

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"This House resolves that in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, for the amendments to Rule 19 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 made by the Notification No. SRO 1161 dated the 30th April, 1956, laid on the Table on the 21st July, 1956, the following be substituted, namely:

(1) In the proviso to sub-rule (2) of rule 19 for 'that in the case referred to in clause (a) none of the members' substitute:

'that in the case referred to in clause (a) none of the minimum number of two members and in the case of those members two of them'

(2) In the proviso to sub-rule (2) of rule 19, in part (i), after 'is' insert 'or are'

(3) After sub-rule (2A) of rule 19, insert:

'(2B) Where a deceased member of the joint family entitled to claim partition has left sons all of whom are less than 18 years of age such sons shall together be reckoned as one member of the family and where the deceased member has left no sons but only a widow such widow shall be regarded for the purposes of this rule, as one member of the family.'

This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do concur in the said resolution."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"This House resolves that in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, the following

sub-rule be substituted for sub-rule (3) of the rule 19 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955, as further amended by the Notification No. SRO 1161 dated the 30th April, 1956, laid on the Table on the 21st July, 1956, namely:

'(3) For the purposes of calculating the number of members of a joint family under sub-rule (2), a person who on the relevant date—

- (a) was less than eighteen years of age; or
- (b) was a lineal descendant in the male line of another living member of joint family;

shall be excluded:

Provided that where a member of a joint family has died during the period commencing on the fourteenth day of August, 1947, and ending on the relevant date leaving behind on the relevant date all or any of the following heirs, namely:

- (a) a widow or widows;
- (b) a son or sons (whatever the age of such son or sons);

but no lineal ascendant in the male line, then, all such heirs shall, not withstanding anything contained in this rule, be reckoned as one member of the joint family'.

This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do concur in the said resolution."

The motion was adopted.

GOVERNMENT PREMISES (EVIC-TION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Government Premises (Evic-

tion) Act, 1950, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration”.

This was a comparatively very brief measure and it was not thought that it would take such a long time as it has actually taken. This Bill, which seeks to introduce two changes in the main Act, was introduced in the Lok Sabha as far back as the 30th August 1954—about two years ago. The motion for consideration of the Bill was moved and discussed in the House on the 16th November 1954, and the Bill was referred to a Select Committee. The Committee held as many as 11 sittings and the Report of the Committee was submitted, and the Bill is now before the House practically in the original form in which it was introduced.

The two changes that are sought to be made relate to two matters. One arose out of a judicial pronouncement that a person who might have originally entered into any government premises as a legal lessee or allottee continues to be so even if that original relationship is terminated. This was the judicial pronouncement of the Bombay High Court. This was never the intention of the legislature, because once that original relationship is determined and terminated, then he comes within the provisions of the Eviction Act and should be summarily liable to ejectment. It is to clarify this intention that this amendment is sought to be made. There has been no controversy so far as this amendment is concerned.

The other amendment, about which there is a Minute of Dissent also, relates to the extension of the principle of the Act to buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust in Delhi. This being a subject with which many of the hon. Members are intimately conversant, and also greatly interested, there has been a very lively interest taken in the pro-

vision which is relevant to this extension of the principle of summary eviction and summary realisation of the government dues with regard to the buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust, making it at par with the land and buildings belonging to the Government. I need hardly add that the present provision which applies to government lands and buildings is one which has stood the test of time, and in view of the extensive areas of land belonging to government and a large number of buildings belonging to the Government, it is in the fitness of things that Government should have this power.

With regard to lands belonging to the Improvement Trust, this Act already applies. But so far as buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust are concerned, the original Act was not applicable, and by this amendment it is sought to be made at par with buildings belonging to the Government, so that as regards the buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust also unauthorised occupants may be liable to be dealt with as if those buildings belong to the Government.

While discussing this matter in the Select Committee as also at the time when this Bill was introduced here, a large number of points were raised. I have no intention of going into all those details. But, my respectful contention is that those matters are matters of detail concerning the administration of the Improvement Trust. The essence of those points is that the Improvement Trust having not been able to discharge its functions in a manner which came up to the expectations of the hon. Members this further extension of the power of the Improvement Trust should be denied. I submit that that may be a very pertinent form of criticising the working of a public institution and, I am sure, the observations that have fallen from the lips of hon. Members in the House or in the Select Committee will be given the weight they deserve and all those points will be

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

taken into consideration on the administrative side while giving effect to or implementing the various schemes which might necessitate the eviction of people from buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust.

But, while considering a legislative measure of this type, it would, perhaps, be going a little beyond the scope of the Act to go into the individual schemes or to go into the merits or demerits of each individual case or even a group of cases.

The main plank of criticism has been that certain assurances which had been given by the Mover of the Bill, when it was originally piloted, have not been implemented. There may be differences of opinion which can be sorted out; but Government's contention is that those assurances have been implemented. I do contend that so far as the present Bill is concerned, its scope is extremely limited, namely, the application of the provisions of the Act to the building property belonging to the Improvement Trust. The Improvement Trust is a public organisation functioning under the administrative control of the Delhi State Government under the general guidance and superintendence of the Health Ministry. Being a public body, the Improvement Trust should also enjoy the same rights of summary eviction as are applicable to the case of buildings belonging to Government. Both are practically at par with each other. Being public property, it is in the interests of the general public, it is in the interests of the general taxpayer, it is in the overall interest of everybody concerned that there should be this summary method of dealing with the situation rather than the complicated process of an ordinary civil court. After all, they will exercise this power of eviction only with regard to property of which the Improvement Trust are the lawful owners. They will take this action only against unauthorised occupants. Even if the summary power is not there, it is not that the

person who is in unauthorised occupation can continue to hold on to that property. If the Improvement Trust goes to an ordinary civil court, the decree for eviction of the unauthorised occupant is bound to be passed. Is it then in the ultimate interest of even those unauthorised occupants that they should be made to go through this elaborate and intricate process of civil law involving a lot of expenditure and botheration that a regular civil suit involves? Therefore, it is really in the interests not only of the administration, not only of the public institution which, after all, has been established for the general improvement of the lay-out, living conditions, provision of essential services and the like but also, I submit, in the interests of the people concerned that there should be a power of this nature.

Along with this it should be remembered that Government have already given an assurance, that an advisory body will be set up to advise the Delhi Improvement Trust in matters of slum clearance with a view to affording better and cleaner living conditions to the slum dwellers and also for providing alternative accommodation to the persons to be evicted in localities nearabout their present dwellings, as far as possible. With this arrangement for an advisory body functioning, the interest of the unauthorised occupants also requires that there should be a provision of this nature rather than that they should be pushed to a civil court to establish title.

सासा प्रचित राम (हिसार) : यह एडवाइजरी कमेटी (परामर्शदाता समिति) किसके मातहत होगी।

Sardar Swaran Singh: The Advisory Body will not be subordinate to anybody; it will be advising the Improvement Trust.

The suggestion had been made that there should be statutory provision

for providing alternative accommodation. I submit that to make a provision of that nature open to judicial examination in civil courts will not be a very fair proposition because everything will be held up and nothing will move. It has to be remembered that this process of slum clearance, provision of services, and evicting unauthorised occupants is not a very pleasant job. The original wrong-doing of the individuals is generally forgotten and the popular sympathy is always in favour of the person who is in actual occupation, even though it may be illegal and unauthorised. Therefore, any steps that are taken are generally viewed with very great rigour and the enforcement of normal rights is sought to be thwarted by one clog or the other.

The provision of rehousing tenements, the provision of services and the provision of alternative accommodation are matters which require a great deal of labour, detailed work and the like and they cannot be judicially scrutinised. If once this gate is opened that they are capable of being scrutinised by a civil court, then every scheme will be held up and nothing will really happen. Therefore with this rider that the details of it will be given by my hon. colleague the Health Minister at a suitable opportunity, I submit that this principle that the Bill should be extended to buildings belonging to the Improvement Trust, as reported by the Select Committee, may be accepted.

With these words I commend the motion that I have already moved for the consideration of the House.

5 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Government Premises (Eviction) Act, 1950, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I make a request? We have just heard from the hon. Minister

who moved this motion that he is not in a position to give certain details. He has not been able to give us the full picture. If his colleague, the hon. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, is able to fill the gap it will be better in the interest of a fair debate. What has she, for instance, to say about the Advisory Board and other matters? Otherwise, all the arguments from this side may not be helpful.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Health Minister may intervene at this stage. The hon. the mover of this motion will have an opportunity to reply.

Sardar Swaran Singh: I submit, Sir, that so far as the general principle contained in the report of the Select Committee is concerned, Government stand by this assurance. In the light of the observations made by the hon. Members if any clarification is necessary, only then would the Health Minister like to intervene.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: We want to know the full picture of the whole scheme.

Sardar Swaran Singh: I do not know what the hon. Member means by the full picture of the whole scheme. I cannot give details—that this road will be here, or there will be a three-storeyed house or four-storeyed house there and the like. That is a matter of detailed drawing up of the scheme. But the general principle is that in these matters the Improvement Trust will take the advice of an advisory body. This is a matter of principle and once this Bill is approved by the House, then the details about the working of the advisory body and all that can be worked out.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: May I know what is being held back from us? What has the hon. Minister for Health to tell us? After all this is not the Bill of the Health Minister's department; he is only officiating for her Ministry. I want her to give us full details as to what the scheme is, what are the functions of the Board,

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

etc. Supposing the scheme is satisfactory, the House will be much more satisfied than with the generalisations which we have heard from the hon. Minister. The mere fact of the existence of an advisory board is not sufficient; we must know what the advisory boards are and what their functions will be.

साला अर्चित राम : हमने देला कि यहां पर ऐश्वोरेंस दिया गया कि इसके लिए एक कमेटी बनेगी लेकिन दो, तीन वर्ष तक बड़ी कमेटी बन नहीं पाई और जब वह बनी तो उसकी सिफारिशों को नहीं माना जाता है। अब यह चीज साफ हो जानी चाहिए कि कौन कमेटी बनायेगा और कौन उन पर प्रभल करायेंगा और उसके वास्ते क्या मशीनरी होगी, इन सब बातों का हमें पता लगना चाहिए। हम सब मिनिसट्रों की इज्जत करते हैं लेकिन हमें लोगों में जो एक मायूसी की भावना है उसको नजरअंदाज नहीं करना चाहिए और वह मायूसी क्यों है और उसको कैसे हटाया जा सकता है, उसके बारे में पता लगाना चाहिए।

Mr. Speaker: The Health Minister may say what she has to.

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps, I may say just a few words now, because to go into minute details is rather difficult.

I would first like to refer to the meetings that were held and the assurances that were given. Now the assurances that were given were that the Delhi Improvement Trust would seek the advice of the citizens of Delhi, those who know where the slum dwellers live and those that are concerned with the refugee population with a view to seeing that in all matters of slum clearance we should be able to afford better living conditions to slum dwellers and that we should provide alternative accommodation to persons who were to be evicted in localities as

near as possible to where they are living at present.

May I also submit that at this stage much water has flowed under the bridges since these discussions were held. The Delhi Development Authority has come into being which has already got on it as members, for example, the Development Minister of the Delhi State and others. The Improvement Trust is now not selling any more land. The Chairman of the Improvement Trust is actually Secretary to this authority. All plans of slum clearance, and all plans of further building have got to get the sanction of this body which is a very representative body and has representatives of the Delhi State Administration as well. So that, things are very different now from what they were in the old days.

I wish again to assure Members that nobody will be evicted without alternative accommodation. We never have evicted anybody without alternative accommodation. After all if you have to clear slum areas and there are 10,000 people living where according to standards of health there should only be 5,000, naturally those other 5,000 will have to be removed to another place. You cannot go in for slum clearance, or solve this problem of congestion without a little hardship coming to some people. But, as far as possible, we will try to give them accommodation where they will be able to earn their livelihood and not suffer monetary loss. I would again say that the Improvement Trust has never broken any of the assurances that were given on the floor of this House. In this Delhi Development Authority, I would like to remind hon. Members, there are three Members of Parliament—Shrimati Subhadra Joshi is there, Shri Nawal Prabhakar is there and Shri Kailash Bihari Lal is there—I think I am right in the three names. So that, Parliament also is well represented on this Committee and they advise us in regard to every step that we take.

I need hardly say that I echo every word of what my hon. colleague the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply has said. We have never intended to break, nor broken any promises; nor will we break them in future. May I also mention that we are both Punjabis and if any anybody's heart aches for the refugees it is the hearts of these two Ministers that ache more than any others. We are not out to disturb or hurt the refugees in any manner and I do hope that with this assurance and the fact that the Improvement Trust being a statutory body of Government should have the same powers as Government for it would be invidious for it not to have these powers, and also the assurance given by me and my hon. colleague, I hope this House will accept this Bill.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareli Distt.—East): May I ask a question of the hon. Minister?

I would like to know whether the attention of the hon. Minister has been drawn to a statement made by the hon. Speaker a few days ago when he visited the colony known as the Jumna Bazar where about 10,000 people are living. They have been asked to leave that locality and land in that locality is being sold to rich persons in Delhi. He has drawn the attention of Government to that. Now if these slum areas are going to be developed, and new and better buildings are going to be put up, how is it going to be done? If you are going to sell this land to rich people naturally they will put up palatial houses and residences either for themselves or for rent. What measures are you taking to prevent this happening?

It was said just now that the Improvement Trust does not sell land. Now if the Improvement Trust does not sell land, somebody else sells land. It makes no difference. Who sells the land makes no difference as long as that land is sold. Now when land is

sold, naturally the persons to whom it is sold has got a right to build whatever he likes and the people who are living in that locality are asked to go ten or fifteen miles away. It is not a proper thing that persons working in a locality and living there should be asked to move ten or fifteen miles away from where they are living. This is a very serious thing which all of us are facing every now and then. I would like to know if any attention is paid to them.

लाला अशित राम : मैं दो सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। आप ने फरमाया है कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बाद बहुत देर हो गई है—much water has flowed under the bridge. अब एक देहली डेवेलपमेंट प्राविजनल अथॉरिटी बन गई है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इसके बनने के बाद कोई एडवाइजरी बोर्ड बनाने की ज़रूरत है या नहीं? वह बनाई जायगी या नहीं और वह कब बनेगी? क्या उस की कोई डेट मुकर्रर की गई है?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I may refer to the hon. Member's question and say that no land has been sold recently by the Improvement Trust.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: I said that it makes no difference who sells it. If you like, I can give the name of the person to whom it has been sold; it is Bawa Bachittar Singh, a millowner in Delhi.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: As far as I know, no land has been sold by us to anybody in that area. To Bawa Bachittar Singh the Improvement Trust has not recently sold any land. As far as building is concerned, there are strict regulations that no building shall go up anywhere without reference to the Delhi Development Provisional Authority. So far as I remember, the land that has been referred to belongs to the Improvement Trust, and if that is so, no sale can have now taken place and has taken place.

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

I am also here to say that nobody is being asked to go ten miles away.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister's attention has been drawn to the fact that six or seven plots have been sold by public auction at Rs. 60 or Rs. 70 per square yard and some persons have built Gita Bhavan and some other Bhavans.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: That was not now but a long time ago.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: There is one great difficulty. If we point out something, the Government says that it happened some time ago. Now the people are already staying there, they are dwelling there; what are they to do? Are they to go 15 miles out of town? There are 10,000 people in that area. I think the best thing is that you pay back the money and take the land.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The Ajmeri Gate people were sent seven miles away to Rameshnagar, Andha Mughal, etc. where there is no means of livelihood for them.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: No one will be removed ten miles out; no one will be removed to a place where there is no assurance that they will get their livelihood there. So far as I remember—I have not got the facts and figures with me here—this particular area had been marked out to be kept as an open space, as an open park, and all these people now there have built for themselves these huts in an unauthorised manner. I did ask the matter to be explained to you, Sir, because I understood that you had taken a special interest in the case. These were all unauthorised structures, and we have not dealt harshly with them, and no one has been turned out. These dwellings are very near a crematorium, and in my opinion, a crematorium is a sacred place and should not have this type of dwelling house or any type of building near it. We

should have a clear open space in the vicinity of the crematorium. That is the ideal. But I shall be perfectly willing to go into details again in regard to this, and I would like to assure hon. Members that I shall ask some of the refugees themselves or some of the Members that the Parliament may themselves agree on to come and advise me in regard to all these places where refugees live. I shall see to it that the land is not sold.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: Outside the House nobody bothers about us. It is only here.....

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I do not catch him.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member says that outside the House, the Members are not cared for, and inside the House.....

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): Tens of times I have called the hon. Member and given him tea. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When a question was put, the hon. Minister has explained the situation and has suggested to hon. Members that there are a number of slum areas in the capital city, hon. Members may go and visit them and make suggestions to her. She openly says in the House, she gives an assurance, that hon. Members can go round and make their own suggestions which will be considered by her. She has not said the last word about it. She has stated that that is the conclusion to which she has come. Other hon. Members can come and place before her reasonable grounds as to why that particular course ought not to be adopted, and in that case I am sure she will change it.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: I would like to give the assurance to my friend, Shri Feroze Gandhi, that if it is a question of any land having been sold to anybody here or there, and rich people are building Bhavans there, I will certainly not allow that. I will consider the question if this has been

done. If necessary, we will acquire the same for the price that was given, and I say with all the emphasis at my command that I will see that the poor are not penalised in any manner. As I said before, I shall ask for confirmation that land has not been recently sold to rich persons and even where plots had been sold earlier, further construction has been stopped under the powers with the D.D.P.A. with a view to seeing that if this land is to be kept in an open space, no building shall be allowed thereon. If it is a question of rich people having taken land, which really should go for construction for poorer people who earn their living there, that matter also will be looked into. I will give this assurance.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: The other assurance I want is that if any of them are removed from the present dwellings, some accommodation will be provided for them, say, within a mile or two and not more than two miles away.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: It is not always possible for me to say within a mile or two because the areas are so terribly congested, but I do give the assurance that we do not remove persons unless we feel that they can earn their livelihood in the other place. I suggest that even if they are removed five miles away, I shall see that they get occupation there and that this objection will not be there. But it is not always possible that I can find accommodation within a mile or two. People have to go round Delhi as I go round almost once a week to see what the conditions are in which these people live. Nobody knows Delhi better than I do. I am out to clear up the mess and not to create a further mess.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: May I put one question? The hon. Minister has said that it is not possible always to give accommodation within a mile or two. Still I want to know whether those that might have been asked to go away and given other accommoda-

tion elsewhere can earn their livelihood there. This is the point. I was the Chairman of the Select Committee and we had occasion to inspect the spots and go into the matter rather deeply. The hon. Minister may place any evidence she has on the Table of the House to show that such persons who were removed could get their livelihood there. I would like to know if there is any such evidence with the hon. Minister. If she can satisfy us on this point, many of the objections will go away, because this is the main objection.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): On a point of order, Sir. You were pleased to allow two questions to be put, but then this has developed into a sort of a debate across the Table. It would be really better if we are able to know something. We do not belong to Delhi; we have absolutely no idea of the Advisory Committees. This law is meant for the whole of India. The whole of India is interested, not only the Delhi Improvement Trust.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): This is for the improvement of Delhi.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Will the hon. Minister be pleased to read the amendment that has been given in clause 3. Clause 3 says.....

Mr. Speaker: We need not enter into a discussion again. The hon. Member also will have an opportunity to participate in the discussion. As he pointed out, this need not become a question hour once again. Enough questions have been put to the hon. Minister for clarification, and if anything more is to be done, she may have an opportunity to explain one or two matters at the end.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): What Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has asked is very pertinent for this discussion. We want to know how they are removed.

Lala Achint Ram: I put two questions one, whether the Advisory Committee is going to be set up, and another, when it is going to be set up.

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: Sir, I may say that under this Delhi Development Authority an interim plan has been drawn up and Members of Parliament are going to be given a free view of this plan. This will give them an extremely good idea of how Delhi is to develop, how open spaces are being provided, where they are kept and what provision is to be made for slum clearance.

Now I may give two instances. The slum evictees of Delhi Ajmeri Gate area were removed to Andha Mugal and Karol Bagh. If you see the wretched quarters where they were removed and see their present premises, you will know that they are happy now. Another scheme is going on under which some of them have been moved to Thilmila Teharpur where further quarters are being constructed. We have also seen to it that they are going to get occupation there.

लाला अर्चित राम : मेरे सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया गया ।

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow this kind of questions and cross-question. Is there any hon. Member who wants to speak on this Bill?

Some Hon. Members rose.

Mr. Speaker: Shrimati Subhadra Joshi.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (करनाल) : बार बार इस बात के बारे में बात चीत होती है, पर कुछ एरियाज ऐसी हैं जहाँ के लोग बड़ी मुश्किल में हैं। बार बार मैं उसका जिक्र कर चुकी हूँ, पर उस का कोई फँसला नहीं हुआ। उन में से एक एरिया है जमुना बाजार की। एडवाइजरी कमेटी (मंत्रणाकार समिति) थी उस में यह कहा गया कि जमुना बाजार एरिया में कोई बिल्डिंग नहीं बनेगी क्योंकि हम ने कहा कि अगर किसी को भी वह जगह देनी है तो वहाँ के जो लोग हैं उनको प्रायटिडी (प्रायमिकता) देनी चाहिये। अब वहाँ कुछ मकान बने, एक या दो, तो

कहा गया कि वहाँ कोई बिल्डिंग नहीं बनेगी और जो जमीन दे दी गई है वह वापस ले ली जायेगी, और जो मकान बने हैं वह गिरा दिये जायेंगे। मैं ने उस वक्त भी कहा कि यह मुमकिन नहीं है कि जो गरीब धादमी हैं उन को वहाँ से उठा दिया जाय और वहाँ से कहीं दूर पर फेंक दिया जाय। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट फँसला कर चुकी है कि जो मकान बन गये हैं उन को गिरा दिया जायेगा, तीन मंजिला मकान वहाँ खत्म किये जायेंगे। बड़े बड़े धादमियों को जिन को जमीन दे दी गई, कोई मकान उनका गिराया नहीं गया। कोई जमीन वापस नहीं ली गई, और जो गरीब धादमी वहाँ पर बैठे हैं, जो मकान बनाना चाहते हैं, और बना रहे हैं, वह लोग हर मिनट इस इन्तजार में हैं कि कब उन को उठा कर बाहर फेंक दिया जाय। इस लिये मैं आपसे कहती हूँ कि जो ऐश्वर्येश या अगर उस का आधा हिस्सा भ्रमल में लाया जाय और आधा हिस्सा फाइनेन्सज (वित्त) की दिक्कत से या और किसी दिक्कत से भ्रमल में न लाया जाय तो इस से गरीब धादमियों का भी दिल दुखता है और बड़ी नाइन्साफी होती है। लेकिन जो कुछ मैं ने कहा और प्रार्थना की, अगर वह मुमकिन नहीं है तो कम से कम उन धादमियों को जहाँ ले जाया जाय, वहाँ कोई पालियामेंट (संसद्) का मेम्बर (सदस्य) जा कर देख ले। अगर वह कह दे कि वहाँ उन लोगों को रोजगार मिल सकता है, तो मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं। मैं ने पार्टी विहण्डकों से जा कर दिसलाया, मैं ने अखबार में पढ़ा था कि हमारे स्पीकर साहब यमुना बाजार को देख आये हैं। मैं चाहती हूँ कि वह जा कर यह भी देखें कि उन गरीब लोगों को कहां बसाया जा रहा है। फिर यह कहा गया कि इस मामले पर गौर किया जा रहा है, और वहाँ पर मकान उसी तरह से तेजी से बनते जा रहे हैं, इस पर कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया। वहाँ के लोग

बहुत परेशान है, इस लिये मैं प्रार्थना करूंगी कि वह इसी इन्तजार में बैठे हुये है कि कब उन को पुलिस उठाने आये। पहले इस बात का फैसला होना चाहिये कि वहां पर जा कर वह कुछ काम कर सकते हैं या नहीं।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We have heard the discussions that went on between the Ministers and several of the hon. Members interested in this subject. I for one have felt one thing. After reading this Bill, I was wondering whether this was meant only for Delhi or a Bill seeking to amend the Government of India Act of 1950. It is in my opinion a very mischievous Bill and, although the concentration has been on Delhi yet it has got far-reaching effects.

It is true, at one place in clause 4 it is mentioned that it shall apply in relation to the State of Delhi and to the premises vested in the Delhi Improvement Trust. But that is not the end of it. The discussion about the Advisory Committee, which we find mentioned in the proceedings of one of the sittings of the Select Committee, does not find any place whatsoever in the amendment that is being put before the House.

What I find, and which I want to place before you, is this. The definition of "public premises" is what in ordinary logic amounts to saying that the Government is trying to blow hot and cold in the same breath. The definition lays down that whatever has been requisitioned by the Government or has been taken on lease by the Government shall be treated as public premises. Also, whatever is let out by the Delhi Improvement Trust will be treated as public premises. I cannot conceive of an idea that what has been let out by the Delhi Improvement Trust will be treated as public premises, but nothing is mentioned about the public premises as such; that is to say, those premises which have been requisitioned by the Government.

Then we again provide another thing. If these premises are sublet, then the definition of 'unauthorised

occupation' is a peculiar one passing over ordinary conception of law. In one breath we are trying to do away with all the principles of the Transfer of Property Act. The ordinary law, the Transfer of Property Act, provides that you must give notice of this thing and the notice must at least expire in the period of the tenancy, or that the notice must be for a particular period or a particular length of time. All that has been thrown to the wind and it has been put down:

"(e) 'unauthorised occupation', in relation to any person authorised to occupy any public premises, includes the continuance in occupation by him of the premises after the authority under which he was allowed to occupy the premises has been duly determined."

Either the Government or the Select Committee ought to have changed the words: 'unauthorised occupation'. The wording ought to be: 'somebody continuing on occupation after the termination of his period of tenancy'. But here, how can it be called an unauthorised occupation? I cannot conceive that position." Once you authorise a particular person to occupy a particular premises, he is the authorised person to occupy it. He may continue even after termination of his tenancy, but you cannot call it an authorised occupation. You are giving him notice of this by post, which may or may not be received. The postal service is the only service and the service that is to be done here can be given by post. Somebody may forge or somebody may manipulate. Many things are going on in this Development Trust. I have been receiving so many complaints about the Delhi Improvement Trust. One gets fed up with it.

There are some peculiar rules for this Delhi Improvement Trust. If an honest man wants to make any change in the house, he is not allowed to make any. Even a jali or a jaffery is not allowed to be put. He is asked to keep the space open for stray

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

dogs and stray cattle which can go and settle there. But if a dishonest man does not want to take any permission whatsoever, he is allowed to do anything and the man interested pockets Rs. 10 to Rs. 50. Then the rule says, if it is proved that the unauthorised construction has been there for six months, nobody can do anything. The dishonest man goes free and the honest man who wants to go according to the law is let down and is harassed in manner beyond control. That is what is going to happen in this law if you are going to make this change in this law. You are giving a notice of 15 days for the termination of the tenancy of the person who is in unauthorised occupation. That person never receives the notice. Nobody knows whether he has received the notice but the authorities go out with the whole police force and make the person vacate the building. The Act says that "if any person refuses or fails to comply with an order made under sub-section (1), the competent authority may evict that person from, and take possession of, the Government premises and may for that purpose use such force as may be necessary". The mighty Government is in possession of the police force. Already, the people are much afraid of the police. Yet, the Government will send a posse of ten constables and they will throw the luggage into the streets and get possession of the premises. Ordinarily, there ought not to be any difference between the Government and the citizen of India. If the citizen of India cannot get his premises vacated or cannot be evicted from his premises under the law, then, I would most emphatically say that the Government also shall not have power to evict a person. Of course, if there is an emergency, I can understand. But here, there is no question of any emergency. You are making a law for the benefit of yourselves. You want to drive an extra benefit on account of the fact that the Government has the power. The Government should be placed on

a par with the ordinary citizen. Why should the Government take so much power on their hands? You are giving notice, a notice which may or not be served. There is no proof of having served that notice. No due process of law is followed and the ordinary conception of law is not understood. You simply send a notice. Somebody might have signed it. Some mischievous person might get it signed and somebody would manoeuvre it and ultimately you say that the person must vacate the premises. You are driving out the person in this way. This is too much.

For these reasons, I submit that the new definition of 'unauthorised occupation' is what I call a mischievous provision of law. This is only for the benefit of the Government and it will only encourage corruption and nothing else. It will do a good deal of harassment to the public at large and it will not help the people except that it may bring a bad name to the State.

Mr. Speaker: We are not discussing the whole Bill in general. This is only an amending Bill. The scope is limited.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I was humbly going to submit that the words 'unauthorised occupation' have been defined in relation to any person authorised to occupy any public premises. I think the hon. Minister referred to the judgment of the Bombay High Court in this connection. I say that this 'unauthorised occupation' is a very mischievous provision of law. With the powers vested in the Government, once these words; 'unauthorised occupation' are interpreted in the manner suggested in the definition and are enlarged to the extent suggested in this Bill, the provision runs like this:

In the Bill as it stands now, the provision runs like this:

"3 (b) that any person is in unauthorised occupation of any Government premises."

There, the words 'unauthorised occupation' were not defined. The interpretation that has been put by the courts, and as you yourself as a lawyer may know, is to the effect that 'unauthorised occupation' means 'not authorised'. That means, the person concerned must be a trespasser, *ab initio*. But here, it is not a question of a trespasser.

Mr. Speaker: What does the hon. Member suggest? If a man is allowed to occupy for a couple of months or three months or even, say, for a year, and then the Government terminate the lease, is not the continued occupation an unauthorised occupation? What else can be done in this matter? *ab initio*, it may be all right for a time.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Yes; you know the law. There is no doubt that he is in authoriser possession *ab initio*. But the question here is, they must follow a regular procedure of law. Do not stretch the meaning of 'unauthorised' or 'authorised'. If you say that tenancy shall be terminated in a regular manner and then the person can be evicted, I would agree to that. But, if you put the definition of 'unauthorised occupation' not in the ordinary grammatical sense but in a sense which is quite different from what the term ordinarily means, and then, if you give the power to the Government to evict the person just by giving 15 days' notice by ordinary post—not even by registered post—I say that it would not be proper. Giving just a notice in writing will create mischief. I submit that this thing must be guarded against. The citizens of this country must be protected against such mischief. As legislators of this country, we are in duty bound to protect the interests of the citizens. This power cannot be given to the Government since it will injure the interests of the public at large.

Mr. Speaker: Cannot rules be framed to ensure that the person without proper notice ought not to be evicted?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: But the Act provides differently. That is the difficulty.

Mr. Speaker: Government must have the right to determine the procedure.

Shri K. K. Basu: The executive has the powers.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The executive authority has been given the full rights. That is what I say. The Act says:

"the competent authority may, by notice served by post or otherwise, order that that person as well as any other person who may be in occupation of the whole or any part of the premises, shall vacate them within fifteen days of the date of the service of the notice."

So, if what you have suggested is provided for, then we shall all agree. When Government really need the premises, they should not be jeopardised in anyway, but, at the same time, in its attempt to get some premises, it should not be high-handed or exercise arbitrary powers to as to deprive the ordinary citizen of the ordinary protection of law that is granted to him under our Constitution.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): Can we not change that "shall" into "will"?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: This is not like a professor taking a class here!

So, if we want to make an amendment, my humble submission would be this. We should not just focus our attention to Delhi alone and say that it will apply only to the State of Delhi for a particular purpose. It will apply to the whole of India, and therefore, I would say that the Select Committee has not done the proper thing in restricting it only to the Delhi people and the refugees. Perhaps the Members of the Select Committee were obsessed with the idea that this would be applicable only to

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

the Delhi people and the refugees. But then the definition is an overall definition covering the Government premises all over India and making them public premises. Thus, any house which the Government may requisition or lease will automatically become public premises, and the irony of fate will be that people all over India will be put to trouble by this measure.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal):

While moving the motion for consideration of the Bill as reported by the Select Committee, the hon. Minister characterised the Bill as a simple, short and innocuous one. It is clear from the feelings already expressed by the hon. Members that the Bill is not actually a simple and innocuous one but is a Bill of serious consequences to the people who are likely to be affected by it.

Before I pass on to the consideration of the provisions of this Bill, I would like to say a few words about the report of the Select Committee. From the report of the Chairman of the Select Committee, it appears that although the Bill was referred to the Committee on the 16th November, 1954, it took about eight months, and the report was submitted to this House on the 31st August, 1955. During this period, the Members of the Committee went to the various places in Delhi. They went to the Jhandewalan area where the refugees have colonised themselves. They went to the Delhi-Ajmere Gate area where the slums exist. They saw the actual conditions and continued their deliberations for such a long time; still, I find that not a single word has been changed by the Select Committee's report on the Bill, except two items, namely, 'sixth year' and '1955'. These are the two items which are underlined in the Bill as reported upon by the Select Committee. When there were so many eminent Members on the Select Committee and when they took such a long time, and

when they have actually seen to the conditions of the slums, we expected that they would introduce certain welcome changes. Whenever a Bill is referred to the Select Committee and particularly when a Bill relates to such controversial topics, we naturally expect that the basic defects in the Bill should have been dealt with. But unfortunately we have to regret that there is no such change, and apparently there is no statutory provision made in the Bill so as to allay the fears of the people who are likely to be affected by this measure. The scope of the definition has been expanded. It has been said that as a result of the decisions of some courts, it was necessary to have this change and by using the words "public premises", they would now be in a position to effect summary eviction of persons without any notice. As for the unauthorised occupation, the point has been very ably dealt with by the eminent lawyer who preceded me and I need not dwell at length on it. The main thing here is human consideration. Everybody would agree that there should be clearance of slums and that our cities should be planned better and be full of decent houses. Even the people who were living in the slums were certainly not happy. Who would like to live in dirt and squalor? Those people living there are trying to clean the slums. It is not a question of preventing decent houses springing up in place of these hovels; but, it is a question of life and death for these poor people who have been leading a miserable existence for so many years.

We are giving such wide powers to the Government and other bodies like the Delhi Improvement Trust. We know the history of the Delhi Improvement Trust. Whatever the hon. Health Minister may say in its defence, we have got the report of the Birla Committee; we know that for a petty amount lands were taken and huge profits were made by selling them at exorbitant rates. This

is a matter of history on record and we cannot forget this. Not only this; but we have also the recent experience of how the Improvement Trust evicted the people and removed them to places so many miles away, thus depriving them of their professions. When we are in possession of these facts, how can the Government expect us to accept the Bill as it is without certain amendments for removing the likely dangers for the people who will be affected? So, instead of some vague assurance from the Minister which may not be honoured, there must be some statutory provision in the Bill itself. Something has been said about some advisory committee. We do not know its actual composition and the exact manner in which it will function; those details are not yet available. We wanted certain information as to what actually has been done by way of providing alternate accommodation to those people at short distances, so that they would be in a position to eke their livelihood; but those details have not yet been supplied to the satisfaction of this House. Under these circumstances, we will not be in a position to accept this Bill as it is.

There are certain areas such as the Jamna Bazar, Ajmere Gate etc., to which reference has been made, and where the conditions of the people are very miserable. Unless Government take sufficient precautions by way of providing alternate accommodation at places from which they can come to the city and carry on their professional work, they would be in a very great difficulty. So, we must be sure that actually steps would be taken to see to it that these people are not thrown into the streets. We must remember that these people—the artisans, the cobblers and the masons—were responsible for building this city. It was the masons who built the places brick by brick. Now, when we are going to have skyscrapers and magnificent buildings in the city, when the Government has announced a socialist pattern of society as its goal, how is it that they

now bring forward legal arguments? The hon. Minister stands up and says these people were occupying certain houses rather illegally; originally they were squatting on those places and all that sort of thing. My submission is that the question must be considered in a different way. Those people were rendering useful service to the dwellers of the city, but they had no houses, because the lands were all grabbed by a few people in the city. Under those conditions, they were forced to occupy those places. You must take into consideration the human aspects of the problem. When you announce to the world that you are going to work for a socialist pattern of society, certainly the responsibility devolves on you to see that those people are not summarily evicted, as provided here.

Power is sought to be given to the Delhi Improvement Trust and any other body which may be constituted. It has already been pointed out that the provisions of the Act do not apply to Delhi alone, but to other places as well. I see the hon. Minister shaking his head. I may inform the House that trouble has arisen not only in Delhi, but in Calcutta also. In Calcutta they wanted to remove some slums in a reckless manner; but the people resisted and ultimately it had to be postponed for some time. Although we welcome slum clearance and the provisions in the second Five Year Plan in this regard, we must not make a beginning like this. This is not the way in which the work is to be started. If there is to be real town-planning and if decent houses are to be built in cities and towns, certainly we have to do it in a human way and in a more sympathetic way, keeping all these things in mind.

So far as Delhi is concerned, the Government would do well to constitute a Central authority of their own and not rely on a body like the Delhi Improvement Trust. They should themselves undertake the responsibility of developing the city, clearing the slums and building new houses. At the same time, Govern-

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury]

ment should give an assurance to the people who will be affected that they would be allowed to come back and live in those houses later on. For the time being, they may be provided with alternate accommodation and conditions should be created in which they may not find any difficulty in earning their livelihood. Only after such an arrangement is made and some amendment to this Bill is accepted whereby some statutory provision would be made with regard to the procedure by which any change will be made or people will be provided alternate accommodation according to the due processes of law, we can agree to this measure. Otherwise, as the Bill stands today, it is not acceptable and as such we are opposed to this Bill.

साला अर्चित राम : इस बिल के मूताल्लिक बोलते वक्त मेरे दिल पर यह असर हुआ कि दो मिनिस्टर साहबान जिनका कि इस बिल से ताल्लुक है और जिनके लिए कि मेरे दिल में बड़ी इज्जत है क्या कहूं और क्या न कहूं, क्योंकि उनके मूताल्लिक ही मुझे इस मौके पर अर्ज करना है और मुझे बैलेंस करना पड़ रहा है कि क्या कहूं और क्या न कहूं सच बोल् और कुछ कहूं या चुप लगा जाऊं लेकिन मजबूर होकर कुछ तो कहना ही पड़ता है ।

अभी सबाल तो यह दरपेश है कि देहली कि जो एम्ब्रुवमेंट एथारिटी (मुघार प्राधिकार) है उसको जो पावर्स दी जा रही हैं वह पावर्स उनको दी जानी चाहियें कि नहीं दी जानी चाहियें । अब चूंकि अपनी गवर्नमेंट है और वह अगर पावर्स मांगे तो यह कुछ अच्छा नहीं माबूम पड़ता कि हम उसमें कुछ हील वुज्जत करें लेकिन क्या किया जाय लाचारी है और हमारी मसल तो वही बन रही है कि दूध का जला छाछ फूंक फूंक कर पीता है । अभी मिनिस्टर साहब ने दलील दी कि यह पावर्स जिनके बरखिलाफ इस्तेमाल की जायेंगी, वे उनके भले के लिए हैं । अब यह दलील

उनकी ठीक हो भी सकती है लेकिन यह कैसे मानी जा सकती है । यह तो वही दलील देना हुआ कि एक आदमी जिसको कि फांसी की सजा हो चुकी है उसके बारे में कहा जाय कि उसको आगें सेशन जज (सत्र न्यायाधीश) और हाईकोर्ट (उच्चन्यायालय) में अपील करने का हक न हो क्योंकि बेकार में वक्त और रुपया दोनों उसका बर्बाद होगा और इस वास्ते फौरन उसको फांसी की सजा दे दी जाय और मैं समझता हूं कि समरी पावर्स (संक्षिप्त शक्तियां) अच्छी हैं, इस दलील को कोई कबूल नहीं कर सकता । अपील करने में चाहे उसको मुसीबत क्यों न आयें और खर्चा भी करना पड़े, इस समरी पावर्स की दलील को अच्छा नहीं समझ सकता और इस वास्ते इस दलील को कबूल करना मुश्किल पड़ रहा है । कबूल तो उनको पांच मिनट बाद हो ही जाना है और आज नहीं तो कल वे कबूल कर ली जायेंगी और हम सब उसके लिए अपने हाथ उठा देंगे और वह चूज यहाँ हाउस से पास हो जायगी लेकिन उसके साथ ही हम अपने मिनिस्ट्रों को जिनके लिए कि हमारे दिल में बड़ी इज्जत है यह बतला देना चाहते हैं कि हम क्यों इस पर ऐतराज उठाते हैं । हमारे गाडगिल साहब ने यहीं हाउस में वायदे किये और हमें उनके मूताल्लिक पूरा भरोसा था कि वे अपना वायदा पूरा करेंगे और उन्होंने हाउस में यह ऐलान किया कि वे अपने हर एक वर्ड को और करेगें लेकिन उस ऐलान के दूसरे ही दिन हमने देखा कि मकानात गिरना शुरू हो गये । हम गाडगिले साहब के पास गये और उनसे कहा तो वे बोल कि हम ठीक कर देंगे लेकिन हमने देखा कि वह १०, २० दिन तक नहीं हो पाया और मामला ली लटका रहा लेकिन चूंकि एलेक्शन नजदीक था इसलिए डिमोलिशन का काम उस वक्त आगें के लिए रोक दिया गया ।

पटेलनगर में जो मकानात तोड़े गये उनके रहने वालों को माकूल आल्टरनेटिव एकोमोडेशन (वैकल्पिक आवास) का क्या

इंतजाम किया गया और उसके बारे में हमें बहुत तल्लू तजुर्बा है।

अभी मिनिसटर साहब ने फ़रमाया कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से जो ऐश्वोरेंसेज दिये गये थे उनको तोड़ा नहीं गया है। अब मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि यहाँ पर हमारे भूतपूर्व मावलकर साहब के हुकम से एक ऐश्वोरेंस कमेटी बनी थी और उस कमेटी ने इस बात की जांच पड़ताल की कि यहाँ हाउस में गवर्नमेंट द्वारा जो वायदे किये गये थे उन पर अमल हुआ या नहीं हुआ। वह कमेटी आपके हुकम से बनी, आपकी मर्जी के मुताबिक बनी और उसने इसकी जांच करके अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश की और उसने अपनी रिपोर्ट में साफ तौर से इस बात को कहा कि ऐश्वोरेंसेज (आशवासन) को तोड़ा गया और उन पर अमल नहीं हुआ। मैं तो उस कमेटी में नहीं था लेकिन मुझे भी इस बात में कोई शक नहीं है कि ऐश्वोरेंसेज को तोड़ा गया। . . . पटेल नगर के अन्दर बने हुए मकानों को गिराया गया . . .

राजकुमारी अमृत कौर : मेरे डिपार्टमेंट ने कोई मकान नहीं गिराये। उनको इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट ने ही गिराया।

लाला अचित राम : मैं इस में कोई फ़र्क नहीं देखता कि किस मुहकमे ने उसको गिराया, आखिर सब सरकारी मुहकमे भाई भाई हैं।

अभी हमारे मिनिसटर साहब ने फरमाया कि जो हम आपको ऐश्वोरेंसेज देंगे उन पर हम कायम रहेंगे। अभी सरदार साहब ने कहा कि हम ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी बनायेंगे लेकिन अभी थोड़ी देर ही पहले मैंने आपको बतलाया था कि ऐश्वोरेंस कमेटी (आशवासन समिति) जिसको कि बनाने की बात थी वह महीने दो महीने नहीं बल्कि पूरे दो, तीन साल तक अमली रूप में सामने नहीं आई और उसके बाद चार साल गुजर गये तब मुझे नोटिस आया कि आप कमेटी के म्बर हैं। अब उनसे पूछा जाय कि चार साल तक वे कहां रहे तो वे

फरमायेंगे कि आपके बगैर काम चलता ही रहा, तो इस तरह की बातें वहाँ पर चलती हैं। आपका एक शब्द यह कह देना कि यमुना के नीचे से बहुत सा पानी गुजर चुका है और अब तो देहली इम्प्रूवमेंट एथारिटी (सुधार प्राधिकार) बन गई है मुझे दिलासा नहीं दे सका क्योंकि हमारा पिछला तजुर्बा इस बारे में बहुत मायूसकून रहा है और हमारी राजकुमारी जी ने और तो सब बातें बतलाईं लेकिन इस बारे में साफ साफ नहीं बतलाया कि कमेटी बनेगी या नहीं बनेगी और अगर बनेगी तो कब बनेगी। केवल यह कहा है कि हाँ एक कमेटी बनेगी और मैं उनके इस ऐलान का स्वागत करता हूँ लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसके लिए आप कोई तारीख तो मुकर्रर करें कि दस दिन में या बीस दिन में वह कमेटी बन जायगी।

यह चन्द बातें मुझे अर्ज करनी थीं। मुश्किल की बात तो यह है कि जिन मिनिसटर साहबान के खिलाफ मैं बोलने पर मजबूर हुआ वे हमारे बुजुर्ग हैं और उनके लिए हमारे दिल में बड़ी इज्जत है और हम बड़ी मुसीबत में पड़ जाते हैं कि क्या कहें और क्या न कहें। अधिक न कह कर मैं उन से यही निवेदन करूँगा कि हम लोगों की दशा दूध का जला जैसे छाछ फूँक फूँक कर पीता है, वैसी ही रही है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि आपकी बात देखने में तो बहुत स्वागत योग्य है और मीठी है लेकिन फिर हमारे दिल में शक होने लगता है कि कहीं पहले की तरह इन ऐश्वोरेंसेज को भी तोड़ न दिया जाय। इसलिए कृपा करके हम जो आप पर विश्वास करने जा रहे हैं उसको किसी तरह से अांच न आने दीजियेगा और उन पर कायम रहियेगा।

Mr. Speaker: I think we will be able to finish it in an hour.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: This will take more time as it is a controversial subject.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard almost all members except Pandit Bhargava.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I have spoken on this matter twice before. I will take more than an hour. I will give you full facts and I will not repeat what others have said.

Mr. Speaker: The very fact that he has taken two hours indicates that he will not take much time now.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Others also want to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Then we must have six hours for this.

Sardar Swaran Singh: Some members on this side also want to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I am allowing every hon. Member to speak. But if every hon. Member takes more than 10—15 minutes, I will have to allot ten hours. But I do not want to hustle any hon. Member. This is a beaten track and again and again reference is made to the same thing. Only three or four more members are interested in this matter.

Shri M. K. Moitra (Calcutta—North-West): An hon. Member of this House has opposed the granting of wide powers to the Government or the Delhi Improvement Trust for ejecting people. He has suggested that the law should take its own course. But when law is allowed to take its own course, it must follow certain princi-

ples. Here I have got the Second Five Year Plan where principles for clearing slums have been laid down. These principles clearly state as follows—(it is mentioned on page 562 of the book)—

“The scheme is based on two main principles. The first principle is that there should be the minimum dislocation of slum dwellers and the effort should be to rehouse them as far as possible at or near the existing sites of slums so that they may not be uprooted from their fields of employment. The second principle is that in order to keep rents within the paying capacity of the slum dwellers, greater emphasis should be on the provision of minimum standards of environmental hygiene and essential civic amenities rather than on the construction of elaborate structures.” These are the principles that have been laid down.

Mr. Speaker: As it is six o'clock now, the hon. Member can continue his speech tomorrow.

6 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 23rd August, 1956.