

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

a significant point. My resolution gets added significance because of this fact. There are two aspects to the recommendation of the ARC or any function of the Government. The hon. Minister has promised that he will take into consideration the recommendations in all seriousness. An effective machinery is required to act as a watch dog and see whether these recommendations are implemented as they should be, and in time too. Otherwise, the effect of recommendations will be lost. Therefore, I was wondering if he could agree to these two points. One point was made by the hon. Members of the Opposition and I agree with that: there is a lot of sense in the appointment of a standing committee or Parliament which will function in an informal manner. It would act as watch dog over the business of the Government. There is a lot of sense in that suggestion. This is a federal Parliament. We have seen the way it functions. In a budget discussion of five days, what can we do? Members get 5 or 10 minutes. In that short time we cannot put our points of view. What is the most effective way in a federal system? In America they have established these committees primarily for the reason that they could act as the watchdogs of the country. Every matter cannot be taken up in the House and discussed in great detail. The hon. Minister must consider the sentiments expressed by almost the entire Opposition Members. Standing committees should be constituted. I also strongly support that suggestion.

Secondly, I refer to the ARC recommendations in many reports. I had occasion to see some of the reports and Mr. Hanumanthaiya had also provided us with some guidance and suggestions. In every report they have said that something should be taken up by the PAC or the Public Undertakings Committee or the Bureau of Public Enterprises or by a parliamentary committee. Therefore, I submit that a watch-dog committee of Parliament should be constituted and it should be a permanent committee just

like the PAC or the PUC. There are many significant recommendations which are coming from the ARC. We are watching how they are implemented. The hon. Minister referred to this report and said one sentence: we shall examine it sympathetically. I hope that he has not given this assurance as Mr. Shukla but as a Minister of the Government. In view of this assurance and in the hope that he will appreciate the views of the House and give due consideration to the two points which had been raised and that a Committee will be appointed in the near future, I withdraw my resolution.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: If she is withdrawing the resolution, where is the question of amendment?

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR: I beg to leave to withdraw my amendment.

*Amendment No. 2 was by leave,
withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Has the hon Member got the leave of the House to withdraw her resolution?

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

16.46 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. RURAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I move:

"This House calls upon the Government to give priority for rural housing development in the Plans."

About 20 years back, there was this cry:

"छोटा ना घर होगा बच्चों के छंभ में।"

Young boys and girls spread over the five and a half lakhs of villages in our country went about humming this tune. After all, the call was given to the country by the late Prime Minis-

ter, when after crystal-gazing into the future, describing our future he said that we have a tryst with destiny. Those boys and girls had hopes and hummed the song like any other children in the previous centuries; only these children were hoping that with our country having attained freedom those hopes would come true. But after these 20 years, those young boys and girls have come to age, they have their own families, yet still, living in the villages, on the streets, under an open sky just remembering those hopes which they fondly cherished once, while their children go about in the streets having the same hopes.

Will those hopes ever come true? If we see the record of this Government for the last 20 years, what do we find? We had four or five ministers in this Ministry and this time we have a young minister. We have thought that new hopes, new thoughts and a new determination would come. But nothing happened; he is sitting there with fists clenched, but those hopes still remain to be fulfilled. We do not know what will be done. During these long years, we have not built houses. All that we have built are towers of Babel. We have talked of socialism, and talked of a welfare society and about equality. But they remain only as talks. Nothing concrete has come up.

If I can quote the Minister himself when he said in November, 1967, while speaking on rural housing:

"The 1961 census reveals that out of 651 lakh houses hardly 124 lakhs or just about 19 per cent were pucca houses; the remaining 527 lakhs or about 81 per cent or about 527 lakh houses were katcha, which would require to be rebuilt or improved substantially. Further, these 651 lakhs of existing houses were actually occupied by 689 lakh odd rural households which meant that 38 lakh households in rural areas do not have a separate dwelling unit for themselves. It is now estimated that by 1966 we will have a

total shortage of 627 lakh houses in rural areas of which the houseless households constitute 113 lakhs."

These are the words of the Minister himself. Even after so many years, so many promises, after so much of wastage of public funds and so many other projects, this is the situation where one of the three basic necessities of man's life—food, clothing and housing—is concerned, we have not been able to provide him with a house. If this is the position, what have you succeeded in doing?

For years, we have been grappling with the food problem. It appears that we are on the brink of being a little easy about it; we might even solve it. About clothing, of course the Government have done nothing to make it cheaper to the common man, the farmer and the other people in our country. Similarly, about houses, the Minister is again waving his hands and nothing has happened, and people in villages go about wringing their hands.

One of the answers that the Minister gave generally during the Question Hour and elsewhere is that we have paucity of funds. Coming to the question of paucity of funds, the Estimates Committee has got to say this:

"The Committee note that the funds provided for the village housing project scheme during the second and third Plan periods were utilised only to the extent of 37.6 per cent and 34.7 per cent respectively, resulting in a shortfall of 62.4 per cent and 65.3 per cent respectively."

The Minister may say that it is a State subject. Prior to the last general election, almost all the States, except for a brief period when Kerala had a different rule, were under the Congress rule. And so this shortage essentially means that the Congress party, through its governments at the Centre and in the States, has failed to implement the housing programmes.

[Shri S. K. Tapuriah]

Sir, the standard of housing is an index of the nation's social achievement. In this, as the figures show, Government has miserably failed. Hope does not take us a long way. As Francis Bacon said, hope is a good breakfast, but a very lean supper. In the last 20 years of Congress rule, we have often invited the people to the breakfast of hope, but we have denied them the fulfilment of that supper. Breakfast was taken long ago, and hunger walks the streets again. People now realise that they cannot remain very much on hopes only and it is time to make room at the table. They have shown their determination in the last general election when more than half the country rejected the Congress. It is high time they woke up.

Take the economic aspect. Standard of living, aspirations and hopes are closely linked with the state that the economy is in. While we are passing through a period of recession and bad times, housing is one of the programmes which any Government should take up. If you open any book on economics, even in the beginning stages, the student is taught that at the time of depression, housing, road building and such other social programmes are to be taken up and given top most priority. If this simple basic law of economics is not known to the Government, they are unfit to rule.

For housing, no imports are required. For any other industry, we say that there is paucity of foreign exchange. But here all the basic materials required for housing like bricks, cement, steel, woodwork, electricity, labour—all are available indigenously. There is no paucity of any of these items right now in the country.

Coming to the employment aspect, the figures of unemployment are staggering. I cannot expect this Government to take up a bold programme which will require 5 million houses a year. Even if you take a fraction of it say one million houses every year, it would mean employ-

ment for 20 lakh persons. At the rate of Rs. 5000 per house excluding the price of land, 1 million houses would mean Rs. 500 crores every year. 50 to 60 per cent of the cost of a house always goes in terms of wages, partly in direct construction and partly as wages in the materials required for building the House. At the present level of wages in our country, it would mean employment to 20 lakh people. In 1966, we had 93.64 lakhs people employed in Government sector. Leaving aside transport and communications services, it comes to 23 lakhs people. Instead of taking up gigantic steel plants, only by taking up this housing programme, you are going to increase the employment by nearly 100 per cent in relation to governmental employment as it stands today.

Another aspect is that there is no danger of regional imbalance in this programme. Someone wants a steel plant in Salem, someone wants it in some other place and so on. The Housing programme will create no imbalance of growth. This is an activity which goes on all over the country. There is no question of priority between States and there is no transport bottleneck. Some of the ministers and Congressmen plead for village industries. Housing programme will give work to village industries and village artisans. It will be spread over in all the villages all over the country, there being no concentration anywhere.

Let us move a little away from our shores, since our ministers are so fond of going abroad. I do not know what they see there. I wish they had seen the housing programme in other countries. I would like to take you to one of our neighbouring States, in the same geographical hemisphere having the same sort of living and social conditions like ours—Singapore. It had a target of 10 new dwelling units for 1000 persons. Unlike our Government's programmes, they have built 9.4—

only 0.6 short-dwelling units for every 1000 persons. This rate of achievement has been unsurpassed by any developing nation. Between 1960 and 1966 the Housing Development Board built more than 50,000 low-cost housing units and provided new accommodation in all for four lakh people. That is about 23 per cent of Singapore's population. I would suggest that the Minister, Shri Jaganath Rao, visits Singapore soon, sees how their programme has been working. He should see what sort of incentive they have given to the people and possibly try to do something. The present method will not work and we have got to find some other solution to the problem.

Going a little far, to the United Kingdom, we find that there, between 1947 and 1967 more than six million houses were built and the 1970 target is five lakh houses a year. If you go still beyond and see what a capitalist country—whom we call exploiters and attach all sorts of adjectives—like the United States is doing, the figures there would still more shock some of my friends here who think that everything that United States does is wrong. Only one week back the US Congress authorised expenditure equivalent to Rs. 4000 crores in the next three years on the biggest governmental house building programme in any country's history. The Housing Act calls for construction or rehabilitation by 1971 of 1.7 million houses every year for people of small incomes. These are programmes taken up by socialist countries, the United Kingdom where there is the Labour Government, a capitalist country like the United States and our own neighbour—Singapore. Wherever you look you will find that housing has been a major problem in all the countries. It is not that we are confronted with it only ourselves. It has been a problem everywhere. But we have to see how other countries have solved it. There is no harm in look-

1265 (A1) LSD—13.

ing at other people's achievements and programmes. If we can learn or borrow something from other countries we must definitely borrow and get those ideas.

But the question that arises is, do we have the determination to do it or is it only slogan shouting only to dupe the people possibly to counter-act the influence of some Communists or others when you say phrases like "better living conditions", "equality of justice" and all that? You do not have the will to do it as your own results have shown.

Now I will come to what we should do. When I come to that I can very well guess that the Minister would give two or three stock arguments and I would like to dwell a little on them. One is that we have no funds. Coming to the question of funds, as I said, whatever meagre funds were given have not been utilised by the States. What have you done to pull up those using states? This may be a State subject. But we have other State and Concurrent subjects like power, irrigation, health and family planning. Do we not have a Central Power and Irrigation Agency? Do not we have a Central Family Planning Board? Why do not we have something like that for housing? Why cannot we have a central authority to give direction to the States for housing programme? If it is a question of it being on the State List, why cannot we give it priority and bring it on the Concurrent List? If you really want to solve the problem you have to bring it on the Concurrent List. You should have a Central Housing Authority to direct the programme in all the States. Let them deal with it directly and see to everything singly. One of the things you can do in that direction is to see that the funds are earmarked for housing and housing only and they are not spent on any other account.

[Shri S. K. Tapuriah]

He said that funds are not available. We have a little allocation in our Plan period. We have to add a little to that. It is not as stupendous a task as the Minister thinks it to be. He said somewhere that they would require about Rs. 20 thousand crores in five years. Where are we going to get the money from, he asked. All of it need not come from Government. Why should he think that everything has to come from Government and the Finance Minister would not give it?

17 hrs.

This programme, if you take up a million houses a year, will cost you Rs. 500 crores. This need not be a drag on the Central Government's resources. Private banks, LIC, housing loan funds, co-operatives and other agencies which give advances have to be utilised. You have to make certain new laws to see that the Reserve Bank gives some funds to private banks and other agencies to advance loans for housing. You have to drop the idea that the Government has to build houses and give them to the people because this has failed. You have to make the people themselves interested in it. Let them come forward for the loans. They can go to the co-operative banks, any of their regional banks, private banks, the State Bank or any of the authorities for the loan. For that purpose the Reserve Bank has to give some advances and the Reserve Bank has to guarantee those loans.

Here I will give you an example. Some years back there was a complaint from every place that the small-scale industries did not get enough advances from private banks. What was done after that was that the Reserve Bank stood guarantee for those loans given by a bank to the small-scale industry and in the last two or three years the advances by banks to small-scale industry have gone up by nearly 2½ times.

Here also the Reserve Bank has only to stand a guarantee. The LIC

can also stand guarantee. You can also have a provision that the insurance companies can also provide insurance for these loans, just as we have in the case of hire-purchase. Any company which gives out money on hire-purchase against a car or a truck has this advance insured and against that insurance the banks advance money. Some sort of this idea will have to be brought in here so that funds are made available easily.

Funds will also come in from the people. I have no doubt about it. 25 or 30 per cent of these funds will come in the form of mobilisation of rural resources. People will be motivated towards more savings. After years and centuries of being in a poor state, being in a state of impoverisation and under loans, under the clutches of the local moneylender, only last year our farmer has seen a little ray of hope. There had been a good crop. But what happened? The moment that crop was there, many of us here and most of them in the ruling party started jumping and saying that we must tax the farmer. Have we become so much money conscious, a grabber of the sort that for the first time in centuries the farmer has got a little money and we just want to grab it? It was wise that the Finance Minister objected to this idea. Let the farmer have that money. But you can also have a part of that money in a better and a nicer way.

You have seen how your small savings programme and schemes have failed, because we asked the villagers and the people only to save money so that at some future date they will get some more money, but with the rising price index nobody had an incentive to save. But when you say that you will have this housing programme where you have to go not only to a Government, a magistrate or a local politician but to any one of the hundreds of banks or institutions for a loan, he will have the feel-

ing to save money. He can possibly see that there is a home in his future; he can see that if not he, his son can have a home in the future and he will try to save. With that not only your savings programme be augmented but he himself is motivated and the money that has gone to the rural economy and that we hope will go into the rural economy in the next couple of years, hoping to God that we have good crops, will be brought back in the economy, not by taxes or by taking away that money from the farmer but by drawing that money to the economy and giving them something in return. You will have to choose whether you want to give something back from what you take or you want to be a grabber of money in the form of taxes and giving nothing in return.

I will finish by giving two small suggestions for the Minister to bear in mind. This is not an expenditure; this will not be a drag on the Government's resources but this is an investment the returns of which will start coming in in three or four years time when the people start repaying their loans. It will generate employment of 20 lakhs of people. These people who will get this employment will not keep the money with themselves. So, consumer industries will grow and it will create more employment potential. In indirect ways it will be bringing in revenue to the Government, in the form of excise duty on consumption that they will make and in the form of other taxes that they will pay. The growth of the economy, which you have failed to generate, will be there. Where so many plans and gigantic projects have failed, the housing programme will succeed. It will do good to the people to the community and, may be, to the ruling party also.

My last suggestion is: Make housing industry a priority industry. One of the reasons why you have not been able to motivate people is that many

of your Ministers, many of your top-ranking leaders, always call that housing is a dead investment and that housing is a non-productive investment. It is not. You motivate people, you call it a priority industry, you give more and more incentives and you make it more conducive to getting loans. Did't you, two years back, realise that for tourism—you were in-charge of Hotels then—hotel industry should be made a priority industry? Did't you find that hotel industry was just beginning to gear up for that growth? Why can't you do the same thing here for housing? Treat it on a priority basis, whether it is for loans, whether it is depreciation or other allowances. You create a feeling among the people that Government is with them to have houses, that Government might have their difficulties but it wants people to have houses and do whatever you can do to create those favourable situations, without giving us funds, and at least show your intention of creating those favourable conditions for farmers, for backward class people, for all our people living in these 5-12 lakh villages, that you have taken all steps you can take to make the situation conducive to building more and more houses. Let us have at least that gesture from you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"This House calls upon the Government to give priority for rural housing development in the plans."

There is an amendment by Shri Yashpal Singh.

SHRI DEORAO PATIL (Yeotmal): I have also given 4 amendments.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: They were disallowed. Shri Yashpal Singh is not here. So, the amendment is not moved.

SHRI DEORAO PATIL: I gave my amendments in time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will find out. Shri R. D. Bhandare.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I listened to the speech of the hon. mover of this Resolution very carefully. He has studied the problem very deeply and sympathetically. He has also understood the economic and social aspect of it. I welcome the Resolution. I think, he has done a yeoman's service to this House and to the rural people of this country.

Sir, this rural housing development has two aspects. It deals with the village as a unit. I need not mention that in every village, there are two villages that in every State, there are two States and that in India, there are two Indias, two Bharats. I need not draw your attention to the structure of the village. As I said, in every village, there are two villages, one inhabited by the backward classes who live outside the periphery of the village who have their own village and the village as we understand, as the westerners understand. When we talk of rural housing development generally, our attention is drawn or we pay attention to the development of housing schemes for those who are living in the villages, not inhabited by the scheduled castes or the scheduled tribes or other backward classes. My hon. friend who have moved the Resolution has dealt with this aspect, the rural housing development, elaborately.

I shall confine myself to the question of the housing for the backward classes. 20 years have passed and we have been talking of egalitarian society, we have been talking of socialism, we have been talking of democracy both in the form of Government and as a way of life. So far as backward classes are concerned, have we been able to change the life of the backward classes according to the philosophy which we have accepted in democracy? The villagers remain as they were before; the lot of the people belonging to backward classes remain as it was in the rural areas. I am quite aware that in the First Five-Year Plan notice was taken of this aspect of housing problem of backward classes; some amount was

allocated and schemes were chalked out. In the Second Plan we increased the amount, and in the Third Plan also we further increased that amount. But when we made the allocations in these three Five-Year Plans for housing schemes, the implementation of these schemes was entrusted, at the lowest ladder, to the Panchayats . . .

17.11 hrs.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA in the Chair]

Madam Chairman, you are always welcome whenever you occupy the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am grateful to the Members of the House for that.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: I was emphasizing this fact that, apart from the question of allocation of amounts for the development of housing facilities for backward classes, the implementation of the various schemes was left to the Panchayats. When we talk of rural housing development, there are two aspects: one aspect is of making provision for the sites on which houses could be built; in other words, it is a question of giving land to the backward classes; this aspect is also entrusted to the Panchayats. The other aspect is making provision of funds, which funds should reach the hands of backward classes. So far as these two aspects are concerned, what do we find? In the first place, the Panchayats, as they are constituted, have very lukewarm attitude towards housing problem of backward classes. They are not prepared to make provisions for sites for these people at all, on which sites they could build houses. All sorts of excuses are advanced by the Panchayats. The result is that there is no progress on this front at all. Perhaps I may be accused for making a very sweeping statement. If you go to the villages, you will find that there is no change whatsoever either in regard to houses or sites. The people have been occupying damaged houses and *kuchha* houses for centuries . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Ghettoes!

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: I do not want to use the word 'ghettoes', because I have seen the American cities. There, 'ghettoes' have a particular meaning. If I have to name and characteristic these places in which they are living, I do not think that I can find any suitable word in the dictionary. I have tried to find out the meaning and whether that word could be made applicable to the villages occupied by the backward classes. What are the sanitary conditions? I need not describe them. I do not want to dwell on that topic at all. What I want to point out is that though we are very proud that we have brought about democratic decentralisation, since the panchayats have not changed their attitude and have always retained their lukewarm attitude . . .

SHRI DEORAO PATIL: The State Governments have not changed their attitude.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: I am coming to that. I am thankful for the suggestion.

Since the panchayats have not changed their attitude, the result is that their conditions remain as they were before. Whatever the States—we talked of the elite, we talk of educated persons, we talk of leaders drawn from different States—their attitude remains the same.

The States had two schemes, Centrally-administered schemes and State schemes. Under the Third Five Year Plan, we have given up Centrally-administered schemes and brought in Centrally-aided schemes. There is a vast difference between the two. Under both the schemes, the fate, lot and condition of these people have remained as they were. When Centrally-administered schemes gave place to Centrally-aided schemes, the States got a wide latitude and freedom to spend the amount earmarked for housing schemes of backward classes on some other scheme. They could spend it in any

manner they like except for housing schemes for the backward classes.

We have a paper. I happen to be a member of the panel on the backward classes. We divided ourselves into committees. Some of my friends dealt with housing schemes for the backward classes. What do we find? We have certain facts, figures and study papers gathered and compiled by the study teams. If I may be excused for using the word, the States have adopted a condemnable apathetic attitude towards these housing schemes for the backward classes. I do not know on what basis the decision was taken to change the Centrally-administered schemes into Centrally-aided schemes.

I would pinpoint the problem. First, the Planning Commission is not making adequate and necessary allocations for housing for the backward classes. Second, whatever amount is allocated is not spent on the housing schemes at all. The result is that the fate of these people remains as it is. Our main purpose in chalking out housing schemes was to bring about an egalitarian equalisation or mixed society. I do not use the words 'emotional integration', because it will take some centuries to bring about the necessary changes in people's attitudes and emotions to bring about that consummation, but we wanted to have some sort of integration or mixed society. When power is given to the village cooperatives or societies or States, if at all they build houses for the backward classes, they build them at a site far away from the rest of the population. Thereby they are creating different villages exclusively for the backward classes. How could there be any integration if we proceed in this manner?

We have an illustration, after the Koyana earthquake. I was under the impression and in fact I made the suggestion we have been making suggestions for a long time that the societies must mix. If at all we want to have houses, the houses must be

[Shri R. D. Bhandare]

so mixed so that there can be some sort of integration. When I was the Leader of the Opposition in the Maharashtra State Assembly, we had a committee under the chairmanship of the present Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, Dr. Gadgil we gave a report which dealt with the housing problem.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI (Poona): You lead the opposition in that State?

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: There are certain social problems which Mr. Joshi may not understand or appreciate—the problems which we are facing—because he is not living in the villages. I am living in the village; my people are living in a village. What difficulties and what sufferings we undergo you do not know. Why do you want to provoke me?

AN. HON. MEMBER: What is your experience in the Congress?

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE: When I was out of the Congress in the Opposition I used to come to the Planning Commission and submit documents, reports, etc. and carry on discussion and try to persuade the members of the Planning Commission. With what result? No result whatsoever. Now I am in the Congress and I am on the planning panel of the backward classes; I can do what I want to. What I could not do, what I wanted others to do can be done by me myself because I belong to the party in power. So, that has changed. The second change is that our people have a sense of development since they feel that they belong to a party which is ruling the country at the Centre. That sense of pride is there.

Rome was not built in a day. It takes time to make social progress. The process is going on, the process of formation and reformation even in the Congress itself. You are all aware of it. Therefore, have patience. I have asked my people also to be patient.

I was saying that the States have not changed their attitude of apathy towards the housing schemes of the backward classes. Time will not permit me to say more now. I hope there will be another occasion when we shall deal with planning and I shall give facts and figures. I thank you for giving me this opportunity to say a few words on this.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA (Gauhati): First of all, I must congratulate my hon. friend Mr. Tapuria for bringing forward this resolution to this forum of the nation. Because it is a very big problem for our country. The mover of the resolution has said enough and Mr. Bhandare also has stressed and laid emphasis on too many things about this problem. But what I cannot understand about this Government is this. This Government is wedded to the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi; wedded to the philosophy of socialist pattern, not socialism but the socialist pattern. Now we get the intimation from the Government, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, that Gandhi Centenary is coming and we should give certain suggestions about rural water schemes and other things. But I do not understand one thing: when this Government is wedded to the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and trying to do most of the things in the name of Mahatma Gandhi, I have not found one thing. You must remember that Mahatma Gandhi used to live in the villages. I know that some crores of rupees will be spent during the centenary. I want them to take up a certain number of villages in every State: say 10 villages in Assam, 20 in West Bengal, and like that, take a number of villages in all the States, in memory of Mahatma Gandhi, during this centenary and in those villages, some model housing programme must be taken up in the name of Mahatma Gandhi. I do not understand why they are not taking up such a thing. I request the Government that to begin with, in the name of Mahatma Gandhi, during the centenary, they should

take up certain housing schemes in the villages.

Secondly, these Ministers talk about rural housing and say that our country is marching towards socialism. But I know that even the Deputy Minister's bungalow has been provided with furniture, glass and windows at a cost of Rs. 45,000.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY (SHRI IQBAL SINGH): Rs. 22,000 in all, including all the electrical appliances, furniture, furnishing and everything.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA: May be, it is 50 per cent of what I have said. The point is, we could have at least 20 houses at that cost. Now, on the other hand, we are having palatial buildings. Mahatma Gandhi used to live in Sabarmati Ashram and the Sevagram in Wardha.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are you living?

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA: I am living in whatever has been allotted to me by the Government. I do not want that we should all be provided with bungalows. What I want is that the attitude of the country should change. What is the present attitude? They are constructing five-storey buildings in Delhi and some other cities; they are not giving enough money for constructing houses in the villages, in the rural areas. You are having a revolving tower, making the Asoka Hotel an ideal hotel in the whole world. Ours is a very poor country. Today, in the morning, we passed a law for evicting unauthorised persons. We can evict those who are dwelling on the streets

AN HON. MEMBER: Not yet passed.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA: Well, I think it is going to be passed. They are going to give the Central Govern-

ment the power to evict persons who are living in thatched houses or in hutments in unauthorised places. They will be evicted by the Government, but this Government does not take the responsibility for providing houses to the rural people, or those people who have not got any house at all. This is a shame and a sin for our country.

Thirdly, I wish to tell the mover of the resolution one thing. I know he belongs to the Swatantra Party. The private industrialists have been allotted some funds for the construction of houses to the coal-mines workers, industrial workers, etc. The money has also been allotted in their names. The hon. Member is not present here. He also belongs to the big industrial family. They are not providing houses to the industrial workers. Government also is not prepared to construct houses for workers. They are living in slum areas.

May I continue on the next day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. He may continue on the next day.

श्री इबराहिम पाटिल : सभापति महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि इस प्रस्ताव के लिए टाइम और बढ़ाया जाय ।

सभापति महोदय : जब यह प्रस्ताव प्रगली बार इस सदन में आयगा और सदन आवश्यक समझेगा, तो इस का टाइम बढ़ा दिया जायेगा ।

17.31 hrs.

HALF AN HOUR DISCUSSION

DEMURRAGE PAID BY FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA

श्री ब्रह्मलक्ष्मीकर शर्मा (बी/का) : सभापति महोदय, इसी सत्र में मेरे प्रस्तावित प्रश्न संख्या 789 का उत्तर देते हुए माननीय खाद्य तथा कृषि मन्त्री ने कहा था कि उत्तर प्रदेश, हरियाणा, पंजाब, राजस्थान और दिल्ली के विभिन्न स्थानों पर फूड क्लेब कापॉरेशन