

we are taking note of that and we are trying our best to keep them away from our waters.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** The statement as laid on the Table of the House by the Minister, lacks in substance because there is a petition now pending before the Petitions Committee and I am absolutely certain that the Petitions Committee has summoned officials of the Ministry of Agriculture to enlighten the Petitions Committee about the truthfulness of the petition and also asking them to elaborate it.

A deputation consisting of fishermen both from East Coast and West Coast came to Delhi and met scores of Members of Parliament and also submitted a petition to the Prime Minister and in that they clearly stated:

"Our rights are continuously trampled upon by the 400 odd mechanised boats, trawlers who have engine power to go in deeper waters but they come close to the beach because their sole interest is to catch and export prawns to Japan and America. In the process of trawling and purseining they brutally kill fish-eggs and destroy breeding grounds"

I would like to know from the hon. Minister in this context as to what immediate steps he proposes to take to at least stop this destroying of fish eggs and breeding grounds? Will he also enlighten the House what is this 5-fathom rule that is prevalent and why it is being allowed to be violated?

**SHRI SURJIT SINGH BARNALA:** The guidelines provide that upto 5 kms from the sea coast only the traditional fishermen can do fishing. Beyond 5 kms upto 10 kms. small mechanised boats can operate and beyond 10 kms bigger vessels of more than 25 tonnes can operate. So far as West Bengal, Karnataka and Gujarat are concerned, these States have written to us that

there is no dispute there and they need not implement these guidelines. So, they are not taking up the guidelines even.

So far as destroying of fish eggs and breeding ground is concerned, I will look into this matter.

#### Allotment of Plots in Delhi to D.Ps.

\*108. **SHRI K. GOPAL:** Will the Minister of WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION be pleased to State:

(a) whether a representation was received by Government from Association of displaced persons from East Pakistan declared eligible for allotment of plots in Delhi; and

(b) if so, Government's action thereon?

**THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The suggestion of the Association is not considered feasible.

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** The hon. Minister has very easily brushed aside the suggestion by saying that it is not feasible. I would like to remind the hon. Minister that a commitment was made by the Government in 1966 to give plots to 2794 persons. 2000 persons were given plots. Only 794 persons were left without plots. Again there were 80 plots and they resorted to draw of lots which had never happened in the case of refugees. In the case of resettlement of refugees from Punjab, draw of lots was never resorted to. I regret to say that the Minister has told a deputation that Bengalis have no place in Delhi. I would like to know whether Government would consider providing plots to these people in Chitranjan Park or in the alternative to provide plots in other colonies which are being developed by DDA?

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** Primarily I would like to correct the information of the hon. Member that this scheme was considered only with regard to a particular number of persons. About 2000 plots were developed. Applications were invited and in the first instance, 1750 applications came out of which 1453 applicants were found to be eligible. All of them were given plots. Some plots were still there. So, again applications were invited on 13th August, 1967; 752 persons applied out of which 467 persons were found eligible. All of them were accommodated. 82 plots still remained. As far as the original part of the commitment was concerned, it was fully met.

Again, as many of them as applied for allotment of plots were given and all of them were fully accommodated. It was only for the 82 plots which were left that applications were invited and this time 794 applications came. So, there is no question of enlarging the scope of this particular scheme. Of course, there are five plots of 450 sq. yards and 50 plots of 533 sq. yards which remain. There are three schemes under consideration. One is whether they can be developed as smaller plots. Supposing 160 yards plots are developed, between 100 and 120 persons can be accommodated and if it is used for the construction of multi-storied flats, about 300 persons can be accommodated. So, this particular area can be utilised for allotment of plots to more persons, but, definitely, not all of them can be accommodated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He says that you have stated that Bengalis have no place here and you are making a distinction?

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** The scheme that has been drawn up is being fully met.

**MR. SPEAKER:** But did you make the statement that Bengalis have no place here?

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** The Chittaranjan Park Colony itself is an EBDP colony; where East Pakistan refugees are to be settled. So, to say that it was stated that they have no place here is not correct.

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** First of all, I would like to question the Minister's statement that they had fixed a particular number of refugees. It is not so: the criterion was that those who were gainfully employed for four years up to 31st March 1966 were entitled. No number was fixed: you will agree with me. So, don't say that 2000 persons or some other number was fixed.

Secondly, what is the answer in regard to the second part of my supplementary as to whether you are prepared to rehabilitate these refugees in other parts—not necessarily in Chittaranjan Park but in other areas which the DDA is going to develop?

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** Those people who were entitled under the scheme as originally conceived have all been allotted. No further development of lands in Chittaranjan Park is under consideration.

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** You have still not answered. Your scheme was to rehabilitate who ever was gainfully employed for four years as on 31st March 1966. Am I right or not? That was the criterion; the criterion is not when you receive the applications. Some may apply first and some may apply later.

So, will you please consider allotment of plots in any other area and not necessarily in Chittaranjan Park?

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** He is very right, but the only thing is that the date is not right. It was 31st March 1958 originally but it was relaxed later on. The original date was 1958 but later on, because some plots had still not been allotted, it was relaxed to 31st March 1966. But the basic idea was to place this entire colony at the disposal of the EBDPs.

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** I asked whether the Government will consider their rehabilitation not necessarily in Chittaranjan Park but in any other area.

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** It can be only to the extent of the remaining 82 plots in the Chittaranjan Park, plus 50 plots of 533 sq. metres plus five plots of 450 sq. metres. There is no further scheme which the Government is considering.

**श्री बिजय कुमार मलहोत्रा :** उन लोगों को जो पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान से आए थे सरकार ने मकान बना कर दिए थे और उनकी कीमत इंस्टालमेंट्स में ली थी। ईस्ट बंगाल के जो रिफ्यूजी हैं उनमें से आधों को तो सरकार ने मकान बना कर दिए हैं और बाकी आधे ऐसे हैं जो अपने पास से पैसे खर्च करके मकान नहीं बना सकते हैं और इस वास्ते क्या गवर्नमेंट उनको छुद मकान बना कर देगी। डी० डी० ए० या बकर्स मिनिस्ट्री की मार्फत और उन से इंस्टालमेंट में पैसा बमूल करेगी? क्या इस तरह की पालिसी आप अपनायेंगे?

जो एलिजिबल हैं और जिन को बसाने की गवर्नमेंट की जिम्मेदारी है उन को अगर चित्तंरजन पार्क में रिहैबिलिटेड नहीं किया जा सकता है तो बिस्ली के दूसरे इलाकों में जहां डी० डी० ए० हज़ारों फ्लेट्स बना रही है उन में से दो ढाई सो निकाल कर इन को रिहैबिलिटेड किया जाएगा? जो गवर्नमेंट की कमिटमेंट है उसको पूरा करने के लिए इन दोनों चीजों पर क्या सरकार गौर करेगी?

**श्री सिकन्दर बख्त :** पहली चीज तो यह है की इस पार्टिकुलर कालोनी में मकान बनाकर देने की स्कीम सिर्फ सीमित थी और उस हद तक जो प्लॉट 538 स्क्वायर मीटर के या 450 स्क्वायर मीटर के बताये, उनके बारे में सोचा यह जा रहा था कि डी० डी० ए० मल्टी स्टोरीड फ्लेट बनाकर हायर पवर्ज बसिम पर ईस्ट पाकिस्तान रिफ्यूजीज को दे। जो बताया गया कि 250 प्लॉट और निकाले जायें, वह मसला गवर्नमेंट के जरे-गौर है।

**SHRI CHITTA BASU:** The question is very simple and plain. Now the question is regarding the eligibility

for the rehabilitation of refugees from East Pakistan. The eligibility criterion was the same in the case of those who have already been rehabilitated. But my question is: whether it is not the commitment of the Government of India to rehabilitate all the eligible persons in Delhi, particularly in this case? That is why the Government is going back upon the commitment in the case of 690 displaced persons who are found to be eligible and in view of the fact that the Government made a statement on 4th August 1978 in this very House that "the Government shall take every effort to rehabilitate all these persons who are eligible for rehabilitation", May I know from the hon. Minister why the Government is going back upon the commitment made to the House?

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** The Government is not going back upon the commitment. As far as this particular scheme was concerned, this scheme was totally outside the scheme conceived for the rehabilitation of the refugees from East Pakistan. This was in fact a special scheme undertaken for special reasons. The question of rehabilitation is there. But the commitment is not there as far as these refugees are concerned.

**SHRI BIJOY SINGH NAHAR:** I would like to know from the Minister whether there was a commitment to rehabilitate these people in Delhi if they are eligible. The hon. Minister is talking about a particular scheme. Our question is; how this particular scheme is going to rehabilitate these persons? Whether he would say that they are going to be rehabilitated in this particular scheme or any other scheme in the near future?

**SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT:** The question of rehabilitation cannot be taken up afresh as in 1948. The question was taken up in 1966 and all the applicants had been provided for— whoever was available and who were falling in that category, they had been provided. This cannot be allowed to continue or remain open for all the time to come.