among themselves and one to be elected by the members of the Rajya Sabha from among themselves.”

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) three members of Parlia-ment, two to be elected by the members of the Lok Sabha from among themselves and one to be elected by the members of the Rajya Sabha from among themselves.”

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Many things have been said. But even the most virulent opponent of this Bill, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has said that he is willing to have the Chief Commissioner of Delhi as the chairman of this Authority. I have pleaded again and again before this House that this is only an interim measure intended to ensure quick and efficient working. Anything that this interim body takes up will be best served, if I have the Chief Commissioner as the chairman. I have accepted, in addition to the two representatives of the Delhi State Government to be nominated by that Government (already

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

provided for in the Bill) and the president of the Delhi Municipal Committee also, who is an elected non-official, three more members, two from the Lok Sabha and one from the Rajya Sabha. That will bring six non-officials on this Authority.

I plead for the membership of the chairman of the Improvement Trust because the activities of the Trust and the Authority have to be co-ordinated; it is the Trust that develops the land, and it is the Authority that will ensure that there is proper planning. After all, the Improvement Trust is not being supplanted by this Authority. The Improvement Trust will continue to function. If the chairman of the Improvement Trust is not there, there will be no co-ordination. Therefore, it is necessary that he should be there.

This is the limit to which I am willing to go.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put the amendments to vote. First, there is amendment No. 12 by Shri Radha Raman. Does the hon. Member want to press it?

Shri Radha Raman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The question:

Page 2—

for lines 13 and 14 substitute:

“(a) a Chairman to be nominated by the Central Government who shall be a non-official;”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2—

omit lines 25 and 26.

The motion was negatived

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: I want amendment No. 16 to be put to vote.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) all the Members of Parliament from Delhi State, *ex-officio*,”.

Those in favour will say ‘Aye’.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Those against will say ‘No’.

Several Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Chairman: The ‘Noes’ have it...

Some Hon. Members: The ‘Ayes’ have it.

Mr. Chairman: Do hon. Members want division?

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Yes. Let the bell be rung.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member insists that the bell be rung because he will get more support, I have no objection. But perhaps the condition now might be more favourable to him.

The bell is being run.....

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I would like to submit to you that Delhi is the capital city of India. It is not the property as it is supposed to be of.....

Mr. Chairman: Now it is voting time. So, we cannot go into the merits of the matter.

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the question again.

Shri Kamath: I suppose it includes also New Delhi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Delhi State includes Delhi, New Delhi and everything.

The question is:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) all the Members of Parliament from Delhi State, *ex-officio*,”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the other amendments, namely amendments Nos. 1, 15, and 17 to vote.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Amendment No. 1 is a distinct one. So, it may be put separately.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 2—

after line 26 add:

"(g) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by Members of Parliament;

(h) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by Members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha".

Sardar Hukam Singh: I would like to bring to your notice that when I was in the Chair, Government wanted to accept a part of this amendment. I also advised like that. That might be treated as a fresh amendment to Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's amendment. That has to be put before it so that it is made clear.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava also wanted to move an amendment to that, that instead of two it should be four and instead of one it should be two. If the Government amendment is put first and if that is accepted, perhaps the others would be barred.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very well.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If my amendment is put first and accepted, the Government amendment will be barred.

Shri S. C. Samanta: In order to avoid any anomaly, may I suggest....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can avoid the anomaly. It is open to the Chair to put whichever amendment it likes to the vote of the House. I, therefore, choose the Government amendment first.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: May I humbly submit that that rule

applies when the amendments are on the same subject? Here they are distinct, one is absolutely different from the other. As my amendment has come first it should be put to vote first.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker:

"Three Members of Parliament, two to be elected by the Members of the Lok Sabha from among themselves and one to be elected by the Members of the Rajya Sabha from among themselves".

For Delhi Vidhan Sabha, Rajya Sabha is mentioned here. That is the amendment by the Government.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: They are not on the same subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member knows the rules. If I am wrong, certainly I will be corrected. I can put whichever amendment I like first. If they are different amendments and one does not bar the other, I will consider the matter.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The hon. Chairman has stated that it is an independent amendment moved by Government. You will be pleased to see that in that one member is from the Rajya Sabha. That is quite different from the Vidhan Sabha. Therefore, both are quite different.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One excludes the other. I will put the Government amendment first.

Shri C. K. Nair: But the Minister has given an assurance that she will have no objection to there being two members from the Delhi Vidhan Sabha.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: No. It is true that during the course of my speech, I said that if instead of the two members that are already there—representatives of the Delhi State Government to be nominated by the Government—this House wants to have two Members from the Vidhan Sabha. I would not stand in their way. But some of the Members said that the Vidhan Sabha of Delhi is going to disappear....

Shri C. K. Nair: But not before the Authority..... ..

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. There must be rule and decorum observed in the House.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Therefore, I feel that the two representatives of the Delhi State Government to be nominated by that Government can remain, and two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by Members of the Lok Sabha and one representative to be elected from amongst themselves by Members of the Rajya Sabha may be added.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: My submission is that it is already past 6 O'clock. We can devote our attention to this tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the Government amendment to the vote of the House. I will put the other amendment, of Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, later.

The question is:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(j) three members of Parliament, two to be elected by the members of the Lok Sabha from among themselves and one to be elected by the members of the Rajya Sabha from among themselves”.

The motion was adopted

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the first part of Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's amendment, No. 1, is barred because we have already accepted the Government amendment. I will put the other portion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(h) two-representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of the Delhi Vidhan Sabha”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the other two amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 2—

after line 26, add:

“(g) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Parliament;

(h) two representatives to be elected from amongst themselves by members of Delhi Vidhan Sabha.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 2—

for line 32 and 33, substitute:

“(5) The Secretary of the authority shall be appointed by the Chief Commissioner on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit and”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we shall take up clause 4.

An Hon. Member: It is already past 6 O'clock.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it the desire of hon. Members that the House should adjourn now?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 9th December, 1955.