

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): The broad conclusion was that, with the resources, which may become available, we should maintain the existing target of outlay and not change it, in financial terms. That was endorsed by them, the panel of economists.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the panel of economists remaining silent on whether the investment plan exceeded the estimated resources, may I know if the Government are going to enlighten this House on this particular point?

Shri Nanda. No, Sir. We are going to submit to the House a memorandum which will set out all the facts that can be presented with regard to all these aspects.

Shri Heda: In view of the interest in the implementation of the Second Five Year Plan, may I know whether this memorandum that is proposed to be prepared now would be prepared periodically and laid on the Table of the House?

Shri Nanda: In the course of this month, it is hoped that it will be ready, and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: In view of the answer given in reply to a supplementary question yesterday by the Deputy Minister of Finance, stating that Rs 987 crores will be the foreign exchange component for the rest of the plan period and in view of the fact that the Deputy Minister of Planning answered—

Mr. Speaker: All that is taken note of by them. What does the hon. Member want?

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: I want to know how the variation of Rs 267 crores arises.

Shri Nanda: These are two different figures. The figure given by us was what was needed now for the purpose of implementation.

Internal Resources of Second Five Year Plan

L

*659. { Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:

Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state whether any assessment has been made regarding the internal resources for the Second Five Year Plan for 1958-59 and, if so, lay a statement showing

(a) the amount to be raised by each State and the Centre in 1958-59,

(b) how does it compare with the expectations of the Planning Commission, and

(c) whether it is a fact that the States have been lagging much behind the target in raising their internal resources?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) and (b) State Governments are expected to find about Rs 181 crores for financing their plans during 1958-59. This estimate falls short by about Rs 7 crores of the amount initially calculated by the Planning Commission for financing of State plans during 1958-59. A statement indicating the total resources to be found by each State in accordance with the recent discussions with the Planning Commission is laid on the Table of the House [See Appendix IV, annexure No 17].

Estimates of resources for the Central Government have already been presented in the budget statement for 1958-59 which was laid before Parliament by the Prime Minister on the 28th February 1958.

(c) It is proposed to review the progress made by States in raising resources in a Memorandum on the appraisal and prospects of the Second Five Year Plan which is under preparation and is to be presented to Parliament during the current session.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I know what steps are being taken to mobilise the depreciation and reserves of the various companies which was announced last year?

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): I do not think it has anything to do with this question.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether the Government can give us any idea of what was the expected return from small savings raised by the Centre and the States and what has been the actual returns on small savings?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): That figure upto the month of January has been mentioned in the speech of the Finance Minister on the budget, but the normal expectation is that there should be, on small savings a collection of the order of Rs. 100 crores a year.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: What has been the shortfall?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly refer to the budget.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I know what positive steps have been taken to save leakage of income-tax and in recovering the income-tax arrears?

Shri Nanda: That does not necessarily arise out of this, but I can say certain efforts are being continuously made in that direction.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Can the Government give us an idea of the target if any target has been fixed for raising the resources by additional taxation?

Mr. Speaker: There is no more taxation for the year.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I refer to the target after the report of the Taxation Enquiry Committee. May we have an idea of the target being fixed?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will try to avoid merely repeating the academic questions on the floor of the

House. It is enough for the hon. Members getting facts. This year, there is no more taxation.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I am asking about the target.

Mr. Speaker: There is no target. Of course, let it not be understood that I am answering for the hon. Ministers here. What I want to say is, general discussion on policy should be avoided during the Question Hour, such as a big statement about the second Plan, details, and all that. For instance, in how many States the amount has been allotted and so on,—such questions are asked—and each hon. Member coming from the States takes it up. There is no taxation this year. The hon. Member asks how many recommendations they are going to implement for all the years together. Is that relevant here?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Because the plan of the States is being finalised by the Planning Commission. The States have given an idea of the resources they are going to raise during the next five years. We want to know what is the target fixed for the States in the matter of small savings and other things. It is very relevant.

Mr. Speaker: I will certainly give her an opportunity to speak on the general budget.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: That is true. But the question relates to the Plan being finalised. The different plans of the States are being finalised by the Planning Commission. The whole structure of the Second Five Year Plan of the States is before the Planning Commission. I think we have every right to know what are the States expecting and what are the resources they have at their disposal. I cannot understand how it is not relevant here.

Shri Punnoose: Is there any principle governing the amount that has to be found by the State and the amount allotted in the Plan by the Planning Commission?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): Yes, there are principles. Probably, the hon. Member is referring to the Central assistance. In this connection I can mention particularly three points: one is the nature of the schemes put forward; secondly, the capacity of the States to rise resources, and thirdly the capacity of the States to incur expenditure.

Budget Provisions for 1958-59

*660. {
 Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:
 Shri D. C. Sharma:
 Shri Panigrahi:
 Shri Damani:
 Shri Mohamed Imam:
 Shri B. S. Murthy:
 Shri S. M. Banerjee:
 Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi:
 Shri Punnoose:
 Shri Vasudevan Nair:
 Shri N. R. Munisamy:
 Shri Siddananjappa:
 Shri Ram Krishan:
 Sardar Iqbal Singh:
 Shri Shobha Ram:
 Shri Raghunath Singh:
 Shri Kalika Singh:
 Shri Vajpayee:
 Shri Hem Raj:
 Shri Daljit Singh:
 Shri Harish Chandra
 Mathur:
 Shri Sanganna:

Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state whether Planning Commission has discussed with all the States the plan provisions and programme for 1958-59 and, if so, lay a statement showing:

(a) the total amount provided for each State and how it compares with the expenditure for previous two years;

(b) whether there has been any reduction in the outlay originally proposed by the States;

(c) if so, the amount reduced from the outlay of each State; and

(d) the principles governing the reduction?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 18]

(d) Another statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 18]

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: From the statement it appears that some of the States which raised their resources below expectation have been given more allotment by the Planning Commission while, on the other hand, some of the States, which raised more resources, have been given less allotment by the Planning Commission. May I know what the underlying reason or idea behind it is?

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): I do not think this is a fair presumption to make. If the hon. Member has got any particular State in mind, we would invite a question.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: From the statement it appears that Bihar, Bombay and U.P., which have raised proportionately bigger amounts have got large cuts from the Planning Commission. May I know the reason for that?

Shri S. N. Mishra: In respect of the States mentioned, I do not think there has been such a large cut. If you compare it with the original Plan outlays that were submitted by the State Governments, of course, the cut would appear to be somewhat larger. It is not on that basis however that the Planning Commission, in consultation with the States, determine the figures. There are other considerations.

Shri Panigrahi: May I know whether the targets agreed to by the Planning Commission for different States include the targets assigned for each State to be raised from their internal resources?