

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

important matter. But it is listed for discussion tomorrow at four o'clock, and no Member shall anticipate the discussion on any motion etc. etc. and, therefore, this statement would have been blocked. But I did not deliberately raise it because it is an important issue affecting millions of people outside. We expected that when she chose to make the statement, the statement would go farther than this. My hon. friend Shri Ranga has already raised this important issue, and we thought that she would have had gdate to conclude her statement with a reference to the release of all the goldsmiths who have been arrested in the course of their agitation, and unlawfully detained.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. That statement will help the discussion tomorrow.

Shri Tyagi: The State Governments have to be consulted. So, how can a decision be taken here by the Central Government? (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These interruptions will not be recorded. (Interruptions).*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Pandey.

Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna): I support the sentiments expressed by my hon. friends that all those goldsmiths who have been arrested should be released. I have got every sympathy for those who have been arrested, and I would appeal to Government that they should accept the suggestion by my hon. friends opposite.

Shri Tyagi: Without taking the State Governments into consultation, I am afraid that it would be irregular for the Central Government to make any such announcement.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Let Shri Tyagi read the Constitution again. Let him not be pettifogging and mean-minded at this stage when the Prime Minister is inclined to make a statement.

*Not recorded.

श्री सच्चिदानन्द (मुंगेर) : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि गिरफ्तार किये गए स्वर्णकारों को तो छोड़ ही देना चाहिए, लेकिन एक और बात है कि परसों जिन लोगों को जेल में रखा गया, उन के साथ जेल-अधिकारियों ने और सिपाहियों ने बड़ा बुरा व्यवहार किया है। एक आदमी, जसवन्त सिंह को पीट दिया गया है। (व्यवधान) माननीय सदस्यों को बुरा क्यों लग रहा है। क्या कैदियों के साथ ऐसा व्यवहार करना चाहिए ?

Shri Raghunath Singh: How can these things be discussed at this stage?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: We had said that we would seriously consider releasing the goldsmiths and our attitude is the same. But I would appeal to them now to give up their hunger-strike. That was the main thing.

श्री अशोक लाल बेस्वा (कोटा) : उन को पीटा न जाये। उन को जेल में पीटा गया है।

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): Their release will solve all the problems.

17.18 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: REORIENTATION
OF PLANS—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the resolution moved by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I have only a very few observations to make on this resolution.

श्री शिव नारायण : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस रेजोल्यूशन पर मुझे भी बूलाइये। एक प्राक्सिस के चार सदस्यों और दूसरे प्राक्सिस के तीन सदस्यों को मौका दे दिया गया है। मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि इस रेजोल्यूशन के लिए एक घंटा समय और बढ़ा दिया जाये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may please sit down.

श्री शिव नारायण : मैं ने प्रस्ताव रखा है कि समय एक घंटा और बढ़ा दिया जाय । इस प्रस्ताव पर वोटिंग कराया जाये

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member is obstructing the proceedings. Let him please go out now.

श्री शिव नारायण : मेरा अधिकार है प्रस्ताव पेश करने का । आप इस पर वोट लीजिए ।

Shri Shinkre: He should have gone out, but he is still here and he has not gone out

श्री शिव नारायण : मैं ने प्रस्ताव रखा है कि इस रेजोल्यूशन का टाइम बढ़ा दिया जाये । आप उस पर वोट लीजिए ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member should sit down now.

श्री शिव नारायण : मैं इस हाउस का मेम्बर हूँ । मैं ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, आप उस को लीजिए ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Will he please sit down? Or else, he may please go out of the House.

Shri Sheo Narain: I shall go out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is obstructing the proceedings of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: He may go out for the rest of the session.

(Shri Sheo Narain left the House)

Shri Ranga: I wish to associate my self and my party with the objective of this resolution namely that Government's outlook on Plans in the matter of outlay-resources position should be changed and reoriented and they should also give top priority to the rural sector for irrigation, electrification and water supply. I hope this Resolution would be passed unanimously in this House.

While supporting it, let me warn my friends here and the country that though this is the general sentiment felt by almost everybody in the country, in actual practice, if Government really were serious in implementing the main purposes of this Plan, the object of this Resolution is not going to be realised. On the other hand, they are going to raise the tax burden on our rural people. They have themselves stated here that the water rates are likely to be raised; the land revenue has got to be raised and hundreds of more crores of rupees have to be collected from the agriculturists. So they would have much less for self-reliance and self-help.

Till now what is the position all over India? In almost all places our peasants and agriculturist workers are obliged to spend their own money, individually as well as collectively, in order to provide themselves with a modicum of water supply. In large tracts of our country for weeks, sometimes for months, there is no water at all anywhere nearby; for miles and miles they are obliged to trek, and they are also obliged to purchase water also almost by tumbler-fulls. My hon. friends on the Treasury Benches are well aware of all these things. In Rayalaseema, it is happening even today. In Rajasthan it has happened. In certain parts of Madhya Pradesh and Orissa also, it has happened. This is the miserable fact of our rural existence.

Would Government be able to provide money for these things? Would they be able to do it if they proceed with the plan in the manner they are approaching it. Actually, the whole of this Plan is centrally-oriented. Instead of placing more funds at the disposal of the peasants, they want to take away their resources by way of higher taxes. Instead of leaving more money to be devoted for their expenditure by the States for these things, they want to place more money at their own disposal at the centre. The

[Shri Ranga]

Centre is now going to be a grand leviathan stifling the so-called provincial autonomy and local self-reliance of our State Governments. These facts are writ large in this Plan.

At the Centre, they wanted to spend Rs. 4,200 odd crores in the Third Plan and Rs. 4,300 crores in the States. Now in the Fourth Plan, the respective figures are Rs. 8,500 crores and Rs. 7,400 crores.

The tax burdens are going to be higher and more crushing. From existing taxes alone, they want to raise Rs. 3,000 odd crores out of Rs. 13,270 crores they are hoping to mobilise in India and abroad. Out of these, Rs. 700 crores are to come from state projects and undertakings. How would they raise it except by raising the tax burdens of our kisans? They want to raise this by revision of land revenue rates or adjustments in irrigation charges or special levies or surcharges on commercial crops.

How are they going to exhaust or misdirect our resources? Their proposal is to exhaust or sink Rs. 8,630 crores, 50 per cent, on public sector projects. Excepting for what they may spend on irrigation projects, all the rest of it is going to be spent on these public enterprises which till now have been white elephants. Would they be able to give anything for rural water supply; or rural electricity? Would there be enough money for the purpose? Where would there be any money for these things? Nothing so far as the rural areas are concerned. It is impossible for this Government to improve the rural conditions. They have neglected rural irrigation; they have now neglected rural water supply; they will be neglecting rural electrification.

Then, what is it that they are going to do for the rural areas? In the years to come they want us to hope for something. Therefore, I can only say that though they want this fourth plan to be accepted by the people as

their election manifesto, I can assure them that this fourth plan does not hold out any hopes at all for our rural people who form 70 per cent of the people. Whatever provision they have made for electricity is going to be spent, more than three-fourths, on towns alone.

Shri Tyagi: Our party is not going to neglect the villagers, I can assure you.

Shri Ranga: We suggested that there should be year-by-year plans they have come to that. We want the plan to be phased instead of five years to seven years, in actual practice they will be coming to that. Therefore, the result will be that this document is a grand document of hopes which would be unrealised, but hopes by which they want to gain votes. They will not be able to gain those votes because people who are already frustrated, who are disappointed by the promises by these people are likely to be much more disappointed, and therefore I hope they will not be able to succeed in deceiving those people whom they want to deceive and misdirect.

The Minister of Planning and Social Welfare (Shri Asoka Mehta): The debate so far has developed into a little debate on the fourth plan outline as a whole. So many questions have been raised that it is impossible within the few minutes at my disposal to give satisfactory answers.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: You should have asked for more time, but you asked for only ten minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Plan discussion is coming later.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Therefore, think we shall confine our attention to the resolution that Mr. Mathur has moved.

There are many other aspects and considerations into which I am sure this House would like to go into fully at the proper time. I would welcome

any opportunity where this document will be discussed in full detail. My hope and expectation is that perhaps Parliament will set up various committees, as it did on the previous occasion, and during the inter-session period these committees will go through the different sectors of the plan, or whatever be the way in which the parliamentary committees would like to approach and analyse the document, because as I have stated, this is a draft outline. We want to have the full benefit of the advice, comments and suggestions that the Members may want to make.

This afternoon various valuable comments have been made, and we would try to benefit ourselves from these comments, but I would only beg of those Members as well as others that this plan has to be considered from various aspects, and unless these various considerations are fully weighed, we should not rush to any conclusion. No plan is going to be finalised unless the views of Members of Parliament, Members of the State legislatures as well as of other relevant groups concerned in the country are fully taken into account. But if we were, for instance, to say that a certain thing is done for industry and therefore it is not useful for agriculture we may perhaps be prejudging the issue. If we want electrification, we are going to depend upon copper, which we may or may not be able to import, we will have to develop the aluminium industry. If we want to develop the fertiliser industry, there are again a number of industries, refineries, oil exploration and development, which have to be taken up. There are a number of interrelationships which are needed from the point of view of the development of our economy and the defence of our country. These and allied considerations we have gone into very carefully, seriously and earnestly. We would welcome an opportunity to place these things before the various groups of Parliament. Let them consider them, let them weigh the pros and cons. We have devoted almost three

years before reaching certain conclusions. After they have done that, if they suggest in their wisdom that certain changes should be made, of course, that is the final voice. I suggest it is not a matter which could be decided through a debate of two or three hours. In order that there should be no misunderstanding on this point, I would personally accept the amendment that has been moved by Shri Shree Narayan Das which says that this House is of opinion that the Government should give top priority to the rural sector for irrigation, electrification and water supply because there could be no two opinions on this question. As far as agriculture is concerned, it has to be given the highest priority. Whether we have given adequate priority or not is a matter which I would like any group that is set up to go into carefully. I can give you some figures; Mr. Mathur has given certain figures; I can give the figures and they may or may not carry conviction here and now. These are matters which any group of 10 or 20 or 100 people can go into; we would like them to go into this matter fully. Take for instance, rural electrification. For the current year, 1966-67, the States came forward with certain proposals and they were examined in working groups and were accepted in toto by the Planning Commission. Later on, it is possible that certain new demands may come up in certain States and they have to be gone into again as is being done from year to year. Take minor irrigation programme.... (Interruptions.) I have been quietly listening to every hon. Member and I want that courtesy to be extended to me.... (Interruptions.) Various States have come forward with what may be called supplementary requirements. Teams have gone round and gone into these requirements and now the Agriculture Ministry has come forward with a suggestion that an additional provision of Rs. 24 crores has to be made and the Planning Commission which was associated with these teams had supported this suggestion and that has to be taken up with Finance.

Shri Tyagi: Does that meet the demand of the State Governments?

Shri Asoka Mehta: It is not the demand of the State Governments; the demands are looked into by the various teams that have gone into them and a joint agreement is achieved. It is not a question of demand; it is a question of looking into and arriving at a joint conclusion. For instance, when we looked into it, we found that adequate surveys of underground waters had not been made everywhere. We should try to tap underground water but not in a manner whereby we would be over-drawing upon the supplies. This has to be gone into. Technical teams have come to the conclusion about 18 or 24 months ago that 17 million acres can be irrigated by minor irrigation, and if we tried to do more we would perhaps be overstretching underground water resources. We made provision for 17 million acres; if more is possible, we will see, technically, administratively. We are willing to look into it. We have started a series of discussions with the States administratively or about the feasibility. These are matters which have to be gone into and are being gone into. We have therefore said that the plan will have to be modified from year to year depending upon our performance. It is from agriculture that we hope that the main resources needed would be provided and, as Mr. Mathur said, stability to our economy will come. If that is to come to agriculture, the agriculturists must also give their share of resources needed for development. We cannot expect development will move forward without substantial amounts of investments being made in agriculture; we cannot expect that when production goes up and incomes go up certain marginal rate of savings will not go up side by side. I do not want to enter into any kind of debate on this and I would end up by saying this.

I merely want to invite the attention of the House to the fact that for

minor irrigation, for example, the provision was Rs. 177 crores in the third Plan outlay. In the fourth Plan it will be Rs. 520 crores. For rural electrification, as against Rs. 105 crores, it will be Rs. 250 crores; for rural water supply, against Rs. 18 crores, it will be Rs. 150 crores. If we look at the various programmes of agriculture, one will find that as against Rs. 300 crores which were provided for these programmes in the third Plan, in the Fourth Plan Rs. 920 crores have been provided. Here again, I have no desire to talk in terms of financial provisions. I quite agree with those hon. Members who have said that we have to look into the physical performance. That is precisely what we have been trying to do. It is possible that in a particular State the physical performance may today be just better than what we judge when a certain Plan was drawn up; we are quite willing to look into it again. That is why this is called the Draft Outline.

Therefore, I would say, rather than pass any judgement on what has been done, here is an outline on which let us devote our concentrated and co-operative attention and try and see that this Plan is so modified, where modification is necessary, so improved where improvement is possible, so that while subserving the needs of our economic development, it will also safeguard the long-term objectives that we have, of creating an economy that can stand on its own and also give the support that is needed for the security of our country.

Shri Tyagi: May I seek just a clarification? Last time, for major and medium irrigation schemes, 2,300 crores were sanctioned, out of which only Rs. 1,300 crores were spent. There were still Rs. 1,000 crores. There were half-done schemes. Have you made up the shortfall? How do you make good the shortfall? That is all I wanted to know.

Shri Asoka Mehta: As somebody said, there are 500 schemes, and as for the why's and wherefores, why 'X' provision is made and why 'Y' provision is made; I am quite prepared to sit down with any group of people and let them look into it and let them look at these things objectively and try to understand and say what is to be done.

Shri Tyagi: In the Plan, it is cut down.

Shri Asoka Mehta: How is it possible to give that kind of detailed answer which would satisfy him? I am quite prepared to do, rather, we are most anxious to sit down with various groups and let them look into these things.

Shri Tyagi: Agreed.

Shri Asoka Mehta: That is subject only to one consideration: that while they look into any one particular sector, they must also take into consideration the needs of other sectors also; otherwise, it is very easy to say that this particular sector must be supported and so on. The overall requirements have got to be looked into.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I will only take five to seven minutes. I am most grateful to the hon. Members who participated in this debate, from all sections of the House and from all parties, giving robust support to the central idea of this resolution.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Why don't you thank all those who had no chance to speak also?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am most indebted to our revered Dr. Aney, because what he means to say is the feeling of the House as was made absolutely plain and clear by Shri Tyagi twice, that the whole House is at least one on this particular issue. I would have been happy if the hon. Minister of Planning had taken a little care at least to resolve the contradictions which I pointed out. I know he could not go into the entire

gamut of the Plan, but it is from the experience of the three Plans and it is from the experience of the functioning of the Government and more particularly it is because of the provisions which they have made in the first year of the fourth Plan that I felt compelled to say that they are going just the other way, just at a tangent from the professions which they had made in the third Plan. My hon. friend says he is prepared to accept that the agricultural sector and rural electrification must be given top priority. But what is the sense of top priority? That is exactly what I pinpointed: what this top priority means. There has been a tapering down from year to year of the major river valley projects; they have been cutting down and making them smaller and smaller. So also, I gave a pointed example of how a particular State—the State of Rajasthan—could not get even Rs. 5 crores for those schemes which are ready. My hon. friend says they had sent out a team; that team had come. But there are so many schemes under execution at the present moment. Are they going to re-examine all those major and medium schemes about 500 in number, which are not new and which are already there? They have been fully examined and are under execution. The most patent factor is they have not been able to find Rs. 200 crores, so that instead of getting 26 million acres under irrigation, we will get only 14 million acres.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I dispute those figures. For lack of time I could not go into them. I would like to discuss it with him or any group later.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: He could have given those figures. My source of information is his own Ministry's documents and what has been told to us. If these figures are to be disputed, it would have been much better if he had come out with his figures.

It is not at all a party question. We are passing through a crucial period and something has got to be done here and now. They have to take

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]
certain decisions in September about the additional funds to be provided this year for rural electrification and irrigation. I wish he learns a little lesson. His visits to USA will not satisfy any of us here. There is no Minister of his rank and calibre who wasted 22 days in a foreign country. I understand he is going again there next week. I wish he creates a much better rapport between himself and all sections of the House, try to understand our mind and feelings and take immediate steps. I suggest again before he leaves for U.S.A.....

Shri Asoka Mehta: I am not leaving for USA; I am not going out of the country just now.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am happy to learn that.

He referred to underground water. There are so many schemes. I will not enter into any further controversy unnecessarily here. I would appeal to him, at least for 1966-67, he should take the cue from the feelings of this House. We would be happy to learn during this session before the 7th of this month as to what his thinking is, what additional funds he is going to provide and what importance he is going to give to the feelings voiced in this House. Let us first see what is to be done in 1966-67. For the rest of the four years, we can discuss it in the November session.

With these observations, I do hope that the Minister will give proper attention to this matter.

Shri Asoka Mehta: On that, I had made the position clear. The Food and Agriculture Ministry is asking for Rs. 24 crores more for minor irrigation and the Planning Commission has supported that.

Shri Tyagi: That is not enough. Even the Ministry is not asking for enough. We require more. The Ministry is failing us. That is no argument.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Have not the Irrigation and Power Ministry

asked for at least Rs. 30 crores for rural electrification?

Shri Asoka Mehta: An additional Rs. 29 crores.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put Shri Yashpal Singh's amendment.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put Shri Shree Narayan Das's amendment which is being accepted by the hon. Minister.

The question is:

"That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that the Government should give top priority to rural sector for irrigation, electrification and water supply." (3)

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Since this substitute motion has been adopted, the original motion and the other amendments fall through.

17.44 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: SCHEME FOR DRINKING WATER FOR MADRAS

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that the Government should provide sufficient financial assistance to the State Government of Madras for early implementation of a scheme to provide adequate supply of drinking water to the city of Madras."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue his speech on the next day.

17.45 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, September 3, 1966/Bhadra 12, 1885 (Saka).