

# LOK SABHA DEBATES

1

LOK SABHA

Monday, November 25, 1985  
Agrahayana 4, 1907 (SAKA)

-----  
*The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the  
Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

## ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : What do you want.  
Do you want to observe holiday.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : How  
can I move an adjournment motion, Sir ?  
There is no quorum.

## ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

**Demolition of Hutments by DDA in Delhi**

\*101. SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD  
SINGH : Will the Minister of URBAN  
DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) Whether it is a fact that DDA  
has demolished the hutments of the  
weaker section of society in Munirka and  
other colonies in Delhi this year; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the  
reasons therefor ?

2

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF URBAN  
DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ABDUL  
GHAFOOR) : (a) and (b) In clearance  
operations carried out by the DDA in  
Munirka and in some areas recently,  
encroachments from DDA land including  
those of some weaker section of the  
society for commercial purposes like  
storage and sale of rags, paper wastes,  
plastic wastes, etc., were removed. Most  
of the structures removed were reported  
to be let out by the land grabbers to  
tenants.

On the whole, the DDA demolished  
approximately 2,500 unauthorised  
constructions of various types comprising  
pucca and semi-pucca structures,  
Khokhas, boundary walls, Jhuggies, etc.,  
in various localities in Delhi during  
1985.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD  
SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the reply  
given, the hon. Minister has stated that  
2,500 unauthorised construction were  
demolished during 1985. I want to  
know that the law gives the power to  
remove unauthorised structures, is there  
no provision in the law to rehabilitate  
such families as have no place to live ?  
I want to know whether any alternative  
arrangement to rehabilitate the families,  
whose *jhuggis* have been removed, has  
been made or not ?

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR : Perhaps  
you have taken it for granted that the  
people who were removed, had no land  
of their own and had no place to live  
but I have explained the entire position  
in my reply. In Delhi and elsewhere  
there are land grabbers who have made  
it a profession to grab land and the

they let it out to other people on payment. Currently, their market rate is Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 6,000. They include the people who are tenants elsewhere, live at other places, but had opened a shop on such land. Therefore, it is not like this that only those persons had been removed who had no other place to live. They included all types of people. The second point is that they erected pucca or semi pucca *jhuggis* on the DDA land which had been earmarked for some school, park or a higher secondary school. How far can we allow them to encroach upon DDA land in such a situation? You have mentioned the case of Munirka in your question; demotition was done there in 1983-84 too, but those people again occupied the land and put up constructions. These constructions were again demolished but they again built up dwellings. This has happened for the third time. Of them, some people are such as prompt the people to resist the demolition operation. Now, you tell me how can work go on smoothly if they are not removed. Before resorting to demolition, we had conducted a survey that the people whose *jhuggis* were being removed (*Interruptions*) I went to make all these things clear to obviate the need to ask further supplementaries to this question. We had ordered a survey to identify the people whose *jhuggis* were being removed; but nobody came forward to us; none of them came...

MR. SPEAKER : I was saying that although you wanted to sum up, yet he is bent upon putting a long supplementary.

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have heard the reply given by the hon. Minister; you have also heard my supplementary. My supplementary has not been replied to. I did not say anything about semi pucca or pucca houses, which the hon. Minister has referred to in his reply. I am not interested in the number of semi puca houses, boundary walls and *jhuggis* that were demolished. I only want to know whether you have made any alternative arrangement to rehabilitate those who had no roof over their heads? Secondly, I

want you to identify the elements who permitted the construction of these structures, who built their houses and realised the rent. You give me the names of one or two such persons, who these people were, whose backing they had, how did they realise rent. They constructed houses and in spite of all this, your officials remained mute spectators. Constructions came up before their very eyes and the people continued to charge rent. What action did you take during this course?

SHRI ABDUL GHAFUOR : This is an old malady in Delhi. Earlier also such things had happened following which a meeting was held in which the then Government had regularised 5 to 6 unauthorised colonies. This further encouraged the people in this endeavour. They thought that they could occupy any land at any place, sooner or later it would be regularised. Thereafter, we had held a cabinet meeting at the office of the Home Minister wherein it was decided that... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we want your protection...

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister should tell him that in future such construction will not be allowed.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFUOR : That is what I am telling that when a meeting was held with the Home Minister, a question arose why such a thing happens at all, why the *jhuggi* dwellers encroach upon such land? We appointed an officer to check such unauthorised constructions with the instructions—

[*English*]

—Your duty is only to see that no fresh encroachments take place.

[*Translation*]

But the people are very clever.

[English]

PROF. N. G. RANGA : I have an objection. We do not want to know what happens in the cabinet sub-committee.

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY ; I want to know from the hon. Minister that when this malady is not confined to Delhi alone but has become a countrywide phenomenon, what steps are proposed to be taken to check this malady of encroachment ?

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR : The Central Government sitting in Delhi cannot stop this problem of encroachment throughout the country. The State Governments are equally responsible to check it. So far Delhi is concerned, I have made the position clear.

[English]

**Urban Population Covered by Drinking Water Supply**

\*104. SHRI BHOLANATH SEN : Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state :

(a) what percentage of the urban population in the country has so far been covered by drinking water supply;

(b) what is the coverage in West Bengal as compared to the coverage in Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamilnadu, Kerala Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh; and

(c) what is the per capita availability of drinking water in the urban areas of the States named above ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT SHRI DALBIR SINGH : (a) According to a mid-Decade review conducted recently, about 72.9% of the urban population is estimated to have been provided with drinking water facilities.

(b) & (c) : The information is given in the Statement below :

**Statement**

(b) The coverage of urban population as on 31st March, 1985, in the State referred to is given below :

State	Percentage of urban Population
West Bengal	63.7
Maharashtra	87.1
Gujarat	83.2
Tamilnadu	83.8
Kerala	64.5
Andhra Pradesh	52.1
Bihar	59.5
Rajasthan	56.0
Uttar Pradesh	70.1

(c) Per capita availability of water supply varies from town to town and State to State and depends upon the population of urban area and availability of water resources. Per capita availability of drinking water in all the urban areas of the States mentioned is not readily available. However, service level in the capitals of these States as reported by the concerned State Governments is given below :—

Calcutta	235 liter per capita per da
Bombay	130 „ „
Gandhi Nagar	600 „ „
Madras	70 „ „
Trivandrum	150 „ „
Hyderabad	190 „ „
Patna	110 „ „
Jaipur	176 „ „
Lucknow	266 „ „

SHRI BHOLANATH SEN : M Speaker, Sir, I find from the statement that the percentage of urban population covered in regard to water supply 87.1% in Maharashtra, 83.2% in Gujarat, 83.8% in Tamil Nadu, 70.1 in Uttar Pradesh and 63.7% in West Bengal. Would the hon. Minister enlighten us as to why West Bengal could not cover more population in matter of water supply as has been done