

RAJYA SABHA

Monday, the 8th August, 1994/17
Sravana, 1916 (.Saka)

The House met at two Minutes past
Seven of the Clock_ Mr. Chairman
in tile Chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS Per Capita income

*201. SHRI IQBAL SINGH: Will
the Minister of PLANNING AND
PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION
be pleased to state:

(a) whether per capita income in the
country has increased or decreased in
1993-94 as compared to 1992-99;

(b) if so, the per capita income in
the country in 1992-93 and 1993-94;
and

(c) the climated per capital income
in the country during the furst
three months of the current financial
year?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF
THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING
AND PROGRAMME
IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI
GIRIDHAR GOMAN-GO): (a) said (b)
The per capita income (pat capita net
national product at fasten cost) at
constant (1980-81) prices in the
country has increa-std from. Rs. 2216
in 1992-93 to Rs, 2251) 1.1 1993-94.

(c) Estimates of national product ' are
not prepared on quarterly basis, and as
such the estimate of per capita income
during the first three months of the
current financial year is not available.

श्री इकबाल सिंह : केयरमैन सर, भारत
को आजाद हुये 47 साल हो चुके हैं
और तीन साल बाद हम स्वर्ण जयन्ती
मनाने वाले हैं। यह देखा जा रहा है कि
भारत के लोगों की पर-केपिटा इंकम
बहुत कम है। जबकि हमारे देश के आजाद

होने के बाद जो पड़ोसी देश आजाद
हुये हैं उनकी पर-केपिटा इंकम बहुत
बढ़ी है। तो जबकि फाइव ईयर प्लान
का मुख्य उद्देश्य यही है कि इन्वेस्टमेंट
का बढ़ावा करना प्रोडक्शन का बढ़ावा करना
एम्प्लॉयमेंट को बढ़ाना, नेशनल
इंकम को बढ़ाना और पर-केपिटा इंकम
को बढ़ाना। मेरे पास 1984 के आंकड़
हैं जो कि स्विटजरलैंड में 16330 डालर
पर-केपिटा इंकम है, यू.एस.ए. में
15390 डालर, जर्मनी में 11130 डालर,
यू.के. में 87 हज़र्ड 50 डालर, जापान
में 10620 डालर और चीन में....
(अवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN; Please ask the
question.

श्री इकबाल सिंह : और भारत वर्ष में
करीब 200 डालर है। तो मैं माननीय
मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि हम
कब तक दूसरे देशों की तुलना में यहां
के लोगों की पर-केपिटा इंकम बढ़ा
सकेंगे और पर-केपिटा इंकम बढ़ाने के
लिये क्या-क्या उपाय किये हैं और किस
ढंग से हमारे जो गरीब लोग हैं, उनका
स्तर बढ़ा सकेंगे ?

SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO:
Sir, during the Seventh Five-^Year
Plan, against the growth rate target
of 5.8 per cent, we were able to
achieve only 5 per cent. During the
Eighth Five-Year Plan, against the
target of 5.6 per cent, we were able
to achieve only 1.1 per cent in 1991-
92; 4 per cent in 1992-93, as per the
quick estimate which were
publish
ed; 3.8 per cent in 1993-94, ag per
the advance estimates furnished by
the Department of Statistics; and for
1994-95, the forecast is 4.5 per cent.
The hon. Member asked about the
investment and achievement
over the years. I have furnished the fi
gures as per the information receiv
ed from the Department of Statis
tics.

In regard to the comparaitipe figures
which he had given, comparing o&r-
selveg with the other countries, I

would say that We are developing on the basis of the investment which is available in the country.

श्री इकबाल सिंह : मंत्री जी ने वह तो उत्तर नहीं दिया कि दूसरे देशों के मुकाबले हम कितना आगे बढ़े हैं, व्याज की दर के बारे में बात की, लेकिन हमारा देश ग्रामीण देश है, हमारे देश के लोग अनुसूचित जाति, शेड्यूल ट्राइब्स, आदिवासी और फारमर्स के साथ लेबर करने वाले लोग हैं, मैं इनके बारे में जानना चाहता हूँ कि इनका कब तक स्तर ऊँचा उठा सकेंगे ताकि ये देश में शिक्षा प्राप्त कर सकें और जो कि पापुलेशन का बढ़ावा हो रहा है, उसको तब ही वे खत्म कर सकेंगे जबकि इनकी एजुकेशन मिल जायेगा और इनके रहने का स्तर बढ़ जायेगा, तो मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE) : Mr. Chairman Sir, if you agree, I can answer this question. Though I am not the Minister concerned, as the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, perhaps, I can answer this.

Firstly, I would like to inform the hon. Member that *per capita* income also depends, to a considerable extent on the population. The hon. Member would surely appreciate that when we became independent, when we started our planning, at that point of time, the total population was a little less than 350 million. But today, we are almost reaching a population of 900 million. Therefore, this has some relevance.

Secondly, to a considerable extent, *per capita* income depends on what growth we can achieve. During 1951-1979 i.e. from the First Five-Year Plan to the end of the Rust Five-Year Han, in addition, to the three Annual Plans, our growth rate was 3.5 per cent. Of course, in the last decade, in the eighties, we achieved a higher growth, i.e. more than 5.5 per cent in the Sixth and Seventh

Five-Year Plans. Again, there has been a declining trend. Though we have been able to achieve a growth rate of 4 per cent and 3.8 per cent in the first two years of the current Plan, it is still less than the target we had fixed, i.e. 5.6 per cent.

Therefore, *per capita* income, over all' gross domestic product net domestic product and net national in come would all depend, to a considerable extent, on how we can step up our investment and output. So far as the question of rural development is concerned, keeping that in view, one of the thrust areas of the Eighth Plan is massive rural development. So far as the public sector outlay is concerned, if - one compares it with the total outlay which was originally decided at the formulation of the Seventh Plan, it was Rs. 7,000 crores at the price level of 1985-86. That has been stepped up to Rs. 30,000 crores, at the price level of 1991-92. It is not adequate. I do agree with the requirements of the rural sector ' but, noneinences depending on 'he availability of resources if the whose country's investable resource are 23.2 per cent of the GDP, naturally we cannot expect to have a very high level of investment. To bridge that gap we are inviting' foreign invest, ments, and all these things are related thereto.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : माननीय सभापति जी, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूँगा कि पर-केपिटा इनकम की ओर कांस्टेंट ग्राइसेज पर मत तीन वर्षों में क्या रही है? क्या यह सही है कि 90-91 के मुकाबले में 91-92 में पर केपिटा इनकम कांस्टेंट ग्राइसेज पर कम हुई है? यदि हाँ, तो उसके क्या कारण हैं? वे कौन से राज्य हैं जिनकी पर-केपिटा इनकम नेशनल एवरेज को दृष्टिगत रखते हुये कम हुई है और पिछले एक दशक में पर-केपिटा इनकम का टारगेट क्या था और उस टारगेट को ध्यान में रखते हुये जिन राज्यों में

पर-केपिटा इनकम कम हुई, वहां की पर-केपिटा इनकम में सुधार के लिये सरकार की तरफ से क्या प्रयास किये जा रहे हैं ?

SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO: Sir, already I have stated that for 1991-92 the percentage of GDP was only 1.1. Then, the information which we have got is State-wise per capita income. If you see the per capita income for the year 1991-92, Bihar comes last with Rs. 1,008. We are Delhi is first with Rs. 5,000. This is the information which we have received from the States' Statistics Departments. We are compiling this information which we have received from the field level about the afferent schemes undertaken by the different departments. We are calculating the per capita investment and per capita income. Oh the basis of that we have got an all-India figure. Though State-wise we have got the figures, for compiling we are using whatever information we have received from our field organizations like agriculture, mining, manufacturing, electricity, construction, hotel, financing, and community, social and personnel services. In all these eight sectors where we have received the information, I have already furnished it, and the investment which has to be increased on the basis of the resources available in the country. Already the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has explained the position. The per capita income will have to be calculated by dividing the income available for the year by the total population of the country. So, whatever information we have received and compiled, I have given the comparison of the increase and decrease, the performance which we had for the year 1990-91, which we calculated in 1991-92. It was a year where there was stagnation in different fields where we could not achieve whatever targets were estimated for that year.

SHRI JAGESH DEBBI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this answer, to me is a paradox. The industrial production has come down. It was even minus, and now it is 1.5 per cent. There is an increase of 16 per cent in the production of consumer durables which are purchased by elite and rich people. The per-capita income growth does not reflect the correct picture. How has this growth been distributed? That is important. When there was 15 per cent growth in consumer durables, that means the rich people have amassed wealth at the cost of the common man, and the number of people below the poverty-line has gone up. So, will the Minister tell us about the extent to which the number of people below the poverty-line has gone up? That will give the real picture. For that purpose, I would like to request Mr. Pranab Mukherjee who is in the Planning Commission to answer my question, how he is going to meet this challenge.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, the point which the hon. Member referred to, has some relevance. It is true that there has been growth in certain sectors, particularly in consumer durables, which is encouraging and which is also contributing to the overall growth. Keeping in view the overall performance of the economy over a relatively longer period, the total population below the poverty-line has come down.

However, as is known to the hon. Members of the House, we appointed an expert group. It has suggested a different methodology. If we apply that methodology, then, there will be some variations in terms of the total number of persons below the poverty-line. But, the whole thrust of the Eighth five-year Plan is to ensure that the rural sectors get massive investment both to the physical infrastructure and in the social infrastructure. That is why, out of Rs. 3,61,000 crores of public sector fresh investment, and III «a

take into account the current outlay, the (total investment luring the Eighth Plan would be Rs. 4,34,100 crores. At the price level of 1991-92, nearly 78 per cent of this investment is earmarked specifically to provide the physical infrastructure and the social infrastructure. By social infrastructure I mean employment generation, health and education, and by physical infrastructure, I mean power, transport, communication and irrigation. There has been some slippage. There is no denying of that fact. As a result, the employment generation has also not come upto the mark. As I mentioned in reply to an earlier question, we are short of the targeted growth rate, though we have improved much in 1992-93 and 1993-94 from the level of 1991-92.

डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र (बिहार) : सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि प्रति व्यक्ति आय की स्थिति राष्ट्रीय औसत में और राज्यों की प्रति व्यक्ति आय में जो खाई बनी है और बनती जा रही है, यह विस्तारित है। खास तौर से बिहार, बंगाल, उत्तर प्रदेश, उड़ीसा और पूर्वांचल के राज्य हैं, उनमें यह खाई बनती जा रही है, इस खाई को पाटने के लिये क्या कोई संभावित प्रयास सरकार के विचाराधीन है और जैसा कि अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा कि पूँजी निवेश से और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विनियोग से उत्पादन बढ़ने की संभावनाएँ होंगी और इन राज्यों की आमदनी बढ़ेगी। इस संबंध में मैं सरकार से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति और जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विनियोग की संभावनाएँ बढ़ रही हैं, उससे ये राज्य जो आज पिछड़े हैं वह और पिछड़े क्योंकि इन राज्यों में आर्थिक संरचना है नहीं। इस लिये विदेशी पूँजी एन.आर.आई. की है और उसमें इनवेस्टमेंट की संभावना नहीं है। इससे वर्तमान आर्थिक नीति के संबंध इन राज्यों में प्रति व्यक्ति आय की खाई आगे के दिनों में बढ़ने वाली है। सरकार इस खाई को पाटने के लिये क्या विचार रखती है? अगर इन राज्यों के राष्ट्रीय औसत की खाई पाटी नहीं गई तो आगे

के दिनों में राष्ट्रीय एकता के लिये बढ़ा चुनौती बनेगी। विकसित राज्य बढ़ते जायेंगे महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात जैसे और उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार जैसे राज्य पिछड़ते जायेंगे जहाँ विनियोग की संभावना नहीं होगी। क्या सरकार की दृष्टि में यह विषय है?

SHRI P'PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Unfortunately there is a dichotomy in the system. What the hon. Member has said is correct to a considerable extent. The per-capita income of as many as eight States out of the 15 non-Special Category States is lower than the national average.

Since 1950, in transferring the Central Plan assistance, we have taken note of this factor. The latest formula for Central Plan assistance to the non-Special Category States is that 20 per cent of the total Central assistance is given to those States through the deviation formula whose per-capita income is less than that of the national average and five per cent is for all States on distance formula. In addition to that 7.5 per cent of the total Central assistance is to take care of the special problems. So, a substantial quantum of money goes to those States. But, unfortunately, even if we look at the performance of the States in regard to the developmental expenditure quite a few of them are well below the desirable level. Unfortunately, it has happened, particularly, in the first three years—first two years and the current year—that the resource mobilisation, which was resorting to by the States to augment the developmental expenditure was far short. Today if somebody compares the per-capita Plan outlay of Maharashtra and Karnataka with Bihar and UP, he will find that there is a big difference, but that would not lead us to the correct picture, because if we take the Central support and the State's own resources then we will find that in some States the Central support is more than the total Plan investment in that State in that particular year. Therefore, this is the problem which we are confronted with today. We have taken it up with the States.

The second question is in regard to the market-related economy. Naturally, the investment decision will not be taken according to the predetermined priority by the Government or by the Planning Commission. It will depend upon the market trend. Therefore, the private sector will go wherever it will find it more profitable. To ensure a balanced growth intervention of the State is necessary. That is why, in the major sectors, particularly in providing the physical infrastructure, the State intervention is absolutely called for and we are actually doing so and we will actually do so.

डा० जग नाराय मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहूँ कि क्या यह सच नहीं है कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना से आज ४वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना तक बिहार समेत इन राज्यों में प्रति व्यक्ति आय और प्रति व्यक्ति केन्द्रीय सहायता सबसे कम है ? इसी वजह से इन राज्यों में आर्थिक संरचना का निर्माण नहीं हो पाया। इसलिये इन कठिनाईयों के कारण यह अतिरिक्त संसाधन इकट्ठे करने में और अपने साधनों से अपना विकास करने में पीछे है। क्या सरकार विचार रखती है कि ऐसे राज्य जिन्हें 1952 से लगातार केन्द्रीय सहायता कम से कम मिली, योजना व्यव सबसे कम हुआ, यह खाई बढ़ती चली गई है और आगे के दिनों में खाई बढ़ती जायेगी तो क्या इस खाई को पाटने के लिये किसी व्यवस्था पर केन्द्रीय सरकार विचार करेगी और इस असमानता को दूर करने का प्रयास करेगी ?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE; Sir, it is a fact that the per-capita Plan outlay varies from State to State, but, as I mentioned, to a considerable extent, it depends also on the State's own efforts at resource mobilisation. So far as the State of Bihar is concerned—my hon. friend will agree with me, because he happened to be the Chief Minister of that State for a number of years—that from the First Plan till the Seventh, only in one Plan period Bihar could reach the Plan target in nominal terms—

From the First Plan to the Seventh Plan, only during one Plan period, Bihar could reach the Plan target in nominal terms and that was during the period of the Sixth Plan when he happened to be the Chief Minister. Unfortunately in the First Plan, Second Plan, Third Plan, Fourth Plan, Annual Plan, in every Plan we found that the actual Plan expenditure was below the targeted level. And what happens? The normal practice is from one Plan to another Plan, we double the outlay.

Therefore, If there is a slippage income Plan, it continues and that is a classic case between Maharashtra and West Bengal. When we had started the First Plan, both of them were at par. But when there was slippage particularly! from the Fourth Plan period, we found that the gap had started increasing. So, the answer lies in not merely providing Central assistance. Central assistance! ?s being provided on the basis of a formula. As I explained, the formula is highly weighted in favour of the relatively poor States. The infrastructural development is important for and investment climate, all these things are to be created in the States.

Contribution of States UTs for Exports

"202. SHRI K. M. KHAN: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state;

(a) whether any decision has been taken to involve the States and Union Territories to extend their contribution in improving the country's exports;

(b) if so, details thereof and the names of the States and Union Territories which have made their contribution in this field so far.

(c) whether it is fact that with this joint exercise country's exports have increased considerably during 1993-94;

(d) if so, the details thereof in comparison to 1992-93;

(e) whether Government propose to take some action or provide some in-