

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

to benefit that area financially or within five years or eight years and if it is not going to be remunerative if the expenditure is to be 5 per cent or 7 per cent," let us not construct it."

Now, there are examples. I will cite the example of Pathankot-Jammu line which was found to be unremunerative as per the survey reports. Now it is so much beneficial to the Railways that there are demands for doubling and the railway track being extended up to Udhampur also. So, lines which were found to be unremunerative at one point of time because there were poor industrial prospects or considered uneconomical may turn out to be very beneficial and financially remunerative at a future reference date. So, this criteria or this calculus of measuring should be changed and the financial aspect should not be taken into account and the wider economic gain that the country and the community is going to have should be examined more closely and we should now adopt what is the economic approach rather than the purely financial or accounting approach. Unless this is done, the justice cannot be done to Railways.

I also agree that the railway department is one on which the functioning of the other departments depends. It is one a single department for which you give one injection and the railway system strengthens itself. The other department like steel must come to them, the coal must come to them. Of course the other things like the Ministry of Labour must also help them, and so on and so forth.

So, whether it is a question of mother-in-law or sister-in-law, ultimately it will come to his.

The Railway Ministry is independent in its operations upon other Ministries and is also a source of strength to the entire eco-

nomie system of the country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can continue on Tuesday. Now we shall take up Private Members' Business.

15.30 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

[Translation]

Fifty-Ninth Report

SHRI RAM AWADH PRASAD (Basti):
Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-ninth Report of the committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 1st March, 1989."

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bill and Resolutions presented to the House on the 1st March, 1989."

The Motion was adopted.

15.31 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW 20-POINT PROGRAMME-
Contd.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up further discussion on the following Reso-

lution moved by Shri Somnath Rath on the 19th August, 1988:

"This House while expressing its appreciation of the New 20-Point Programme initiated by the Government notes that implementation of the poverty alleviation programmes has not been fully satisfactory and urges upon the Government to take immediate steps for effective implementation thereof."

Shri Keyur Bhushan. Absent

Dr. Phulrenu Guha.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, may I know how much time is left for this? Are you going to extend the time for this?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Twenty-nine minutes are left.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, the Minister has not spoken. The Member has to give his reply. Further there may be some Members to speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Only two Members are there.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I would like to know approximately how much time this discussion would take.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It all depends on the Member and the Minister.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Which Minister is going to reply for this discussion?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Biren Singh Engti.

Dr. Phulrenu Guha.

[Translation]

*DR. PHULRENU GUHA (Contai): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at the very out-set. I would like to thank our colleague Shri Somnath Rath for bringing forth this important resolution before this House. Through this resolution he has given us an opportunity to discuss the 20 point programme. Millions of our homeless, destitute, helpless and down-trodden countrymen are sought to be helped to live like humanbeings through the 20 point programme.

Sir, this programme gives an opportunity to the unemployed poor to stand on his own legs. It has brought relief to countless numbers of poor and needy people. But I regret to say that some provisions of this programme has not yet been properly and fully implemented I fully agree with what Shri Rath has said about it. Sir, to get any benefit under this programme, these miserable people are required to fill several forms. In the first instance getting a form itself is very difficult for them. If they are able to obtain the required for they find it difficult to fill them properly as there are several rules and regulations in that respect. They need help of others to fill the forms but help and assistance is not available to them. Not only that, many a times recommendations of the Panchayat is required which these poor people find difficult to obtain. They run from pillar to post and get exhausted but their applications do not get the necessary recommendation. Sir, millions of people have applied for assistance under the NREP, IREDP etc. but they have been disappointed. Opportunities of education are not available at many places. Wherever they are available, the people are too poor to avail of these opportunities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, our country is village oriented. More than 80 percent people live in the villages. But unfortunately village industries or cottage industries have not developed properly in the rural areas. Therefore the economic conditions of the

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Bengali.

[Dr. Phulrenu Guha]

people are not improving. The rural people are therefore compelled to migrate to the cities. The condition in the villages thus further deteriorated. The cities also suffer due to pressure of population. These migrants to the cities also lead a miserable existence for want of employment. They cannot live properly like human beings. With wives and children they pass their days in great misery and sorrow. How can we expect that their children will grow up as responsible and respected citizens of the country and will achieve some thing for the country.

Sir, the roads in the villages are in very poor condition at most places. For setting up any cottage unit for producing anything, items have to be brought from outside and for marketing the commodities produced in the villages, they have to be taken to the towns or sub-divisions. But this becomes extremely difficult due to the poor condition of the village roads. Transportation becomes expensive and the cost of the produce becomes high. As a result, it becomes difficult to sell the products of the cottage industries as the price is high. The Cottage industries have, therefore, to close down gradually and people engaged in them become unemployed.

Sir, there is a programme to distribute land to the landless there is no doubt that some landless people are getting land. But they are not the only people to get land.

There are instances where the land-owners have also got land, this I am speaking from my experience. I will draw the attention of the Government to this aspect specially. If we discuss the 20 point programme point by point, then we will find that in most cases we have not achieved the desired results. In a nutshell it can be said that even after spending huge amount of money we have not been able to bring proportionable relief and succour to these millions and millions of poor, landless, helpless and miserable people. I will request the Government of India as well as all the State Governments to

exert all their power and resources to implement the 20 point programme properly to help our countless poverty stricken brothers and countrymen.

In the end I will say that these deprived and downtrodden people have today become awake and alive. They are demanding their due rights from the society and are refusing to remain deprived and exploited any longer. We will have to work for their betterment and we should realise that we are not doing any charity for them thereby. They are demanding their rightful dues. If the society does not yield their rights and just dues then in the words of Rabindra Nath Tagore, I will say, "Thou Shall Have to fall to their level and become equal to them through insult and disrespect."

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS (Bhilwara): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I support the resolution on 20 point programme and want to submit that the new 20 point programme given by the Prime Minister, if implemented properly, will accelerate the pace of development in the country and our greatest enemies viz. unemployment and poverty can be eradicated. But I want to submit a few things about the way this programme is being implemented. The President has made a mention about it in his address and this programme has also been referred to in the new Budget. Two crore people are unemployed today. 80 percent of the people live in the villages at present, who remain busy in agricultural operation for six months but remain without work for the other six months. Employment opportunities have not been created for them. Unless provision is made to provide them employment for the other six months under 20 point programme, we will not be able to bring them above the poverty lone, i.e. raising their income above Rs. 6,400 per year. There is need to implement it properly. The hon. lady Member was talking about the land reforms a little while ago but these could not be implemented properly. We passed the Land Ceiling Act and implemented it too. A poor man like me who owned 40 bighas of land, parted with 20 bighas of land under the Land Ceiling Act.

But the big landlords continue to own vast chunks of land under *benami* holdings and are leading a luxurious life as hitherto-fore. These new rulers have circumvented the ceiling laws and saved their lands from land reforms. No action is taken against them. They hold the land in different names to escape the provisions of the law. They own large agricultural farms and earn lakhs and crores of rupees per year therefrom. Unless land ceiling is enforced on these big landlords, 20 point programme cannot make headway. Therefore, it is necessary to implement this piece of legislation in letter and spirit. People find it difficult to get 50 sq. yards of land to construct a house for themselves whereas these landlords hold several lakhs sq. yards of land under *benami* ownership. Wherever land is allotted by the Government, they claim it to be their land. I know about Jaipur. The Maharaja of Jaipur says that all that land belongs to him. When acquisition proceedings are initiated, high courts and supreme court grant stay orders. This law cannot be implemented if such things continue to exist and our efforts aimed at lifting the poor people above the poverty line under 20 point programme will not succeed. The ceiling laws should be made applicable to the rural as well as urban areas so that people may get a house to live in. This 20 point programme is the need of the hour as the poor fail to get land because the land is in the possession of big people. Such provisions should be streamlined. I appeal to the Minister of Planning to make such laws that the high courts may not grant stay orders in respect of every land. This will enable you to implement your plans to allot houses and plots to the people. Your programmes for education to the children, provision of hostel accommodation and setting up of health centres are very good. But this work of providing houses is most essential of all and moreover, it is the duty of the Government to provide shelter to the people.

Secondly, I will like to submit a few points about employment opportunities. You have started N.R.E.P., R.L.E.G.P., TRYSEM and Minimum Needs Programmes for providing employment to people.

You have stated in your Budget speech that at least one member of every family below the poverty line will be provided with a job. Out of 80 crore population of the country 35-40 crore people are still living below poverty line. In terms of family, their number will be 8-9 crore and providing of employment to at least one member of each family will mean giving job to 8-9 crore people, otherwise they cannot be brought above the poverty line. How will this declaration be implemented since we cannot provide employment to so many people overnight. It is my submission that you may merge all the programmes like N.R.E.P., R.L.E.G.P. TRYSEM and Minimum Needs Programme and a programme similar to Employment Guarantee Programme being run in Maharashtra, is taken up throughout the country so that the contract system is abolished and all these programmes should be implemented with the working force of the unemployed. Be it the work relating to irrigation, forests, soils-conservation, or water works or any other work, the services of the unemployed should be utilised. All Government work should be got done through these unemployed people. If you merge all these programmes into one, we will definitely get a big force and we will be able to fight unemployment and to provide employment to a very large number of people. Next, I take up the case of Khadi and Village Industries Commission. We provide employment to fifty lakh people through this Commission but do not pay them sufficient money. Some people are paid Rs. 3 and some are paid Rs. 4. Do you think that anyone can provide succour to his family with this meagre amount, construct a house to live in, provide education to his children or provide necessary health cover. These people do not get even the minimum wages fixed by you. These people are good artisans engaged in weaving cloth, high class carpets, woollen cloth, *Khadi* etc. How can they make both ends meet with Rs. 3-4 paid to them? Therefore, you should arrange to give them minimum wages. There is need to expand this programme and to extend it to weavers, leather craftsman or khadi workers providing them loans, maximum amount of training and implements. Thus you will be

[Sh. Girdharilal Vyas]

able to give maximum employment to these village folk. But you have not thought on these lines. Khadi and village Industries Commission is concentrating on production of cloth only. No attention has been paid to other village crafts. Therefore, these people should be trained and provided employment under TRYSEM programme, which is not being implemented properly. Please strengthen it further, improve the training programme so that employment is available to them and these programmes become worthwhile.

In the end, I want to say a few words about banks. The self-employment scheme is very good. But who gets the money from the banks, the money lenders, who further advance the money on high rate of interest. Poor men like me, inspite of strenuous efforts fail to obtain money for self-employment from the banks. Therefore, streamline the working of banks. By improving their working, your plans to provide employment to lakhs of people will succeed. Many frauds take place in the banks. These are indulged in by big people. They misappropriate Rs. 200 crore and no action is taken against them. This parliament has no power to take action against such banks. Their audit reports are not presented in this House. Even this sovereign parliament cannot look into these numerous fraudulent cases. Therefore, I will submit that working of the banks which are under your control should be streamlined. Instead of implementing various programmes sponsored by the Government, the banks are making efforts to see that these programmes are not successful. I would therefore, like to request the hon. Minister to make proper arrangements for programme implementation.

The Bank Managers, Development officers and Veterinary Doctors swindle the amount of subsidy funds allocated under I.R.D.P. Our hon. Prime Minister has rightly said that out of Rs. 100 released from the Centre hardly Rs. 15 reach the villages. The Government officials, officers and people's

representative like us Swindle Rs. 85/- in midway and this way the money do not reach the villages. There is a need to remedy this situation so that the 20 point programmes, which is one of the best programmes, could be implemented properly. If this 20 point programme is implemented properly in this country, it can remove poverty from the country and solve the problem of un-employment. Then only we can strengthen this country.

With these words I support the Motion.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI BIREN SINGH ENGTI): Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion on a Resolution brought by our hon. Member, Mr. Somnath Rath.

I was listening to the speeches made by hon. Members of Parliament from the very beginning and the discussion that took place, and I really appreciate the points raised by the hon. Members and I also agree with them that there are some problems, there are some loopholes, while implementing all the various schemes of this 20 point programme. Sir, as all of us know, the 20 point Programme was brought by Indiraji in 1975, then subsequently it was revised in 1982 and again it was revised in 1986. Now, most of the Members have mentioned about the problem of implementation at various stages in various places.

Sir, the hon. Members know about the present arrangement. We have high level monitoring committee at the State level and at the political side, the Chief Minister is the chairman of the committee. From the official side, Chief Secretary and other top officers are members of the committee at the State level. We have also set up monitoring committees at the block level and district level and committees for implementation.

Members of Parliament and MLAs are also included in those committees. The main functions of those committees are to recommend and also to point out some defects, if any, in the implementation. They would make suggestions to implement this 20 point programme effectively so that the poor people get the benefit. The main objective of this programme is to help poor people, those who live below the poverty line. As on today, there are more than 37% of people who are below the poverty line. Now in order to improve their socio-economic conditions in the rural areas, this programme specially focussed on the points, mainly to attack the rural poverty. The programmes like NREP, RLEGP and IRDP are anti-poverty programmes.

In the course of the debate, many hon. Members have mentioned that at the meetings of the monitoring committees at State level and district level, the views of the Members are not taken into account or are not regarded. For your kind information, I may say that whenever we receive such type of complaints and information, we do write to the Chief Ministers of all States, requesting them to listen to the views of the Members and also to take note of the views expressed by the hon. Members while participating in such committees. They express their views as to how to implement effectively in the rural areas particular programme or project. Naturally, we would like the views of MPs and MLAs are fully regarded and also looked into by the authorities of the State Government. Government have laid much emphasis on this programme. You will find that, out of Rs. 1,80,000 crores total outlay in the 7th Five Year Plan, we have given approximately Rs. 6500 crores for 20 point programme. Our main emphasis is on rural side through IRDP, NREP and RLEGP as to how to create income-generating assets in the rural areas, as we have defined poverty line as 6400. We are spending crores and crores of rupees for their welfare in all the rural areas and our target is that the poorest of the poor should get the assistance.

As I said, employment is the most im-

portant point Hon. Members have also mentioned in their speeches about this particular point about employment. We have rough estimate as on today, on the live register, of 13.05 million unemployed people. That is, as on today 13 crores to 14 crores of people are unemployed and they are job seekers. Government is creating jobs for a maximum of 3 million people a year. This is the picture.

We are now trying to improve the position and also to implement effectively those schemes which will generate more employment and more income so that ultimately the poor can cross the poverty line.

16.01 hrs.

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN *in the Chair*]

Some Members have said that the funds are not released in time. In fact, the funds are released quarterly but the Rural Development Departments are releasing the funds twice in a year. The Central Government has no such problem of releasing funds. Some Members have said that the programme is not effectively implemented because sometimes it is happening that the funds are not released in time and that is why the schemes are not timely implemented and that is why the people are not getting the benefit. It is found from the records that there is no such delay from the Government of India side. Funds are released twice in a year from the Rural Development Department for all the schemes. The only question is that the entire implementation is done at the State Government level. We do not implement the programme and the scheme. The implementation part lies with the State Government. The Ministry of Programme Implementation monitors all important points of the 20 Point Programme and the mechanism is evolved by us. We send two reports. One is the monitoring report and the other is quarterly progress report. In the monitoring report, we give the picture of all the programmes. We get this information from the State Government. They are really

[Sh. Biren Singh Engti] implementing all the schemes. They do send the report on monthly basis. Some target is fixed by us. They do send the report and we do monitor all the points. There are some other points which cannot be monitored on monthly basis. They are monitored quarterly. We do get this report through Ministry. This is the mechanism through which we are monitoring the programmes.

Some hon. Members suggested that the monitoring system is not good and effective and, therefore, the programmes are not effectively implemented in the rural areas. Some of them have suggested, instead of handing over the power to the State Government, the Central Government should themselves implement the schemes direct from Delhi.

Hon. Members know very well that it is not possible to implement the scheme direct by the Government of India for various reasons. hon Members also mentioned that until and unless the 20 Point Programme is implemented, we cannot expect any type of good results.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't you constitute a Committee with the Member of Parliament as Chairman for the implementation of these programmes? Many of the Members of Parliament are very senior people. They cannot go and sit by the Collector.

SHRI BIREN SINGH ENGTI: Sir, the Implementation Committee is there at the State Level. Members of Parliament are also Members of those Committees.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS: The point is that a Member of Parliament should be appointed as the Chairman of such Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, instead of the Collector, you can make the Member of Parliament as the Chairman.

SHRI BIREN SINGH ENGTI: I am going to all these points. As I said earlier, this is the suggestion of most of the hon. Members. This is a good suggestion. We will look into it.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): I, for a change, support the Chairman in this regard. (Interruptions)

SHRI BIREN SINGH ENGTI: Sir, we have accepted the 20 Point Programme. We talk about the devolution of power. We talk about giving more powers to the States, to the District level. In view of this we don't want to centralise power. We don't want to implement the programmes by giving directions straightaway from here. All these programmes are covered under the State subjects. They are like providing schools, drinking water this and that. The implementation aspect rests with the State Governments. Under the Constitution, the competent authority to implement these programmes is the State Governments.

Sir, as I said earlier, monitoring is done through monthly progress reports and quarterly progress reports. We do monitor these things in our Ministry of Programme Implementation. For example, in the year 1987-88, we have monitored as many as 29 items. It is found that through this mechanism we could improve the functioning and performance of various sectors aimed at the development of the rural areas. Further, I would like to say that through the process of constant evaluation and through the monitoring system, the State Governments are quite aware of the position. They are aware that it is their duty to monitor and implement effectively the various programmes. There is no lapse. So, they are aware of their responsibility. Through this report, we do get information regularly. Whenever there is some shortfall, we do remind the State Governments pointing out the lapse on their part. We do suggest the steps which are to be taken by the State Governments to implement effectively any particular point or any particular project. So, we are doing this work.

Further, I would like to say that the Department of Rural Development are doing the evaluation activities. Through some independent agencies/institutions, they do evaluate some of these Programmes like NREP, Rural Drinking Water Schemes etc. They do monitor and evaluate these programmes. We indeed get results which are very encouraging. By and large, the 20 Point Programme is a good programme and it is doing a very good job. At the same time, I don't say that all the programmes are working well. In a big country like ours where 80 crore people are living, while implementing all these programmes, there may be some lapses here and there. We do admit the fact. Whenever we get such complaints, we do remind the concerned authorities and also request them to plug the loopholes. We also issue necessary guidelines to the State Governments regarding some complaints. When we receive any complaint from the hon. Member or from anyone else regarding non-payment of minimum wages—right now, one hon. Member was referring to it—we issue guidelines to the State Government. As soon as we receive such type of complaints from any hon. Member of Parliament that workers are not paid minimum wages including rice etc., naturally, we write to the State Government requesting them to look into that and take appropriate action. We have done it. Our Minister has also written letters to all the Chief Ministers about these points. There were lots of complaints from various parts of the country that workers are not being paid minimum wages. We requested them to look into it and see that they are paid fully.

Many hon. Members—both from the ruling party as well as from the opposition parties—have talked about land reforms and land management. It is true that we should have distributed lakhs of acres of land to the landless people. It is true that lots of these issues are pending in the legal courts. As on date, we have information that as many as 45 lakh acres of land out of 72 lakh acres of land have been distributed among the landless and poor people in the country. At the same time, we have requested the various

State Governments to see that instead of handing it over to the party or to the poor people, they should take it up themselves to see that these cases are disposed of quickly. Government should take upon themselves this responsibility so that immediately this land can be distributed among the poor people.

At the same time, we have also requested the State Governments to see that land distributed to the poor people, landless people is properly managed and improved because, after all, poor people want to utilise the land for production purposes. They want to utilise the land not for the sake of getting land but for the sake of getting something out of it. We have also reminded the State Governments to see that in such cases, land is improved, not only for irrigation, not only for more production but also to improve the *Patta* system and the ownership system. These complaints are very common throughout the country. Land is distributed, no doubt. It is only in name, as it is in the possession of someone else. These complaints also, in some cases, are found to be genuine. In view of this, while sending our guidelines to the State Governments we have explained to them very well about it and have said that these are to be looked into and Government should see that poor people when they are given the possession of land, they should really become the owner of the land and not anyone else.

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS: My point was different. Big people are having lakhs of bighas of land and the land Ceiling Act is not properly enforced on them. They still have lakhs of bighas of land. The level Ceiling Act should be properly enforced in such cases also so that, land could be made available to poor people.

[English]

SHRI BIREN SINGH ENGTI: I am coming to that point. The point is that the 48 lakhs acres of land which was already dis-

[Sh. Biren Singh Engti] distributed among the poor people, there are complaints that poor people are not becoming the owners of the land. But we are trying to see that these things do not happen and the poor people become the real owner and also they get the benefit out of it.

Regarding the point made by the hon. Minister, it is a good suggestion. It is not that these things are not there in our country. These problems are there. So certainly we will look into them. We also need the cooperation of the State Governments. The Central Government alone cannot do this job. These things are related to the States. That is why we are always trying to get the cooperation of the State Governments and all the political parties. Until and unless we get their cooperation the implementation of such big schemes is not possible. That is why I appreciate the Members' views. I would like to seek their cooperation in solving these social problems.

I don't want to go itemwise because it will take a long time. Hon. Members know very well about all these 20 point programmes sector wise and the allocation made—how much we have spent and how much we have to spend; what improvements have been made etc. As I said, in our Ministry we have monthly and the quarterly report about this 20 point programme. Hon. Members used to get all these copies. From them they come to know very well about what is happening.

As all of us know, this year our Hon. Finance Minister has announced a new economic programme for the poor people specially the amalgamation of anti-poverty programmes like NREP and RLEGP. Many Hon. Members of this House also suggested on various occasions of amalgamation of these two programmes because the objectives of these two programmes remain the same. That is why there is no point in keeping these two programmes separate. Our Hon. Finance Minister in his Budget speech made it very clear that from the next

financial year these two programmes will be amalgamated and it will become one. And the funding pattern will be 75 and 25.

Another new programme, that is distribution of free sarees to women is included. Of course the AICC resolution requested our Government to include some programmes. Except some, all other programmes suggested by the AICC are the ongoing programmes. These programmes now have become new ones. According to this some projects will be taken up in this financial year or next year. Of course, these matters are now being looked after by the Government. It is being worked out and it will take time.

From this it is quite clear the Government is really going ahead with the anti-poverty schemes and to see that all the people living in the rural areas, the most backward areas get employment. They also get the economic benefits out of these programmes.

To strengthen the machinery we need the cooperation of all the State Governments. We do emphasize it. We are not simply speaking about this; we are trying to involve the State Governments and other agencies to implement such programmes. From our own Ministry we do take up the issue with the State Governments very frequently. We discuss with the State Governments from time to time regarding these 20 point programmes. When there are some lapses, we do remind the State Governments also and request them to take it up and see that the loopholes are plugged and that these schemes are properly implemented.

As I said, I don't want to go into details. Our Hon. Members themselves know very well. But I would like to inform them that since 1975 the 20 point programme is doing very well for the poor people. That is why we are now giving it the emphasis. This programme will continue in the Eighth Plan. That being the case we need cooperation of all the hon. Members of the house and also State Governments to implement it effectively in

the days to come.

I do not want to take more time of the House on this Resolution in reviewing all the progress made by the Government and the points raised by the Hon. Members. I will certainly look into all the genuine suggestions made by the hon. Members. In view of all this information and what I have said I would request the hon. Member, Shri Somnath Rath to withdraw his resolution because I would like to assure him that whatever points he has made we would certainly look into them.

SHRI SOMNATH RATH (Aska): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to say that I am grateful to the hon. Members of this House who have taken part in the discussion. Thirty one Members of this House have taken part in this discussion which started on 19.8.1988. Besides the hon. Minister who intervened about 8 hours of time has been taken by the members during the discussion. It is really unique that the members have shown such an interest in this resolution and the hon. Minister was also good enough to say that this resolution is a very valuable resolution.

Most probably the discussion that took place about this resolution has been reflected in the speech of the Finance Minister while presenting the Budget in this House.

The anti-poverty programme is not that of a relief work. It is an overall development programme to help to alleviate the extreme poverty and the performance must be equally strong and effective to sustain the growth of the economy.

Hon. Minister has replied that they have taken care to ask the State Governments to see that this 20 point programme is implemented in right earnest. There are district-level committees and the reports are being received at the Centre. But with great respect to these committees and reports I would say that the reports are only on paper and the figures are manipulated to satisfy the Centre by the bureaucrats who draw up

these reports from the States that these programmes have been rightly and earnestly implemented. If you go to the field the result is otherwise.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, there is no quorum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the quorum bell be rung. Now there is quorum. Mr. Somnath Rath may please continue.

SHRI SOMNATH RATH: Sir, the hon. Minister has stated that care has been taken to see that these programmes are implemented from the grassroot level. For the information of the Minister, I will invite his attention to one instance. I hope he will also take action, if necessary through C.B.I. Most probably on the instructions of the Central Government, the Orissa Government, by a Gazette Notification appointed a vigilance Committee to oversee the utilisation of grains of RLEGP, NREP and other poverty alleviation programmes and in each district, one MP is made the Chairman of the Committee, one MLA is made a Member, one Panchayat Samiti Chairman a Member alongwith three engineers and the additional project officer, DRDA happens to be the convenor. Unfortunately or fortunately, in Ganjam district Orissa, I am the Chairman of that Committee. On a complaint made by the Panchayat Samiti Chairman of Sorada and other Sarpanches, this Committee visited Panchayat Samiti, Sorada and verified the utilisation of grains. It was found that the grains which were said to have been given for the beneficiaries for the construction of Indira Awas have been totally misutilised and misappropriated. The grains have not been given. The so-called village Committee manipulated and forget the documents and had shown the AC sheets, purchased for those buildings at a lower rate, to have been purchased at a very high rate. Taking the evidence, both oral and documentary, and seizing the records, this Committee gave a report to the Collector Ganjam to take necessary action because as per the Gazette Notification, it is for the Collector to take action as per report. But inspite of the report

[Sh. Somnath Rath]

to take action the Collector sent the observation of the Committee which recommended for the suspension of the B.D.O. and to frame charges under different heads as enumerated in that report. But after receiving the report from such a high power committee Collector sent it to the SDO and no action was taken. Then to ride track the issue the Collector said that the vigilance Department of the Government will take necessary action to ride track the issue. This fact was brought to the notice of the Chief Secretary Government of Orissa but no action was taken. The hon. Minister said that the Chief Secretaries of different States have been alerted to see that these programmes are to be slightly implemented. But no action is yet taken, against block development officers Soaredo (Orissa) through the special vigilance Committee appointed by Government for this specific purpose has given a report. Under these circumstances, it is not that if an MP is made the Chairman, the problem will be solved. The problem will be solved if the State Governments and the Central Government is very very vigilant and the bureaucrats come in a very big way, sincerely and honestly, to implement these programmes. Our Prime Minister said that to reach one rupee to a beneficiary, six rupees are spent by way of administration and rightly now the Government thinks of decentralisation which is also reflected in the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister. We want to reach the goal in a better manner, in the best possible manner attention should be given at the grassroot level, but at the implementation stage, there are defects and malpractices. The beneficiaries do not get the benefit that is meant for them. That is the factor and the only factor that has to be looked into. I am very happy that the Minister has taken a note of it and he has stated that this will be taken care of. Also, the reports, the complaints that are received from the hon. Members and others will be scrutinized and action taken.

Take for instance, the land given to the

poor people after the land ceiling has been applied. The Minister has rightly said that the land which was given to the poor people is, in fact, not in their possession; it is in the possession of somebody else. And according to the reports at the Central Level, huge acreage of land has been distributed.

Similarly, with regard to drinking water, the problem of drinking water is there in villages. In problematic villages for 250 people one tubewell for drinking water should be given. That is the policy of the Government and accordingly, the Central Government gives funds to State Governments to provide drinking water to the rural people. Has it been implemented in the right earnest? Is there any agency to supervise whether the tubewells that have to be sunk have been sunk; whether they reached the required depth so that they can supply water throughout the year. They sink the tubewells during the rainy season or just thereafter and the same go dry during summer.

Then, about education, Government has given thrust on the universalization of the elementary education, the blackboard operation and also non-formal education. I would cite an example about the non-formal way of adult education. To eradicate illiteracy huge amounts have been given to the voluntary organizations. At once place, Balaguntha in Ganjam District, Orissa, a voluntary organization has taken lakhs of rupees and has misappropriated and misused it. Complaints were made by the Panchayat Samiti to the State Government and even to the Central Government to see that the matter is investigated and action taken. It is about one year but no action has been taken either by the Central Government or the State Government. Hon. Minister of Human Resource Development has written to all the M.Ps that we should visit our constituencies and see whether the non-formal education programme is being implemented in right earnest, and if not, to bring to his notice. In fact, I have brought these matters to the notice of the hon. Minister, but I do not know what action has been taken. I have cited only a few instances, there are many.

On the basis of the figures supplied by the officers, one should not say that the 20 Point Programme has been implemented properly and correctly. There should be some other agency from the Centre to see how best this is implemented and if there are any loopholes, those should be plugged.

About the Village Committees. Of course, the Government had given a direction that there should be no contractors employed for the execution of the works. The Village Committees elected by the villagers should be given to execute this work. But this instruction has not only disrespected but also not even thought of by the officers at the village level. The contractors are there. In the name of the village they take the contract work and the money which is meant for the work are being wasted and some time goes to the pocket of middlemen. If there is a complaint no action is taken. The officers are also not interested at the grass root level to see that these village committees work efficiently. They manipulate the things give execution of work to contractors on the plea that the contractor has been recommended by a particular village. But when there is a complaint against the contractor nobody thinks, about it and by the time the complaint is being enquired into, the work is finished and everything is paid. So, these are the defects that are required to be looked into.

I am happy to know that the Finance Minister has stated in his speech that the expenditure on agriculture and the fertiliser subsidy is increased to Rs. 4343 crores. I would like to know how much of this subsidy goes to the agriculturists. It is the industrialists and other agency who consume the major portion of this subsidy and only a minor portion goes to the agriculturists because for the cost of producing the fertilisers the industrialists are also given the subsidy.

Similarly, Sir, the Finance Minister rightly said that under the Integrated Rural Development Programme, over 25 million families below the poverty line have been assisted to take the income generating activities. The total investment in the pro-

gramme since the beginning of the Sixth Plan has been over Rs. 10,000 crores including the term credit provided by the financial institutions. This is great achievement of the Government.

Similarly, Sir, under the programme of employment generation—NREP and RLEGP—67 crores mandays of employment were generated during 1987-88 as against the target of 50 crores mandays. It has been said that this NREP and RLEGP will be going to be covered by a single programme and 75 percent of the sum will be funded by the Central Government. It is a very big step. But what is required is that our aim should be to remove the poverty and provide employment and it must also be seen that the amount is really spent for the benefit of the beneficiaries. It is also stated in the Budget that a total amount of Rs. 1711 crores has been allocated in the year 1989-90 for the new employment programme. So, a huge amount has been allocated for all these programmes.

For the programme of health, nutrition and education of poor children also, a huge amount has been given by the Centre. The aims and objectives of the Centre are reflected very well in the Budget speech of the hon. Finance Minister. What is required is proper implementation of the programmes. The State Governments and the officers concerned must come in a very big way to implement these programmes effectively.

Since the hon. Minister has assured the House that necessary steps will be taken and all the programmes will be implemented in a right manner, I withdraw my Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the House that the Resolution moved by Shri Somnath Rath be withdrawn?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO: This has been discussed for more than four times Sir. It must be adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then I will put it to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"This House while expressing its appreciation of the New 20 Point Programme initiated by the Government notes that implementation of the poverty alleviation programmes has not been fully satisfactory and urges upon the Government to take immediate steps for effective implementation thereof."

The motion was negatived

16.48 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: GUIDELINES
FOR APPOINTMENT AND TRANSFER
OF GOVERNORS

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up the next Resolution. Mr Reddy.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY
(Mahbubnagar): I beg to move:

"This House recommends to the Government to lay down clear guidelines for appointment transfer of Governors."

Sir, in the history of free India, no office has become so sinecure and at the same time so insecure as that of the Governor. Sir, this office has become so controversial that many thoughtful commentators and political activists have demanded the abolition of this office. We must try to understand the reasons that prompted them to make this extreme demand.

Sir, in the initial period we did not have much difficulty with the office of the Governor because only one party was in power both at the Centre and in the States. Trouble arose for the first time in 1958 when a CPI-led Government headed by Shri E.M.S. Nam-

boodripad came to the unsettled in Trivandrum. So, it was in your State that the powers of the office of the Governor were misused with a view to dismissing the legally constituted Government. Sir, this process got accentuated after more and more non-Congress parties came to assume power in the post 67 period. I am not among those who believe that the office of Governor is altogether useless. It has its own uses, provided we go in for certain safeguards. Today none of the constitutional offices is so insecure as that of a Governor. You cannot remove the Election Commissioner, the Judge of an High Court or the Supreme Court or the Comptroller and Auditor General by a stroke of the pen. Of all the eminent constitutional offices, it is only the Governor who can be transferred, hired and fired at the sweet will of the Government of India.

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum): So, you want to make his position more secure.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Yes. I agree with you. It is the sense of insecurity which is also responsible for dilution of the glory this office. When this question was first debated in the Constituent Assembly, I may recall that a sub-Committee headed by Sardar Vallabhai Patel in fact recommended that the Governor be elected directly by the people on the basis of adult franchise. It was Jawaharlal Nehru who felt that this would lead to a kind of diarchy in the States and, I think, Mr Nehru was correct. He therefore pleaded for nominated Governors. While pleading for nomination, he stated that the people who have not been much too active in politics, who may have attained some unquestionable eminence in some walk of life would be chosen for the office. But did that happen? It did not happen that way. At that time, it was also mentioned that the approval of the State Government would be secured before Governor is chosen for a particular State. All these high sounding criteria and procedures were honoured only in breach. As of now, if you look at the scene today, we have as many as 11 retired civilians or defence employees functioning as Governors. Sarkaria Commission noted that