

the then Labour Minister, the present Home Minister, had written to say that the report should be expedited in four or five months. By that time, a number of questions had been asked in Parliament.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: How does he say that it did not overlap? After all, the Chairman was not also a chicken. When he stated that there was overlapping, he must have given the reasons and shown how there was overlapping.

Mr. Speaker: This is entering into argument.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What were the issues involved? It is not a question of argument; it is a question of information.

Mr. Speaker: How do they say there was no overlapping—that is entering into argument.

Shri Daji: Is it a fact that the World Bank team's terms of reference were subsequently enlarged to include transport by all means and transport of all goods?

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: The team wanted to have a complete idea of rail, road and canal transport. They were concerned with it in a general way. It did not overlap at all.

Assistance to States

- +
- *757. { **Shri Kachhavaia:**
Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri Bishanchander Seth:
Shri Dhaon:
Shri B. P. Yadava:
Shri Subodh Hansda:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have of late decided to increase Central assistance for the States' Development projects for 1964-65 by about Rs. 55 crores; and

(b) how much of this additional assistance would go to Assam and other States individually?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour and Employment and for Planning (Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

States	Central assistance intimated to States	
	on 26-9-1963	on 22-1-1964
	1	2
Andhra Pradesh	39.50	43.05
Assam	14.40	22.10
Bihar	47.40	51.80
Gujarat	19.70	21.95
Jammu & Kashmir	13.40	13.95
Kerala	22.00	26.20
Madhya Pradesh	39.30	47.20
Madras	40.30	43.45
Maharashtra	36.00	36.10
Mysore	22.20	29.75
Orissa	29.00	34.20
Punjab	29.10	32.10
Rajasthan	31.90	39.55
Uttar Pradesh	78.00	78.30
West Bengal	36.80	38.80
TOTAL:	499.00	558.50

श्री कछवाय : श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो धन-राशि राज्यों का दी जा रही है वह किन-किन कामों में लाई जायेगी—वह कृषि में या अन्य कामों में लाई जायेगी ?

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: Really it was to be financed through Central assistance of Rs. 500 crores and States' resources of Rs. 350 crores. State-wise allocation of Central assistance of Rs. 499 crores was also indicated.

I shall read four or five sentences as I think it is necessary to give the details.

The aggregate for the draft plans 1964-65 proposed by the State Gov-

ernments amounted to Rs. 1,001 crores against which the Working Groups recommended an outlay of Rs. 1,048 crores and the outlay which emerged after discussion amounted to Rs. 941 crores. In the resources Working Group the States' resources were estimated at Rs. 353 crores. With the Central assistance allocated at Rs. 499 crores there was a gap of Rs. 89 crores under the State Plans. The position regarding this gap was discussed with the Ministry of Finance on 4th January, 1964 and it was agreed to increase the allocation of Central assistance to States to Rs. 575 crores, of which Rs. 558.5 crores has been allocated to States and Rs. 16.5 crores kept back—Rs. 15 crores for augmenting outlays on Agricultural Programmes and Rs. 1.5 crores for a few important social service programmes.

श्री कछवाय : श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि चूँकि मध्य प्रदेश इतना बड़ा प्रदेश है और उस को जो राशि दी गई है, वह कम है, इसलिये क्या सरकार उस राशि को बढ़ाने पर विचार कर रही है।

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: For Madhya Pradesh, it was Rs. 39.30 crores. Now this has gone up to Rs. 47.20 crores.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा : श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि किन्-किन राज्यों ने उन को दी गई राशि को कम बताया है और राजस्थान ने जो ज्यादा राशि की मांग की थी, उस के बारे में क्या सोचा गया है।

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: May I read the figures?

Mr. Speaker: For all the States it need not be read. Of course, every State must have said that they want more. He wants to know only about Rajasthan.

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: For Rajasthan, from Rs. 31.90 it has gone up to Rs. 39.55 crores.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा: अकाल की वजह से राजस्थान ने ज्यादा राशि की मांग की थी। क्या उस के लिये रुपया इसी राशि में दिया गया है, या उस के लिए अलग राशि दी जायेगी ?

Mr. Speaker: For famine conditions, is the amount separate, or is it included in this?

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): It is not included. The amount spent on famine relief is not included in this. The problem itself is that in regard to famine conditions in Rajasthan some other things have to be done. These methods are being looked into by Government, not only to provide famine relief. If as a result of famine, certain other expenditure has to be undertaken for purposes of relief, then that will be looked into.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Rather inaudible.

Shri Ranga: Perhaps you, Sir, could hear the answer, but we could not.

Mr. Speaker: That is being looked into. If more funds are needed, they may provide.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: The hon. Minister said just now that the Central Government had given extra funds to the States. The Finance Minister had said that the Government of Andhra Pradesh had requested that either the Nagarjunasagar project should be taken up by the Centre or extra funds should be provided. So, I want to know whether specific provision for this has been made by the Planning Commission, so as to relieve the development pressure on the State of Andhra Pradesh.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a matter which it is not possible for us to go into in this House. The States do have a very legitimate case

for implementing the schemes they have on hand. Of course, they have not got the resources, but the Centre's resources, too, are not unlimited. That is where the Planning Commission comes in to discuss with the States and the Central Government and to define certain priorities. So, the methodology of it is rather difficult for us to discuss. At the moment what has been said is the amount mentioned by my colleague. Beyond that, I do not think I can add to the information of the House.

श्री विश्व नाथ पाण्डेय : कुछ पहले उत्तर प्रदेश के चार जिलों, देवरिया, आजमगढ़, जौनपुर और गाजीपुर, के विकास के सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने पटेल कमेटी नियुक्त की थी। इस सम्बन्ध में पटेल कमेटी ने जो रिपोर्ट सरकार को प्रस्तुत की है, उस के आधार पर इन जिलों के विकास के लिए सरकार ने कितना धन स्वीकृत किया है, वह धन विकास के किस कार्य में लगाया जायेगा और कब तक ?

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: The question refers to the backward areas in Uttar Pradesh, so far as I can understand it. Separate answers have been given with regard to the help and the pilot studies which took place.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: In view of the Prime Minister's repeated statements that the *per capita* income of Bihar is the lowest compared to all other States in India, may I know whether the Government contemplate to give more additional assistance for the development of Bihar?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Subject to the overall position of the Central resources, the requirements of every State will be considered.

श्री गुलशन : श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब राज्य को दी गई सहायता का क्या ब्यौरा है और उस में से जो सहायता हरिजन-कल्याण के लिए दी गई है, उस का क्या ब्यौरा है ?

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: As I said, it comes under the Social Welfare Board. It is rather a different heading. But I may point out that for Punjab, from Rs. 29.10 crores, it has gone up to Rs. 32.10 crores.

Shri Basumatari: May I know whether this is correct or not; namely, due to the heavy floods in Assam last year,.....

Mr. Speaker: If representatives from every State desire to put questions, even one question may take more than 15 minutes or so!

Shri Basumatari: This is with regard to planning, and Assam is specifically mentioned in part (b) of the question. I wanted to know whether this is correct or not namely, the Assam Government wanted an additional allotment for giving relief on account of the heaviest floods that took place in Assam last year but it was refused. I want to know whether this is correct or not.

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: The answer to it follows from what the hon. Finance Minister said just now in regard to Rajasthan. In Rajasthan and Assam, if there are special conditions, they will merit special treatment.

Unemployment among Graduates

+

*758. { **Shri Bibhuti Mishra:**
Shri Maheswar Naik:

Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the number of unemployed graduates in the country is increasing year after year;

(b) the latest position in this regard; and

(c) if so, whether Government have thought over this problem and taken any decision thereon?