

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

My friend Shri Yashpal Singh suggested that the trustees, mutawallis, should always be religious people. I agree with him provided 'religious' is used in the broad sense of the term. Sometimes, unfortunately, 'religious' is identified with the observation of certain creeds and certain outward forms. It is far more important that there should be men of real religious spirit and a man is of real religious spirit where he has the welfare of humanity at heart. I entirely agree with him that honest and religious persons of this type should be in-charge of the wakfs.

I have already dealt with the question about the representation of the public. All the State Boards and the Central Council will be composed mostly of representatives of the public because it is the purpose of these Boards to advise the Government and let the Government know what the public feel in such matters.

I think, I have dealt with every point that has been raised. Once again, I would like to thank hon. Members who have extended, may I say with the exception of Mr. Trivedi, such unstinted support to the Bill.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Wakf Act, 1954, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Chairman:** We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments. I will put all the clauses together to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clauses 1 to 24 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 1 to 24 were added to the Bill*

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*The Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

---

#### SLUM AREAS (IMPROVEMENT AND CLEARANCE) AMENDMENT BILL.

**The Minister of Works and Housing (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna):** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Sir, about six months ago, I introduced a Bill in this House rather an amending Bill, relating to the improvement and clearance of slums. It was then pointed out that in spite of the best efforts made, we were faced with certain difficulties and with a view to removing those difficulties, an amending Bill was brought before the House. That Bill was fully discussed and the various aspects of the Bill were thrashed on the floor of this House. The principle of the Bill was accepted. Since the principle of the Bill was accepted and fully discussed, I do not want to cover the old ground again, and that will not be correct also.

It was then decided at the request of certain Members that the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament, namely the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. This Bill has been before the Joint Committee.

The Joint Committee held four sittings. They even invited memoranda and evidence, and some of the Members also visited the slum areas. Except for my hon. friend Shri Dinen Bhattacharya who excepting for the first meeting never attended a single meeting of the Joint Committee....

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** (Kanpur): What has that got to do with this? That is irresponsible and irrelevant talk.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna**....all others have presented a unanimous report.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee**: What is the significance of his absence? Is it a defence against his attack?

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna**: The significance is this that if Shri Dinen Bhattacharya had been present at the meetings of the Joint Committee and if he had discussed the various aspects of the Bill with the other 23 Members, there would have been no need for him to append a minute of dissent. That is the only significance.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee**: That is wrong. The hon. Minister is actually insinuating. A particular Member may not attend certain sittings of the Joint Committee. But how can he be debarred from appending a minute of dissent?

**Mr. Chairman**: There is only some mention of it. There is nothing wrong in that.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee**: That is in bad taste.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna**: I do not know why my hon. friend Shri

S. M. Banerjee is always taking up the cudgels on behalf of a particular Member or a particular party and trying to defend him. I am only making a statement of a fact.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee**: My hon. friend is making a speech in the House. He is not talking in a slum.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna**: Please let me continue. I do not know why my hon. friend does not join them openly and take up the cudgels on their behalf, instead of raving about in this manner all the time?

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta South West): It is in very bad taste.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna**: I agree....

**Shrimati Remu Chakravartty** (Barackpore): Everything that he touches goes off with a bad start.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna**: At least, I am grateful to the lady Member that whatever she has said, has said with a certain amount of grace.

What I was saying was this. Here was a Joint Committee for which a motion was made in the House, and then the Committee was formed. Different parties were requested to send in their nominees. The Committee held four sittings and went into oral evidence, and also visited slum areas and spent days over discussions and deliberations, and when the time came, all of them wrote a unanimous report excepting one hon. Member who had appended a minute of dissent. As far as the Report of the Joint Committee is concerned, I have nothing much to say.

15.43 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Joint Committee have only suggested some minor amendments to clauses 2 and 18 of the amending Bill. In clause 2, a sub-clause has been inserted defining land. Secondly, the sub-clause relating to the provision

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna]

of latrines has been elaborated to include conversion of dry latrines into water-borne latrines. In clause 18, provision has been made for the hearing of appeals by an officer not below the rank of an additional district judge; previously, it was only district judge. It is, however, proposed to make a further amendment to clause 18 of the Bill. Under the Delhi Delegation of Powers Bill, 1963, provision has been made that the powers of the administrator under section 20 of the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956, may be exercised by the Chief Secretary or an officer appointed by the Central Government. As the provisions of the two Bills are at variance with each other, clause 18 of the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Amendment Bill is being amended to bring it in line with the provision in the Delhi Delegation of Powers Bill, 1963, which, I think, was passed by this House only a day or two ago. To achieve this purpose, provision is proposed to be made for the exercise of the appellate powers of the administrator under sections 10, 15, 20 and 30 of the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, by the chief secretary or an officer appointed by the Central Government.

In clause 20(b), the Committee have changed the basis for the fixation of rent both in the case of premises in which work of improvement has been executed as well as in the case of premises which have been demolished and re-erected. In the case of the former, previously, the rent was to be fixed at 7½ per cent of the cost of work of improvement and the cost of any additional land required for the improvement work.

You would recall, Sir, that when this Bill was before this House, some hon. Members felt that the rate of 7½ per cent was very high, both in the matter of improvement as well as of clearance. So, this matter was gone into by the Joint Committee, and

they have recommended that the rent should be fixed at 6 per cent of both the amounts, that is, land and improvement. In the case of re-erected buildings, the rent was to be fixed previously at 7½ per cent of the cost of reconstruction and the cost of the land. Now, it will be fixed at 4 per cent of both these amounts. The cost of land will be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Act. So, what we have done is that we have reduced the rental which was originally fixed on the basis of 7½ per cent, in one case from 7½ per cent to 6 per cent and in the other case from 7½ per cent to 4 per cent so that it may be within the easy reach of a slum-dweller who unfortunately has to live under certain unfortunate conditions.

Now, I come to the minute of dissent of Shri Dinen Bhattacharya. Shri Dinen Bhattacharya has made a reference to clauses 6 and 7. He has suggested that Government should themselves resort to direct acquisition of slums and their re-development according to proper plan, for quick and effective execution of the work of slum clearance. He says that under the existing Act, opportunity has first to be given to the owner of a slum area to re-develop it according to the plans and specifications approved by the competent authority, and the owner can delay the re-development. According to him, this defect has not been removed even under the amending Bill. This, however, is not correct. Clauses 6 and 7 of the amending Bill should be read together and not in isolation.

Under clause 7, power has been given to the competent authority to take over a slum area soon after it is cleared and before the work of re-development is started by the owner. The competent authority can also take over an area, even after the re-development work has been started by the owner, if it is found that he is not executing the work according

*Amendment Bill*

to the plans and specifications approved by the competent authority or is delaying the work.

The second point raised by Shri Dinen Bhattacharya is about the place where the existing occupants of the buildings will be taken during the transitional period. It may be stated that the Delhi Municipal Corporation—this Act applies only to Delhi and one other Union Territory—have already set up two transit camps for the slum-dwellers of the adjacent areas, one in the Ajmeri Gate area, and another in the Tis Hazari area. About 200 tenements have been constructed there and will be allotted to the slum-dwellers whose areas are taking up for improvement and re-development. The competent authority will be responsible for arranging accommodation for the slum dwellers during the transitional period.

The third point raised by Shri Bhattacharya is about the slum dwellers who will be rendered surplus when an area is improved or re-developed. The slum dwellers are now living in extreme congestion and it is inevitable that there will be some surplus population. The intention is that the majority of them will be settled in the buildings constructed at site, while the surplus population will be settled in some other areas. This matter will be looked after by the competent authority under the Act.

In this connection, it may be stated that the work of slum clearance is of a vast magnitude and can be accomplished only if private resources are also harnessed in addition to the available government finances. It is for this reason that provision has been made in the Act to enable the owners of slum areas also to re-develop such areas. But they will have to do it according to the plans and specifications approved by the competent authority and would also be under the obligation to let out the premises to the old tenants at a concessional

rent. Some incentives are also proposed to be given to them by allowing them to construct business premises and offices in the ground floor and first floor of the buildings, if it is permissible under the Master Plan.

The second observation of Shri Bhattacharya is in relation to clause 12. This relates to the fixation of rent. In cases where the buildings in a slum area have been improved or re-erected, the Joint Committee, as I have just mentioned, has already made provision for the fixation of rent at 6 per cent of the cost construction and cost of land in the case of improved buildings, and at 4 per cent of the cost of construction and cost of land in the case of re-erected buildings.

Shri Bhattacharya has raised two objections. Firstly, that there is no guarantee that the owner will take back the old tenants. Section 32 of the Act reads as follows:

"Whoever does any act in contravention of any notice, order or direction issued or given under this Act shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both."

If the owner of the slum area does not take back the old tenants, he will be acting in contravention of the orders of the competent authority under section 20A of the amending Bill, clause 12, and will make himself liable to imprisonment and fine in terms of the said section 32. It has been stated that prosecution will not be a sufficient deterrent. But it is difficult to agree with this view. The owner of the slum area would not willingly like to go to jail.

The second objection raised by the hon. Member is that determination of rent would be a process of prolonged litigation. This has already been

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna]

taken care of under the proposed section 20A, cl. 12. In sub-clause (2) of this clause, it has been provided that the owner will furnish plans and estimates of the work of improvement or re-erection of the building to the competent authority who will, on the basis of such plans and estimates, will fix the provisional rent that will be payable by the old tenants. The old tenants will be put in possession of the improved or re-erected buildings on the basis of this rent. Thereafter, the parties, if they so desire, can approach the competent court for determination of rent in accordance with the provisions laid down in the proposed section 20B, clause 12. Thus in the event of litigation, the tenant will be in an advantageous position, as he would be in possession of the premises.

Another point raised by Shri Bhattacharya is that provision should also be made against subletting or transfer of ownership of tenants of plots allotted to slum dwellers, with the necessary penal clauses. The greatest safeguard against these mal-practices is that the slum dwellers are allotted premises or plots as near the place of business as possible and at reasonable rents which are within their paying capacity. This basic principle has been kept in view in the amending Bill. Provision has been made to the effect that the old tenants will have the right to go back to the improved or re-erected buildings. Secondly, provision has been made for fixing the rent of such premises at a very concessional rate.

As for action against sub-letting, there will be two types of premises let out to slum dwellers. One will be those owned by Government and the other those owned by private persons. If the allottee sublets a part or whole of the premises, Government will be able to take action under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act and the private landlords under the Delhi Rent Control

Act. In cases where the ownership of tenements and plots is transferred to the slum dwellers by Government, an adequate provision will be made in the agreement against transfer of ownership to unauthorised persons.

In Delhi, we are now making a start as part of an experimental measure before we go to the rest of India. The allottees of houses under the slum clearance scheme have been permitted to purchase them in instalments over a period of 20 years but subject to the condition that they will not transfer the houses till they have paid the full cost of the houses and for a period of five years thereafter, without the permission of the Chief Commissioner or an officer authorised by him in this behalf. Suitable action will be taken to enforce this condition.

As I said in the beginning, if Shri Bhattacharya had been present in the Committee meetings and had discussed all these matters threadbare, there would have been no need for this note of dissent. Because for obvious reasons, from the various clauses of the Bill, the implications of the Bill and the decisions taken by the Joint Committee in the shape of recommendations that have come before the House, the whole position becomes very clear. The Bill has been discussed threadbare in this House and the other House. The principles of the Bill, as I said earlier, have been fully accepted—they were accepted as far back as 1956, when this Bill came for the first time before this House. Then our hon. colleague, Shri A. K. Sen was appointed to look into the question further. He made certain recommendations which have again been implemented. The rate of subsidy has been increased. It was previously, I believe, round about 50 per cent; it has now gone upto 62 per cent. The measures we have taken, with the co-operation of the general public, are in the interest of the slum dweller himself.

## Amendment Bill

Firstly, the idea is to improve slums. We might even give a little incentive because some of these lands were purchased a long time back and the purpose is the entire clearance of slums. So with the backing that I got from this House before and the backing that I am sure that I will get from the House, because the report of the Joint Committee is more or less unanimous, we should be able to go ahead with our slum clearance programme.

In Delhi, the situation is deteriorating practically every day. Apart from slums, we have got a large number of jhuggis and jhompri-wallas. Their number, according to the first census taken was round about 25,000 to 30,000—that was three or four years ago. Later on, according to our estimates, the number has gone up to 60,000. The problem is of a very serious nature. Once I made a statement in this House and outside that even those who have been left out inadvertently would be treated as our charge because when we propose to provide accommodation to 40 or 50 thousand, a few thousand more will not make a difference. But my main difficulty today is two-fold. One is that in spite of the penal measures that we are taking, in spite of some effective steps we are taking and in spite of the great support I have from this House, this unauthorised squatting is going on even today on a very large scale. Only about three days ago, I was passing through Shanti Path in Diplomatic Enclave towards Moti Bagh. To my utter disgust and surprise, I found new jhuggis being put up.

16 hrs.

So, this problem has to be solved, and jhuggi dwellers have to be provided with alternative accommodation, and we mean to do that. We have made a provision of Rs. 10 crores in the Budget; if need be, I can get some more money. But this problem goes on spreading, and there are certain parties that are bent upon doing that. I am not accusing any particu-

lar party, my friends may also be there. Certain vested interests have been created over a long number of years, and, unfortunately, we have to disturb them.

Yesterday, and I think it was in the newspapers this morning, a demonstration took place outside Corporation Hall, in old Delhi, and the demand that is made, when you read it, is very simple: instead of giving us 25 square yards, give us 80 square yards. The policy of the Government is to give 80 square yards to each eligible squatter, and their number, I have told you, is roughly 60,000 today. We want to remove these people, to take them to places very near to Delhi, so that they can go on doing their work, but if today the demand is made for 80 square yards instead of 25 square yards as we propose to give, this problem will be delayed for a long number of years.

Today we have sanctioned, under the Slum Clearance Scheme, about 7,800 tenements, of which more than 6,000 have already been completed, but under the jhuggi jhompri scheme which was started hardly a couple of years ago, and we are giving it a very great fillip now, 5,508 plots of 80 square yards have been sanctioned of which 4,720 have been completed; 15,430 plots of 25 square yards have been sanctioned, and 8,619 have been completed. Thus, against a sanction of 20,000, we have completed more than 13,000 plots, and anything between 8,000 and 9,000 families have also been moved to these sites. But plots of 80 square yards would mean three plots of 25 square yards; if plots of 80 square yards each are to be carved out, this scheme will have to be delayed for a long number of years. And on top of it, unauthorised squatting will go on.

I have seen most of these jhuggis; quite a large number of them form a part of my own constituency. I do not think any jhuggi-jhompdiwalla has a piece of land more than 25 square yards, he has not got even that. Any jhuggi-jhompdi that you see in

## Bill

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna]

Delhi is hardly 10 x 15 feet, i.e., anything between 10 and 15 square yards. So, what we are trying to do now is to develop these plots according to a phased programme. We are providing them with basic amenities of life, minimum I should say, in the beginning; we are providing them with roads, schools, dispensaries and all that. So, that, when they go there, they set up their own *jhuggis* in a developed area, and as time passed, we will give them 80 square yards.

So, I want to make a categorical statement in this House on behalf of Government that it is our intention to accommodate every eligible squatter whose name was enumerated in the census of 1960 June-July. Even if a name has been left out by mistake, we are prepared to consider him, not only consider him but accept him. I have gone to the length of telling these *jhuggi-jhompdiwallas* that if they can show their names in the voters' list of 1957, I will accept that the names have been left out. If a boy of a *jhompdiwalla* is going to school nearby and he can produce a certificate from the school that he has been studying in that school, we are prepared to accept that as evidence. If he has received a letter or a money order, or even if he has been fined in a court of law, if there is any kind of evidence which he can give which will convince us that he is an eligible squatter, we are prepared to consider his case. Our idea today is to take all those eligible squatters, even those who have been left out by mistake, to developed sites on the periphery of Delhi. We have developed a large number of sites in Narela, Ramesh Nagar, in the South of Delhi, in the North of Delhi and all these areas. Our idea is to take them there, give them developed plots of 25 square yards now, and as we go on developing, we will give them plots of 80 square yards each.

As I mentioned two minutes ago, out of the total of about 20,000 plots sanctioned, 5,500 plots of 80 square

yards have been sanctioned and 4,700 out of them have been allotted already. So, we go on allotting. But some kind of propaganda or agitation is being launched, demonstrations are being staged, and the idea is to scattle it, to give a political colour to the scheme which is in the best interests of those unfortunate people, to suit certain political ends. I am not blaming any party, or nobody at all. In this case I do hope that I will have the support of even my hon. friend Shri Banerjee, and that he will agree that if we have the best interests of these unfortunate people at heart we should do something quickly and expeditiously, so that we move them from those filthy, unhealthy, unsocial surroundings and give them a sort of decent living.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Let us go this evening and clear them. This evening Parliament is going to adjourn, let us go and see that they are cleared.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna:** The only trouble will be that you will go away to Kanpur, I know.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** There are slums in Kanpur also.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna:** This Bill only relates to Delhi. I have got great regard for him, he is a fine friend. Outside we always agree, but here we always differ, I do not know why, but that is neither here nor there.

So, I appeal to every section of the House, those who have got the best interests of these unfortunate people at heart, to see that I am given every kind of support and help, not only in the passing of this amending Bill, but also in the practical implementation of scheme. A slum is a bad spot, whether in Kanpur or Delhi or Bombay or Madras, and if I can do anything to ameliorate the sufferings of these unfortunate people, nobody would be happier than myself.

With these words, I move.

*Amendment Bill*

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill to amend the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Although this Bill relates specifically to Delhi, the fact remains that it has a country-wide significance because certain principles are being laid down in this Bill which are likely, since this is a Central legislation, to serve as a sort of model or guiding line for other pieces of legislation dealing with this problem in other parts of the country. Also, I do not think—I am sure the Minister will agree with me—that the problems of slum clearance or the conditions of slums wherever they may exist in the country are basically very different; they are more or less the same, whether it be in Delhi or anywhere else. Therefore, while we certainly welcome this Bill in so far as it goes—it does represent some advance on the past position—I am constrained to say that it does not go far enough, and that it is necessary to point out certain deficiencies and loopholes which exist even in this Bill as it has come before us from the Joint Committee.

I would remind the Minister that outside Delhi, in other cities of this country, slums not only exist, but are growing. He has expressed quite a lot of sorrow at this fact. We all feel dismayed to see it. The Prime Minister, whenever he is confronted face to face with slums in any part of this country, also gives vent to his dismay, and sometimes expresses himself very indignantly as we know. On one occasion, when he visited some slum areas, I think it was in Kanpur, he made a statement that these should be burnt down because they are not fit for human habitation. The point is that the Minister must realise that with the growth of industries and with the economic development going on, unless some very radical measures are taken however much he and I may deplore it, the problem of slums will grow;

it will not necessarily decrease simply because we are passing an Act of Parliament here.

In this connection, I would just like to bring his attention, an illustration. Just now, I came across the report of a socio-economic survey of slum dwellers in Hyderabad city conducted by the Bureau of Economics and Statistics of Andhra Pradesh Government. They say that the results of the survey revealed the multiplication of slums in Hyderabad city at a rapid pace in the recent past. There is multiplication going on. They say that during the last fifteen years the number of inhabitants in the slums of old Hyderabad city has increased by 25 per cent; as many as 65 new slums with a population of 66,000 proliferated in the city during the same period. Industrial growth and depression contribute much towards erection and movement of slums. The report also notes that the high cost of construction and the intermittent or under-employment and the growth of industrial areas without suitable plans for labour accommodation often forces people to accept shelter in sub-standard houses. I think this report of the Government of Andhra Pradesh has really summed up the core of the problem in all the cities, whether they be old major centres in our country like Calcutta or Madras or Bombay or Kanpur or whether they be the many new industrial towns and centres which are developing and are bound to develop. This problem of slums will acquire quite an important significance and so when this particular legislation is discussed here and is piloted by the Minister, I think his range of vision should be a little wider than being limited to the question of *jugghis* and *jhompdies* of Delhi or to some minute of dissent by the unfortunate Mr. Bhattacharya who is not here and who has been the main target of the Minister's criticism. These are all minor matters. The problem is vast.

The Minister makes frequent trips to Calcutta and I am sure that sometime or the other he must have avail-

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

ed himself of the opportunity to visit some of the slum areas. I do not mean areas particularly where refugees are concentrated but the general slum areas in Calcutta and Howrah. Sixty per cent of the population of that city lives in bastis and if the whole of Calcutta and Howrah is taken into consideration, the percentage would be even higher. You will remember that at the time of the unfortunate communal disturbances last January, a particular aspect of these riots was brought to the attention of the whole country by the Press and that was that one of the major forces operating behind the pattern of communal disturbances which occurred in Calcutta was the destruction and the burning down of a great number of bastis, and the forcible eviction of these basti dwellers naturally they could not exist there any more—from these lands. Every body in the country knows and the Government has admitted it too, that powerful basti owners and vested interests did play a very major part in these Calcutta communal disturbances. Because the whole object was that if the ramshackle bastis must be burned down under the guise of communal disturbances and these people could be evicted, then, it would be possible after that to earn considerably higher profits from the land, either by leasing out the land or erecting new buildings or putting up the price of land, because of land speculation, land values are very high in Calcutta as in every other major city today practically. And it is only an accident of that particular circumstances that the minority community areas, where the minority communities were concentrated more, were affected in Calcutta. I am sure that some of the basti-owners deplored the fact that it was not possible to exploit the communal disturbances to wipe out other basti areas too where the majority community resides. So, they had to satisfy themselves with those areas where the minority community was concentrated.

I may also mention in passing that this may be one of the reasons which impelled Shri Frank Anthony to make certain remarks which were not quite accurate but which led to such a furore recently a few weeks ago here. I know that area; the area to which he made reference is in my constituency, where his community is mainly concentrated in Calcutta. I know. It is true that a few houses of Anglo-Indians were also destroyed and burnt. But that was not because they were Anglo-Indians. Shri Anthony's remarks were rather unfortunate because he tended to give the impression that his community was also a target of these communal attacks; that was not at all. But what happens in many of these areas, is,—which are predominantly inhabited by Muslims, poorer Muslims in the bastis,—there is a certain intermingling of the poorer sections of the Anglo-Indian community: They are also very poor. But they live mixed up with the Muslims in certain areas. When these whole bastis were being burnt down or were sought to be burnt down, inevitably some of the unfortunate Anglo-Indian families were also affected. Shri Anthony unfortunately did not make that distinction and he gave a wrong impression to the House and the country. However, it was bad enough, as it was.

The reason why I am pointing out this is this. Of course, this Bill relates only to Delhi. But it says that the first opportunity for improvement or development of the area should be given to the owner of that land there or the owner of that building. I have not much first-hand experience of the basti-owners or land-owners of Delhi. But from our experience in Calcutta, I would say that it is really an illusion to expect that most of the basti-owners are interested really in slum clearance and slum improvement for the sake of these poor basti-dwellers. People can go to any length, as they did in Calcutta, to get organised gangs of hooligans, under cover of communalism, to attack and burn down the

bastis, and get them cleared. Everybody knows that the West Bengal Government had to come out with a special ordinance saying that in order to foil the game of these basti-owners and to see that all these people who had been affected and whose houses had been burnt down in the riot-affected areas should be given a certain measure of protection and those lands would not be allowed to pass into the hands of unscrupulous profiteers. But this kind of thing goes on.

Then there is another thing. These problems arise everywhere. That is perhaps an unusual circumstance; one would not call it a normal feature of life. But, for example, there are various schemes—slum clearance and improvement schemes—of various types in different parts of the country. But this Bill,—the principles which it embodies, if this is the pattern, model which has to be followed in other parts of the country too—does not give us any adequate safeguard in my view against some of the other evils and some of the other very disquieting features of this problem. For example, in Calcutta city, there is the Calcutta Improvement Trust which has got all sorts of schemes for improvement and clearing of slum areas. Unfortunately—I do not mean this in any narrow sense, but it is a fact—the experience that Calcutta's people have had so far with the Calcutta Improvement Trust Schemes—most of these schemes—is that once that land has been cleared and some new housing project is taken up by the CIT, it is found that most of that passes into the hands of certain section of non-Bengalis. I am not saying this from any provincial or narrow point of view but it is a fact, because there are certain moneyed interests—which Shri Khanna knows—in Calcutta who happen to be—it might not have been but they happen to be—non-Bengalis. They are in a position to financially to speculate on land and grab certain residential areas, lands and building houses. Therefore, the unfortunate result is that in Calcutta, the Calcutta Improvement Trust has

come to be regarded not as a sort of instrument of doing anything for the welfare of the people, but with a feeling of apprehension and panic in the minds of the people. The CIT has come to be regarded as if it were an instrument of eviction and repression and not as an instrument of welfare. But there is no precaution, no safeguard, against it.

Any law of slum clearance and betterment which depends primarily on the assumed goodwill and the assumed charitable disposition of those basti owners themselves is, I am afraid, doomed to failure, just as in other fields of economic and social life this Government is continuing to base itself only on appeals and depending on the goodwill and cooperation of the vested interests, with the result that none of these schemes are coming to fruition. For example, in the case of foodgrains control, Government continues to go on appealing to the All-India Foodgrain Dealers Association and so on, depending on their charity and mercy to stop doing blackmarketing, cornering or speculation of foodgrains. It does not work; it cannot work. It is no use living in a fool's paradise.

Therefore, one of the biggest weaknesses of this Act is this. May be in its application to Delhi, with the Minister sitting here on the spot, he may be able to get certain things done which are not possible at further distances; I do not know, I wish him well. Certainly to the extent he can do something here in Delhi, why should he be afraid that we will not give him our cooperation? Of course, we will. But the point is, the basic problem of basti-owners is that you cannot clear bastis piecemeal. In Calcutta, in every major street, fine-looking broad thoroughfares, lined on both sides by very good, three or four or six-storeyed houses, if you go behind the buildings by any lane or by-lane, you will find that behind everyone of these rows of buildings, there is a huge basti. They cannot be cleared piecemeal. You cannot take up one little basti, clear it and build

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

something there. In cities like Calcutta, schemes on a big scale have got to be executed. A whole area will have to be taken up for redevelopment. A proper plan like that has to be drawn up and executed. In such a case, I submit it is futile to expect that the basti-owner or the owner of that land on which the basti is situated can do it. Even if he wanted it, he could not do it and most of them do not want to do it either. So, the weakness of this legislation is that this competent authority for clearance and development, whoever it may be, in different parts of the country is not vested with the primary and supreme power to acquire an entire area directly and to develop it as part and parcel of a real big master plan.

There is too much hesitation and vacillation in the clauses of this Bill, as if we are under some sort of moral obligation more to the owners of the *bastis* than to the poor unfortunate dwellers there that every time we must give the *basti*-owners the first chance to do something. Even that I would not object to, but after that there is ample scope left for endless disputes and litigation to go on. The owner will claim his rights and he will dispute certain actions of the competent authority. An endless delaying process can be set in motion like that.

I cannot help referring to one or two points which are contained in Mr. Bhattacharyya's minute of dissent. I do not find there is anything wrong with them. He is making some positive constructive suggestions. I know once or twice in certain areas of Calcutta, an attempt was made to start the work of slum clearance and terrific opposition from the dwellers of that locality had to be faced, so that the authorities had to retreat. Why is it? Is a slum dweller basically or intransigently averse to being put in a better house or to live in a place where better facilities of sanitation, water supply, roads, housing and so on are available? Why does he resist? What is the fear in his mind? What is

the apprehension which makes him spontaneously, in these big cities, oppose any such scheme of this type? These are real problems. We must grapple with them.

There is this problem of alternative accommodation. Where is he to go? His *basti* will be cleared. He is told sometimes that later on when that area has been developed he may be given an opportunity to re-settle in that area or that he will be provided with a house. But two questions arise. First of all, where will he go in the meantime, in the interim period? Where will he go with his family? There is no clear-cut provision for this.

**Shri Mehr Chand Khanna:** I have made that clear.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** I do not know about Delhi, but I know most of this type of resistance takes place in our area because of this. There is no provision. Where are they to go? Unless these schemes are taken up on a big scale, nothing can be done. Even then, accommodation will not be provided and cannot be provided in Calcutta. Where will they provide it? If they take up a piecemeal scheme of clearance, where will they put these, let us say, 1000 families? Because no satisfactory answer comes to this question, people prefer to go on hanging on to their wretched huts in the *basties* where the conditions are atrocious, inhuman. They prefer to do that,—a bird in hand is worth two in the bush—rather than be thrown out not knowing where to go. So some principles must be laid down on a priority basis regarding this.

Then, there is the question of a certain proportion of the population which is likely to be displaced by the slum clearance scheme. They become surplus in the sense that they cannot be re-housed and re-settled in the same area again. These are very congested localities generally, as they are at present, and a certain proportion of that population will become surplus to that area itself. Where are they to

## Amenament Bill

go? What are the interim arrangements that will be made? There is mention about transit camps. Transit camps may work in Delhi, but I do not know whether they can work in Bombay, Calcutta or other big congested cities like that where built-up areas exist for miles together. There is no clear-cut provision about this at all.

There is also the question of fixation of rents in the new re-developed areas. Some provisions exist here. Some provisions have been laid down. But as my friend the Minister knows, in these big cities rent is generally a nominal matter. Of course, it does not fall strictly within the purview of this law, but unless simultaneously with this re-development and re-settlement the question of somehow or other checking, combating and suppressing these practices of salami and pugree is also taken up, this rent does not have any meaning at all. I am told even here, in these jhuggies and jhoparies, many of these people who are displaced as a result of these schemes would prefer to go and live somewhere else. "Somewhere else" means somewhere which is more convenient to them for the purpose of their daily occupation and earning their livelihood. Sometimes it does not mean mere re-settlement in a particular area will help that family very much. If he is removed to a great distance from the normal place of his occupation through which he was earning his livelihood and to which he has become accustomed, it will not help him. Shri Khanna knows the huge blocks of tenements which have been put up in South Calcutta—in Tollygunge area—not for slum dwellers as such but for refugees. They remained un-tenanted for years together. One of the main reasons was that it would entail these people being shifted quite a number of miles away from the place where they used to go every day to earn their livelihood. It would entail a great increase in their expenditure by way of transport and so on. Rather than go to these new tenements, they prefer to live in

their old huts which are convenient to them.

These are some of the things which I would like to point out. I do not think this type of legislation is adequate to meet the needs of the case. Because, if one leaves it to the owner of land to agree that he will allow these displaced persons to come back and occupy the new buildings which are to be put up, there is no guarantee that he will do anything of the kind. There are hundreds of ways by which he can get out. It is found that in many of these places actually these new tenements or buildings are inhabited by people who are non-allottees; the original people to whom they were allotted, or in whose names they continue to be allotted, do not occupy them at all. They are occupied illegally or improperly by other people who have probably agreed to pay a little higher rent, under the counter as it were, or who are able to pay the rent whereas the original slum dweller cannot afford to pay the rent which has been fixed. So, all these problems do exist.

I do not wish to take up any more time of the House, but I would just suggest to the hon. Minister that if he intends this Bill to be a sort of model or a line of guidance for the rest of the country then, of course, he should admit that it is very very inadequate, specially to meet the needs of the big metropolitan cities, and the sooner we really take this subject much more seriously the better it is. Because, though we have talked a lot about it, we have to admit it with shame that for sixteen years after the achievement of independence precious little has been done and slums still remain in our country. And however strongly we may feel about it, unless we do something in practice, they will remain not only a disgrace to us but they are exploited by all sorts of people even for doing publicity against India abroad. There are certain people who are interested in it. Most lurid accounts appear in papers and journals abroad, accompanied by photographs, of the slums

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

and the conditions of the slum dwellers, thousands of people fighting or quarrelling near one water tap and that kind of thing, and this is being propagated throughout the world, or parts of the western world at any rate as the typical picture of India after three Five Year Plans. So, our conscience should be stirred a little more strongly and we should act promptly if we really mean business. After all this Parliament is sovereign and it can legislate for the whole country. So, we must determine that we shall wipe out this scourge from the face of our country. If we look at the problem from this point of view, we will find that this Bill is inadequate. We will support it, so far as it goes, but, at the same time, we will ask Government not to rest content but to act more vigorously and take the necessary action promptly so that slums are wiped out.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैंगना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बिल जो आया है यह बहुत सुन्दर है लेकिन मैं इसमें यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार लिटीगेशन को न बढ़ाये। इतनी ज्यादा मुकदमेबाजियाँ बढ़ रही हैं कि उनकी वजह से देश की तरक्की रुकती है। इसी में सुफहा १ पर यह लिखा हुआ है :

"Provided that where the owner of the building is different from the owner of the land on which the building stands and the works of improvement required to be executed relate to provision of water taps...."

और आगे कहा गया है :

"...the notice shall be served on the owner of the land."

ओनर आफ दी लैंड और ओनर आफ दी बिल्डिंग का जब तक झगड़ा रहेगा तब तक सरकार को तरक्की भी रुकी रहेगी और लोग भी नहीं बस सकेंगे। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जो मकान जहाँ बने हुए हैं, उनमें अगर कोई बेकायदगी हुई है तो सरकार

उसकी जिम्मेवार हो, पब्लिक के लोग जिम्मेवार न हो। हमारा बहुत बड़ा कंस्ट्रिक्शन मानव शास्त्र धर्म का और याज्ञवल्क्य स्मृति का है। उसमें लिखा है कि अगर किसी प्रजा के घर में डाका पड़ता है तो उस डाके की एक एक पाई सरकार के खजाने स दी जाए। पब्लिक के लिए लिखा हुआ है कि जहाँ गवर्नमेंट की बिल्डिंग के ऊपर थोड़ी बहुत बेकायदगी हुई है वहाँ सरकार का फर्ज यह है कि जो बसा हुआ है उससे राइट्स लिए जायें और जो थोड़ा बहुत नुकसान हुआ है उसकी सरकार जिम्मेवार हो।

मैं इस मामले में अपने मिनिस्टर साहब को बहुत खशकिस्मत सगंधता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो काम किया वह अच्छा किया। लेकिन इसके साथ साथ मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो ५.५३ करोड़ रुपये दिल्ली में ४३ गन्दी बस्तियों को साफ करने में खर्च किया गया। इस बिल में यह नहीं दिखाया गया कि विलेज कम्युनिटी के लिए कितना खर्च किया गया। देहात में देश के ८५ प्रतिशत लोग बसे हैं, लेकिन देहात के स्लम क्लियरेंस के लिए देहात की तरक्की के लिए आज तक कोई ऐसा कम्प्री-हैसिव बिल नहीं आया कि देहात के लोग भी उससे कुछ फायदा उठा सकें।

इस दिल्ली के अंदर जो सफारिजें १० के ० सैन कमेटी ने की थीं उनको इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया गया है। उस कमेटी ने कहा था कि स्लम क्लियरेंस के लिए बड़े भारी पैमाने पर उन इलाकों में जमीन एक्वायर की जाए, लेकिन अभी तक उस काम का सांवा हिस्सा भी नहीं हो सका है। जरूरत इस बात की है कि यह काम बजाय सरकार के लोगों को सौंपा जाए, और जिस तरह से यह नारा लगाया जाता है कि जमीन जोतने वाले की है उसी तरह से यह नारा भी लगाया जाए कि जो मकान में रह रहा है मकान पर उसका

दृढ़ होना चाहिए। यह करना पड़ेगा सरकार को। अगर सरकार आज इसको नहीं करती तो उसको यह काम पांच साल बाद करना पड़ेगा।

इसके अन्दर सब से ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण बात यह है कि अशोक सेन कमेटी ने सिफारिश की है कि इस काम के लिये दो हजार करोड़ रुपये दिया जाय, लेकिन अब तक केवल ६०० करोड़ दिया गया है। सरकार को दो हजार करोड़ रुपये की व्यवस्था इस काम के लिये करनी चाहिये नहीं तो यह मसला कभी तय नहीं होगा।

सरकार बहाना करती है कि आबादी बढ़ती जा रही है। लेकिन इस आबादी बढ़ने का दायित्व भी सरकार पर है, किसी और पर नहीं है। और अगर आबादी बढ़ती है तो उसका कुछ इनाज किया जाना चाहिये। अगर हमारी कोई राय मान ले तो उससे स्थिति में सुधार हो सकता है, और उससे सरकार और देश दोनों का लाभ हो सकता है। मैंने कई बार कहा है कि इस आबादी का इनाज धर्म युद्ध है। आज हमारे करोड़ों लोग हिमालय को तरफ बढ़ें जहां चीन ने हमारे देश को ३८,००० मुरब्बा जमीन पर कब्जा कर रखा है और उसको उससे छोनें। अगर हम फतेहवाब हो गए तो चीन को बनो बनायो कार्रियों में रहेंगे, और अगर मद गए तो सरकार का आबादी का ममला हन हा जयेगा। हमारे यहां शीता में कहा गया है :

संभावितस्य चाकोर्तिमेमरणदतिगिच्यते

जिन्दगी की और अपमान की जिन्दगी से तो मोटा अच्छो है।

क्या सरकार के लिये यह चीज शोभादायक है कि दिल्ली में एक एक टैप के ऊपर सौ-सौ और पचास पचास आदमी खड़े हों। इतना हो नहीं चांदनी चौक में तो यूरिनलस पर

यह हालत है कि सौ सौ आदमी खड़े हैं और एक दूसरे की खुशामद करता है कि मुझे पहले चला जाने दो मेरी गाड़ी जाने वाली है। क्या यह स्थिति सरकार के लिए शोभादायक है।

मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि जो काम श्री मेहरचन्द्र खन्ना ने किया है उतना बड़ा काम हिन्दुस्तान का कोई दूसरा आदमी नहीं कर सकता था, और मुझे आगे भी उनसे भरोसा है। उनकी देश भक्ति उनसे यह काम करवाती है। जो देश भक्त होते हैं उनको भगवान काम करने की शक्ति दे देता है। नेता जी सुभाशचन्द्र बोस कोई मिलिट्री के आदमी नहीं थे, आई०सी०एस० के आदमी थे, लेकिन उनकी देश भक्ति के कारण भगवान ने उनको शक्ति दे दी और दुनिया में सबसे बड़ी फौज के कमांडर इन चीफ बने और उन्होंने सब से सख्त फौज पैदा कर दी। मैं जानता हूँ कि खन्ना जी ने बीमारी की हालत में एक करोड़ लोगों से ज्यादा को बसाया और उन घरों के बच्चों से हम आज भी ये गीत सुनते हैं :

पराई आग में जलना मरीजों की  
दवा होना,

कोई सीखे मिहरचन्द्र से लाइलाजों  
की शफा होना।

और अगर इस काम को एप्रोसिएशन नहीं मिलेगा तो काम आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता। सरकार को चाहिये कि तहय्या कर ले कि आज हमको गरीब आदिमियों को बसाना है। अगर सरकार ऐसा तहय्या कर ले तो हम सब काम छोड़ कर, घर का खाना छोड़ कर इस काम में सहयोग करने को तैयार हैं। मैं अपनी तरफ से दावत देता हूँ कि मैं अपने पलैट में एक परिवार को बिना किराये बसाने को तैयार हूँ। आज वजीरों के पास इतनी बड़ी कठिनायें हैं कि जिनमें घुड़दोड़ ही सकती है और उनमें चालीस चालीस हजार आदिमियों को बसाया जा सकता है। अगर ऐसा किया जाय तो यह मसला हल हो सकता है। मैं कहता हूँ कि आज जो लोग पूर्वी पाकिस्तान

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

से उजड़ कर आ रहे हैं उसमें उनका कोई पाप नहीं है। गुनाह तो हम ने किया था कि धर्म के बेसिस पर विभाजन को स्वीकार कर लिया। पाप तो किया था हम ने और उसका फल भुगतना पड़ रहा है उनको। वे तो हमारे लिये पूजनीय हैं। जैसे ईसा मसीह ने लोगों के पास का गफकारा किया था उसी प्रकार ये लोग हमारे पास का गफकारा कर रहे हैं। ये तो हमारे मसीहा हैं। यह दुनिया का कोई कायदा नहीं है, यह कोई इन्साफ नहीं है कि पाप तो करे ज़ेद और फांसी लगायी जाय बकरे को। हमने तकसीन को मंजूर किया था। उसका फल हम सब को भोगना चाहिये। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि जिस तरह से मैं अपने फ्लैट में एक परिवार को बसने के लिये तैयार हूँ उसी प्रकार मिनिस रों की कॉठियों में दस दस बीस बीस और सौ सौ परिवार बसाए जायें। अगर देखा जाय तो दिल्ली के अन्दर आज भी यह हालत है कि एक, एक आदमी के पास इतनी इतनी बड़ी कॉठियाँ हैं कि वह उन को सफाई नहीं करा सकते, उन में झाड़ू बूहारू नहीं दे सकते, जाला भी नहीं हटा सकते, उन बड़ी बड़ी कॉठियों को ब्लाइटवाश भी नहीं करा सकते तब भी उनमें बटे बटे हुए हैं। अगर वह बक्त नहीं लायेंगे तो जनता ले आयेंगी। जाहिर है कि जो पहल करेगा, जो इनीशिएटिव लेगा वह जीतेगा। जनता अगर पहल करेगी तो वह जीतेगी लेकिन अगर सरकार ने पहल की तो वह जीतेगी लेकिन एक बात साफ है कि यह कराड़ों लांग घर से बेघर नहीं रह सकते।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आज तक झुग्गी झोंपड़ी वालों के किसी प्रदर्शन में शामिल नहीं हुआ हूँ। मुझे उन के साथ हमदर्दी है। मैं उन के लिये तन, मन दे सकता हूँ। मैं उन के लिये तन मन, धन से हर एक सेवा कर सकता हूँ लेकिन मैं उन्हें जाकर इसलिये नहीं भड़काता, आज तक उनके किसी जलूस में इसलिये नहीं जाता, उन के प्रदर्शन में इसलिये शामिल

नहीं होता कि मुझे माननीय श्री मेहरचन्द खन्ना की काबिलियत पर विश्वास है और जब जनता को विश्वास है तो यह काम करना पड़ेगा और इस काम को सरकार पहल करे और इस आघार को मान कर पहल करे कि लेंड मस्ट गो टु दी टिलर। जमीन जो जोतता है वह उस का मालिक बनाया जाय। मकान में जो रहता है वह उसका मालिक बनाया जाय तभी यह मसला हल हो सकता है।

इस में प्रगति की जाय। देश की तरक्की क्यों रुकती है उस के लिये मैं एक मिनट की बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि तरक्की इस लिये रुकती है कि जो देश को चलाना चाहते हैं उन के ऊपर रैस्ट्रिक्शन्स हैं। इजरायल में इसलिये सजा दी जाती है कि दुकानदार ने दुकान क्यों नहीं खोली लेकिन हमारे यहां दिल्ली में हम देखते हैं कि इसका बिल्कुल उलटा चल रहा है। यहां भले ही दुकान ६ महीने बंद रहे कोई पूछने वाला नहीं है अलबत्ता अगर दुकानदार ने साढ़े सात बजे अपनी दुकान को बंद नहीं किया तो इसके लिये सजा दी जाती है कि उसने अपनी दुकान को वक्त पर बंद क्यों नहीं किया। बस इतना ही फर्क है कर्महीनता और कर्मवीरता में। वह इसलिये सजा देते हैं कि दुकान खोली क्यों नहीं और यहां इसलिये सजा देते हैं कि दुकान बंद क्यों नहीं की।

आज भी एक मुहकमा है सरकार का जो कि खास तौर से स्पीड के ऊपर रैस्ट्रिक्शन्स लगाता है ताकि गाड़ियां तेज न चल सकें। वे ४० मील की स्पीड से ज्यादा न चल सकें, ५० मील की रफ्तार से ज्यादा न चल सकें इसको वह देखता है लेकिन इस सरकार ने कोई ऐसा मुहकमा तैयार नहीं किया जो कि यह देखे कि गाड़ी दस मील की स्पीड से कम क्यों जा रही है और गाड़ी बीस मील की स्पीड से कम क्यों जा रही है। अगर हाई स्पीड के ऊपर कंट्रोल हो तो लो स्पीड के

ऊपर भी कंट्रोल होना चाहिये ताकि वह जरूरत से ज्यादा धीमी न चले। अगर लो स्पीड पर कंट्रोल नहीं होगा तो राष्ट्र का हिलजबूद हो जायेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ और सरकार से कहता हूँ कि वह बिजली की गति से इन लाखों आदमियों के बसाने के काम को अपने हाथ में ले और जो भी सहयोग उसमें हम दे सकते हैं उसे देने के लिये हर वक्त सब काम छोड़ कर वह सहयोग हम उसे देने के लिये तैयार हैं। भगवान से प्रार्थना है कि हमें इसमें सफलता मिले।

श्री बाल्मीकी (खुर्जा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं गन्दी बस्ती क्षेत्र (सुधार तथा सफाई) संशोधन बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ। इसलिये स्वागत करता हूँ कि इस बिल का सम्बन्ध इन गन्दी बस्तियों में रहने वाले हजारों लाखों आदमियों से है, इस विधेयक की खूबियाँ भी हैं और दोष भी। हमें आशा है कि हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी उन लाखों आदमियों को जिनके बसाने का अब तक भी इतने दिन के बाद भी कोई उचित प्रबन्ध नहीं हुआ है, बसाने की सुविधा देंगे और इस प्रकार इस समस्या को हल कर सकेंगे। यह बात भी साफ है कि गन्दी बस्तियों में जो हमारे भाई रहते हैं उन में से कुछ की समस्याएँ हल हो गयी हैं लेकिन बहुतां की बाकी हैं और उन लोगों को मंत्री महोदय से बड़ी आशा है और उनका विश्वास है कि मंत्री जी के रहते हुए उन की समस्याएँ हल हो जायेंगी और उन को विशेष ङंग से बसाया जायेगा।

सारे देश के अन्दर जो भी गन्दी बस्तियाँ हैं, दिल्ली की या और बड़े नगरों की, उनमें से बहुतां को देखने का अवसर मुझे प्राप्त हुआ है। अभी १०-१२ दिन पहले कलकत्ते में और बंगाल के कुछ भागों में मैं गया था और वहाँ भी मैं ने देखा कि यह गन्दी बस्तियाँ बजाय घटने के बढ़ती ही जा रही हैं।

लाखों आदमी भ्राम्यवन्न पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से यहां आ गये और अभी आ रहे हैं। यह देश का दुर्भाग्य ही कहा जायगा कि हमारे यहां एक ऐसी विकट स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है कि उस भाग से लाखों लोग इधर आने को विवश हो रहे हैं। उन के बसाने के लिये प्रबन्ध किया जा रहा है वह एक अलग समस्या है, लेकिन आप देखें कि अनधिकृत झुग्गी झोंपड़ी व मकानों का जो बनाने का सिलसिला है वह अभी बन्द नहीं हुआ है इसीलिये बन्द नहीं हुआ है कि जो सुपरवाइजरी मशीनरी इस काम को रोकने के लिये है वह कोई बहुत स्वच्छ नहीं है। वह दूध में घुली हुई नहीं है वह भ्रष्टाचार की तह के अन्दर है। मैं यह कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि यहां दिल्ली में भी और दिल्ली से बाहर भी इस तरह की बस्तियों में जो लोग आते हैं, या नई नई झोंपड़ी बनती हैं उसमें कोई इस तरीके का काम हमारी ओर से या किसी भी ओर से नहीं चलता है। हो सकता है कि किसी संस्था का हाथ हो वह एक अलग बात है। इधर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों से, जहां काम घंघे, रोजगार और जीवन-यापन का दूसरा कोई साधन नहीं है। मजबूरी में लोग इधर आते हैं। आज इतने दिन की स्वतन्त्रता के पश्चात् तीन योजनाओं के पश्चात् भी ऐसे साधारण लोगों को जो भूमि हीन हैं, धनहीन हैं, भ्रमवहीन हैं, सम्पत्तिहीन हैं और सुखहीन हैं बसाने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया गया है। मैं यहां इस सदन में कहने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि मेरे पास मुई की नोक के बराबर भी अपनी धरती नहीं है। अगर मैं पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर नहीं होता तो पकीनी तौर से बिला किसी लिहाज के क्यों यहां दिल्ली में मेरे कोई रहने का प्रबन्ध ही नहीं होता मैं भी उन अनधिकृत लोगों के साथ ही अपनी झोंपड़ी डालता, विशेष कर जो हमारी आज की सरकार है वह समाजवाद को मानती है और समाजवादी व्यवस्था में विश्वास करती है इस नाते मनुष्य के जीवन

[श्री बाल्मीकी]

के लिए मनुष्य के सुखी जीवन के लिए और मनुष्य को कुछ दूसरे जीवन-यापन के साधन देने के लिए कोई उचित प्रबन्ध किया जाय। वैसे प्रबन्ध हुआ भी है लेकिन आवास का प्रश्न अब भी एक कठिन प्रश्न है। गन्दी बस्तियों में रहने वालों का प्रश्न भी एक ऐसा ही प्रश्न है। जैसा कि मैंने अर्ज किया है कि हमारे जीवन को सुखी तथा सफल करने के लिए उन लोगों के जीवन को सुखी करने के लिए जो कि धनहीन हैं भूमिहीन हैं वैभवहीन हैं और सुखहीन हैं उनको सुखी करने के लिए जो प्रयत्न चले हैं वह अच्छे तरीके से नहीं चले हैं।

हमारी नीति औद्योगीकरण की है और जो हमारा बजट बनता है वह औद्योगीकरण को आधार मान कर बनता है। उद्योग इस प्रकार बढ़ते हैं और जाहिर है कि अगर उद्योग बढ़ते हैं उनके पीछे अनधिकृत बस्तियां और अनधिकृत स्थानों पर बसने वाले लोग भी बढ़ते हैं। उनको रोक नहीं जा सकता है इसलिए जरूरी हो जाता है कि गांवों में रहने वाले ऐसे लोगों को वहीं बसाया जाना चाहिए...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्य श्री काफ़ी समय लेंगे या अपने भाषण को वह खत्म करने वाले हैं ?

**श्री बाल्मीकी :** अभी तो मैं मुख्य विषय पर आने वाला हूँ। इसलिए अभी मैं इस पर और समय लूंगा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** ठीक है माननीय सदस्य अपने भाषण को अगले सेशन में जारी रखें।

**श्री बाल्मीकी :** मुझे यह प्वाएंट समाप्त कर लेने दिया जाय बाकी मैं अगले सेशन में लूंगा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्य अब अगले सेशन में ही बोलें।

**श्री बाल्मीकी :** बहुत अच्छा।

16.49 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A  
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC  
IMPORTANCE

REPORT BREAKDOWN OF MILK SUPPLIES  
BY DMS—contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Indrajit Gupta may put his question now regarding the Delhi Milk Supply Scheme.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta South West): From the statement I find that the factors responsible for the short supplies are the very unfavourable conditions for milk production due to various reasons, such as heavy rains and death of buffaloes etc. which have been prevailing from about the middle of September, 1963. If that be the case, I would like to know why during the period from September, 1963 to May, 1964, the Ministry has always denied reports that the Delhi Milk Scheme is heading for any difficulties. Also, why is it that the consumers were given only 24 hours' notice before the cut was imposed? Even if the cut be imposed, why should the Delhi Milk Scheme raise its own price of milk? Even if there is scarcity, why should the prices be raised?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture** (Shri A. M. Thomas): The previous occasion when a statement was made that there may not be any necessity for any cut was in March. The daily supply of buffalo milk on 4-4-64 exceeded 3,500 maunds. It is in the last few days that there has been a short-fall in the supply. It went down to even 2,250 maunds day before yesterday, so that with extreme regret we had necessarily to effect this cut.