

APPROACH TO THE SEVENTH FIVE YEAR PLAN 1985-90—(Contd.)

SHRI V. RAMANATHAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, first of all, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak in this House on the subject of Approach to the Seventh Five Year Plan. The Approach deals with mainly food, production, employment and productivity. Just like other drafts of the earlier Plans, this draft also gives details regarding the facilities that will be given to the agriculturists, how industry will be improved, how raw materials will be obtained and so on. The draft paper gives all these things in detail in colourful terms.

Sir, first of all, the Approach paper expects a five per cent increase in the Plan. To improve agriculture, they are promising fertilisers, pesticides, loans from financial institutions and other help to agriculturists. They expect the agriculturists to work more, to improve more, to bring the rural economy to a higher position. The planners expect that if the rural economy is improved, the surplus from the rural economy will flow to the industrial economy and thereby it will improve the industrial sector also. But my humble submission is that we should consider whether the rural economy can be improved at this stage, whether the agriculturists are in a better position now. The price of fertilisers is going up. The labour cost is going up. But at the same time, the prices of agricultural products are not going up at all. For example, I want to submit that the Agricultural Prices Commission (APC) was appointed by this Government. It collects data from various sections and after collecting and analysing all the agricultural data, it arrives at a decision and recommends what price can be given to every crop that is produced by the agriculturists. For example, for sugarcane last year the Agricultural Prices Commission fixed the price at Rs. 165 per tonne at 8.5 per cent recovery. But unfortunately the Government fixed only Rs. 135 for sugarcane. Therefore, the production cost of the agriculturist is higher than the price fixed by the Government. Therefore, he becomes a loser in the agricultural sector. Even in wheat and paddy, the agriculturists are

losing like this. Even the Agricultural Prices Commission fixes low prices for the agricultural products. The prices are fixed at a low level, while the production costs go up. So he becomes a loser. He goes into indebtedness. He gets loans from financial institutions, and the financial institutions collect interest and penal interest subsequently. The agriculturists are not able to pay. They go to the court.

By that the agriculturist incurs another 15 per cent of loss. Thus the amounts borrowed by him swell up to more than 100 per cent with the result he cannot make any repayment and he remains indebted constantly. In the process the agricultural sector suffers. The agricultural sector suffers not only from seasonal conditions; the agriculturist is not able to get a proper price for his produce. Therefore, he fails and with him fails the entire agricultural sector. The agriculturist cannot make any improvements as far as his housing and other facilities are concerned. He cannot give proper education to his children. He cannot even properly clothe himself and his family. Therefore, if the rural economy is to be brought up, a proper price has to be given to the agriculturist for his produce; otherwise, agricultural economy will never be able to look up. The Plan has to take this aspect into consideration. They say rural economy will go up by 5 per cent but at the same time they say they are not going to take up any new irrigation schemes. They say they are going to concentrate only on the pending works. As far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, there is no water source at all. They depend upon rain water or tank irrigation. There are thousands of tanks in Tamil Nadu catering to the irrigation of agricultural lands. Unless those tanks are maintained properly, irrigation will suffer greatly and paddy cultivation will go down. When there is not enough production of rice, the agriculturist suffers, the agricultural economy suffers, more than the agriculturist, the people at large will suffer because they will not have any rice to eat. Not only that. Unless there is enough production of paddy, unless there is surplus production of paddy, you cannot export. If you can export paddy, it will fetch you a good amount of foreign exchange. As you know, our

[Shri V. Ramanathan]

foreign exchange reserves are dwindling. We are not able to export our products in good quantities. If our foreign exchange reserves are meagre, we cannot import certain essential items which are not available in India but which we very badly need. As far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, therefore, the irrigation tanks which are its major source, should be properly maintained. Now the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has offered to give electricity free to all consumers for irrigation purposes. To some extent electricity is subsidised. But that alone will not be enough. The State Government is doing whatever it can. There should be some more assistance provided. The State Government should be reimbursed the amounts that it would be foregoing by extending energy subsidy to the agriculturists. Otherwise, the State Government will not be able to make its investments in other sectors. If all these aspects are not taken care of, the agriculturists will suffer, the people will suffer. I would again urge that the irrigation tanks in Tamil Nadu should be maintained properly and every effort should be made to eliminate agricultural indebtedness. You should see that agriculturists are not dragged to courts for recovery of loans. Banks also should try to adopt soft means of recovering their advances from the agriculturists and they should help the agriculturists in all possible manner and not cause any hardship to them.

As far as surplus land is concerned, the Government has been saying for the last 15 to 20 years about distribution of surplus land to landless agriculturists. The report says about small farmers and marginal farmers. They have not said about big farmers. Who are big farmers? What is the formula? An Hon'ble Member was saying that those whose holdings are over 2,000 or 3,000 acres are big farmers. We have taken so far 43.3 lakhs of acres as surplus land all over the country. Only one-third of it has been distributed to landless people. What about the two-thirds? These are still in the hands of big *mirasdars*. To improve land, the Government has so far allotted Rs. 30 crores. Out of this they are able to distribute only Rs. 2.63 crores to the farmers. If this is

1985-90

so, can we claim that land reform policy has been adopted?

Unless these things are taken into consideration, there cannot be any improvement in the agricultural sector or rural economy or in the social conditions of the people.

As far as education is concerned, it is a very important infrastructure to improve the society. In many places boys are not attending schools. To attract students Tamil Nadu Government announced the mid-day meals scheme whereby students are attracted to schools. Now many other States like Bihar are emulating this. This system should be introduced throughout the country to improve educational standards.

Our public sector units are losing heavily in many places. For example, Coal India, Steel Authority, etc. are losing. All of them are running at a loss except Neyveli Lignite Corporation which is making a profit. Salem Steel Plant will also run into a loss unless the proposal that was announced long ago is implemented or given effect to.

As I said earlier, our State Government have announced certain concessions and good schemes such as free power to agriculturists and mid-day meal scheme. The State Government is losing revenue on these schemes and they are not able to invest in other productive schemes. In this context, I would like to make an appeal that State Governments like Tamil Nadu should be given more attention while considering the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission. We should be given more funds. If these things are done, then the Plan will be more useful. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI HUSEN DALWAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in the discussion on the Approach to Seventh Plan.

While examining this Approach Paper, the first and the foremost thing which we have to do is to see whether this Plan is benefiting the common man or not and, for benefiting the common man, the first thing which we have to concentrate on is

cutting down the prices of the essential commodities. Then the production of foodgrains is to be encouraged because that is the only area in which we can offer more employment to the people of this country. The problems of growing unemployment and increasing population also have to be adequately dealt with and while examining this Approach Document, we have also to see how far the planners have taken care to meet these expectations of the people.

The Seventh Plan aims at having a better planning, closer monitoring, efficient administration and effective implementation. In order to achieve these things, we have three-and-a-half decades of experience to our credit and most of the earlier Plans were also on the plus side. But I would like to suggest one more thing and that is very important. I would like to quote, in this context, one instance from my region. I come from the Konkan area, a very backward region of Maharashtra. In 1974, the Planning Commission and the Government of India sanctioned an aluminium plant in the Ratnagiri district because it is a very backward area, backward district, and, in order to give some infrastructural impetus to this region, this plant was sanctioned in the public sector. Now, ten years have passed and still that project has not seen the light of day. But, so far, Sir, the State Government has spent about five crores of rupees and the Government of India has spent about eleven crores of rupees and the total comes to eleven crores of rupees and there is no forum through which we can fix the accountability for this. What I would like to suggest is that we should have a standing committee of Parliament in which we can evaluate the physical targets set by the Government. I say this because, once a plant is sanctioned, once the implementation work is given to the concerned department, there is no supervisory or review committee to find out whether the sanctioned plant has been set up or not and whether the physical targets which have been set have been achieved or not. There is no supervisory or review committee to take note of this and that is why I have made this suggestion and I think this is very essential.

The other point which I would like to highlight here is this: In the note on this Plan, there is a sentence: "Lack of competition has also done much harm and the time has come to have a new policy framework that emphasises efficiency, competition and modernisation." If this sentence is read correctly, one will have a doubt as to whether the Government has any intention, whether the Planning Commission has any intention, to drift from our present policy of planning, from our policy of giving more incentive to the public sector, or to divert to the private sector. If that is so, then that would be a negation of the policies followed by us for the past three-and-a-half decades, the policies which were laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But, if this sentence is to mean increasing competition and efficiency among the public sector undertakings, then I welcome it. So, I would like to request the honourable Planning Minister to clarify on this point because this will not be acceptable to many since the whole idea is to try to have a socialistic pattern of society in this country and we have to look to the interests of the poor people. We have to eradicate poverty from India and for that reason we have planned all these years, all these things. Now that such a thing has crept in, I think that the public sector should continue and the private sector should not be encouraged more than what we are doing under our system of mixed economy.

The other point that I would like to highlight is that our country is known as an agricultural country for years. But up till now we have not achieved self-sufficiency in food production. We are having a Green Revolution. Still I would like to suggest that all efforts should be made to utilise the entire irrigation potential of the country for the benefit of people. Fortunately, we are blessed with so many rivers which are named after goddesses. If the entire water of these rivers is channelised, we can one day prove to be the granary of the world. And we can be proud of it, and we will have the problem of unemployment solved and we will also meet the requirements of our growing population.

[Shri Husain Dalwai].

In education also we have to see, because we have got plenty of manpower, that today what is happening is that we are unable to give them employment. The educational system should be job-oriented system. Those who want to go in for smaller jobs should not go in for University degree, and the rush to colleges for higher education which is today found to be purposeless should be discouraged.

As regards drinking water, I would like to mention very much about this. In 1969 when we were having the Birth Centenary of Mahatma Gandhi we had given an assurance to our people that within ten years we will give drinking water to all and there would not be any problem for pure drinking water. Up till now, unfortunately, we have not solved the drinking water problem. I am thankful to the Planning Commission that in the Approach to the Seventh Five Year Plan at least an assurance has been given that during the tenure of the Seventh Five Year Plan every village in this country will get pure drinking water.

As regards energy we have done a great deal. (*Time bell rings*) We are fortunate that in the Bombay High we are getting petroleum. I read last week a Press Note issued by ONGC that there was proposal of one gas pipeline covering Kashmir to Kanyakumari and from Calcutta to Kutch which will cover the grid also from that gas and we shall be the biggest gas pipeline in the world. So, we are making progress. An hon. Member was saying that we have done enough as he expected. But certainly the Energy Department has done a great deal.

As regards industry, Sir, I would like to suggest that there should be modern technology, which should be accepted and our production should multiply, because we must admit that for the transformation of economy which we have today the dominant role was played by industry. We have encouraged small-scale industries in the country. But, unfortunately, our planning to the extent of supplying them energy, has not met the requirements. So many new entrepreneurs are telling me that they

are not able to pay back the bank instalments. because we cannot give them power. So our planning must be such that we are able to meet their requirement, and the people will also participate in it. For that reason, voluntary organisations should also be involved. The Plan should be decentralised. It should go to the district level and, if possible, even to the block level.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, very many hon. Members have participated in this debate already. To my mind, Sir, it is a very important discussion. We are considering the Approach Paper to the Seventh Five Year Plan which, theoretically at least, indicates to us the direction where we are to go and the whole question of where our country is going to move.

I do submit, Sir, that the thrust of planning is not limited merely to the figures that this Approach contains. The context is much bigger, much more consequential. Of course, the figures themselves are something like 320,000 crores. If they are planning to spend in the next five years a very substantial sum of money, that by itself lends certain weight to our deliberations this evening. But more important than that, to my mind, is a factor which is more than monetary. I shall come to that subsequently.

Having emphasised the importance very briefly of why I feel this discussion to be of paramount importance to all of us in the House, I cannot refrain from observing that it is somewhat unfair to us in the House and certainly to the hon. Minister for Planning that after the Approach Paper has been finalised, he is entrusted with the task of piloting the discussion about the Approach Paper. Personally I have very high regard for him. I have had the pleasure and the privilege of meeting him in other spheres of activity and I have always been encouraged by that. I have always benefited by my association with him. But I

think that it is unfair to expect the hon. Minister for Planning to be entrusted with the task at the nick of the moment. It is negative to my mind. It is an haphazard approach of the Government. You don't have an Industry Minister. The Industry Minister is transferred to your home State. The Commerce Minister is asked to go to the Soviet Union. Until you go to the Soviet Union, you look after Commerce Ministry and because we don't have the Industry Minister, look after industry also. The hon. Minister for Planning is told that it is a temporary and stop-gap arrangement. Look after Planning also. This, I submit, is a very serious objection. I have had to deviate from the discussion that we are participating in. I will just take half a minute to point out another objection that I have. We witnessed a certain development within this House about which all of us are unhappy. I have to put it on record that a discussion as important as the Approach Paper to the Seventh Plan has been treated in a stepmotherly fashion by this House. The earlier programme was that this discussion be fractured in three parts. Now, because of developments in this House, we are sitting up to quarter to seven. I do not mind. If the occasion demands, we can sit till mid-night. But on important matters like this, it is not fair to the Members if you fracture the discussion not just between hours of the day but between days of the week. This very important discussion that we are today participating in has been treated, to my mind, very unfairly.

On the Approach Paper itself, I shall attempt not to repeat what a number of colleagues of mine in this House and, of course, in the other House, have already stated about planning or about the Approach. By the time such debates come to our House, it has been my experience that all that has to be said has already been said and it renders our task so much more difficult to come up with something original, so that the Minister is persuaded to apply his mind. I submit to you, Sir, that the six Plans that we have already gone through or the country has gone through

have created twin problems for us. I put it to you that the problems are of completion and also the problem of non-completion. The very targets have created in their wake much higher expectations. I was submitting, Sir, that during the whole process of Planning I am not going into the philosophy of planning or Approach to Planning: I am putting across the viewpoint as a consequence of the last six Plans that we have already gone through, we are faced with two difficulties, the difficulties consequent upon the attainment of a target because the attainment of a target creates in its wake a series of expectations. I do believe that in the six Plans whatever we achieved, created in its wake expectations, which is one problem of planning. In the continuous process of planning, we did not pay sufficient attention earlier and this Approach paper also does not pay attention to it. It creates an imbalance in its wake. Completion creates expectations. Not-fulfilment of those expectations creates discontent. I put it to you that the other imbalance in this whole process of planning is on non-completion, whether it be projects that we took up for hydro-electricity, whether it be public sector projects that we took up for power or for steel, for shipping or for whatever that we took up. Delays, overlaps in monetary considerations have generated in their wake 'a synergic' effect of consequences. I will take just a minute to emphasise that the synergic is more than just an arithmetical totalling up of consequences. The whole process of planning was not able to comprehend the consequences of completion and non-completion, those consequences which would be synergic, not just straight down the line arithmetical. It would have been my expectation, Sir, that in what it calls itself as an Approach paper, there might have been a few sentences, in recognition of those failures, those challenges, those incomplete aspects of the process of planning that we have not paid attention to. I find fault on that account, Sir. Sir, I am very conscious of the time and I will not, therefore, talk about mixed economy or decentralisation, about which a number of other Members have already pointed out.

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

Sir, I looked for the basic thrust in this Approach paper. What is the basic thrust? And I do not go into all the details of it because I tried to make as exhaustive a study as I could of this Paper which is committing the nation for the next five years or is going to commit the nation in a certain direction. And what I could identify as the basic thrusts or basic attempts were anti-poverty and employment programmes and how to arrive at a nexus between the two, and therefore emphasising simultaneously the continued importance of agriculture, and some other very loosely-worded paragraphs which are not very convincing. These are some of the things which were our concerns in the last six Five Year Plans. About the anti-poverty programmes, I do not want to quote from the Approach Paper because that is not necessary either. Sir, the anti-poverty programme as is being put across as I have understood it is an attempt now to reach the other end of the spectrum. There is a recognition, in what is being put across that the theory of percolatory effect of development has failed. By which, I submit, that in the process of the last six Five Year Plans, the expectation was that the sheer momentum of development would generate in its wake employment, wealth, greater capacity, greater productivity, etc. And all of that would naturally percolate down, and the lowest of the low would be pulled up, would be encouraged, and would be less poor. After Six Five Year Plans we now find that that has not succeeded and, therefore, we attempt to jump the queue, jump the spectrum as it were, and attempt to reach poverty directly. I put it to you, Sir, that such an anti-poverty programme has certain fundamental requirements which this Approach Paper, of course, cannot even talk of, and which the whole ethos in which we are currently living would defeat. Such an anti-poverty programme has, as a pre-requisite, a political climate and ethos of governance, a situation of social order, and a condition in which the administrative apparatus of the State is tuned and is sufficiently fluid in its activity to be able to transfer directly to the poorest of the poor what is required to be done. The political climate

today, Sir, is exemplified, whichever way you may look at it, and that is why it generates so much heat, by what happened in Jammu and Kashmir or Punjab or Assam or Andhra Pradesh. All of us today, who may sit here, cannot with any sense of conviction say that we, as political activities carry credibility in the public mind. Now, that certainly has a very adverse effect. We transfer our lack of political credibility to the administrative apparatus. If we as politicians cannot free ourselves from the bondage of black money, elections, to reach here, how do I get here, corruption starts from the filing of my return of election expenses, corruption starts from my collecting funds for getting elected. Now, if that is the beginning of corruption, then the whole apparatus gets corrupted and if the whole apparatus is corrupted then this direct approach to anti-poverty cannot work, because that direct transference of wealth, that direct ability to produce wealth, that direct elimination of poverty will not work. It will lend itself to the kinds of facade, charade, total fallacies and absurdities like loan melas. There may perhaps be a few but they will become corrupt in the end because of all this. It is against this background that I must particularly warn the Government that it may appear to you that it is a short-cut which will succeed, but in the long run, it is a short cut which will take the country and its people through a very perilous path. Sir, I shall not labour on that point.

I now come to agriculture. As far as agriculture is concerned, I wish to submit, Sir, that food is the first commodity, whether it is India or any other part of the world, without which we cannot exist. Now, I have to put to you, Sir,...

THE MINISTER OF PLANNING
(SHRI P. C. SETHI) : I will just come back.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : That is all right. Sir, so far as agriculture is concerned, it is three quarters of our wealth, national wealth. There is no dispute about it. Agricultural land, whether it is lakes or forests or just tillable land or grazing land, it is 75 per cent of this country's

wealth. It is 80 per cent of our people. To my mind, it is one-half of our national income. I am not an economist. I am not a statistician but these are facts which cannot be disputed. Eighty per cent of our people, three quarters of our national wealth, at least 50 per cent of our national income, what does the State get out of it by way of revenue? I had rather hoped that considering these things, there would be an indication in the Seventh Plan Approach Paper that the time has now come to start talking of agricultural tax, some kind of a revenue-raising from this huge reservoir of national wealth and income. I have not the time. You have been most considerate to give me what you have given me. About the employment, because of the nexus between anti-poverty and employment, I would emphasise that there is a mention here in the Approach Paper about centralised schemes. I am always very suspicious about anything which calls it either centralised or high-level. Whenever I come across a situation where a high-level committee is formed, then I know nothing will get done. Similarly, Sir, when a suggestion is made that a centralised wage policy will be determined, a centralised employment programme, as the Approach Paper suggests, is going to be worked out, I am extremely dubious of its success because that centralised programming, planning may indeed get done in the overcrowded dust-laden files of Delhi offices but I do not really know what effect it is going to have as far as our country is concerned.

7 P.M.

I quickly go on to energy. Sir, this is a very important aspect, and I shall take just a minute to read out a few figures about energy. The total power generated in 1983-84 was 139.89 billion units; and this was, of course, an improvement on the previous year. But our targeted figure was 144.35 billion units. Percentage of thermal, hydel and nuclear energy remains roughly as 62.36 and 2.5 respectively. This 2.5 per cent aspect of nuclear power is the aspect that I would like to emphasise upon. But before I do so, I find, the estimate has suggested that power shortage have resulted in the loss of industrial production to the tune of Rs. 7000 crores a year. Taking into account agriculture

these are such indeterminates... besides our statistical obfuscation for political reasons has been carried to such an absurd limit now that the country does not really have reliable statistics by which I mean to be able to measure it by rupee, anna and pie. If, therefore, this loss of industrial production of Rs. 7000 crores, which is the annual loss to industry on account of power shortage, if that is coupled with the loss to agriculture—I could be faulted on the figure but I have no doubt in my mind—the total figure of loss to the nation on account of power shortage would be in the region of Rs. 15,000 crores, more perhaps, but not less. That is sufficiently compelling. I conclude by suggesting, what I think is very important for the country to which insufficient attention has been paid in any of the earlier plans, perhaps even now—because this is only an approach paper—the hon. Minister would consider at least some participation of the Government's view point on this.

I talk, now Sir, of the non-economic aspects of development. I think the non-aspects of development have been neglected for so long, certainly for the past 6 plans, that we continue doing it only at the cost of national and social homogeneity in the country. By non-economic aspects of development, I would particularly emphasise to you the quality of life that we are attempting to give to our citizens. When I look at the quality of life that we are attempting to give to our citizens, how do I picture it? I picture it by middle-aged women having to run after the buses which they cannot catch in Delhi. I picture it by overcrowded trains in which my countrymen travelling to Hardwar, having purchased a ticket, have to sit on the rooftop. I picture it by the indignity to which every Indian is subjected even when he goes to buy as ordinary a thing as the postage stamp. These are all aspects of the quality of life. Quality of life also includes elementary things like assured drinking water, assured pipe water supply so that toilets may function in the urbanised cities like New Delhi. We are, perhaps, the only Capital in the world in which if you have assured supply of water for 24 hours even for one day, then you think it must be something remarkable; it must be a mis-

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

take. These are small things. Henry Kissinger once said that difference between a good and a bad government is really marginal. It is perhaps doing those small things, those hundred small things, a little bit better. I submit to you, therefore, in the past plans, insufficient attention has been paid to these non-economic aspects of development. It is time that the Government whichever government comes to power after the elections—whether elections in Andhra are held or not is an open question—whichever government comes to power, I would appeal to that government because responsibility of finally implementing this plan would be with it as this is an approach paper—responsibility for this plan document will be on that government that when you take up the Plan, do consider the non-economic aspects of development, make living for Indians in India that bit more civilized, that bit more dignified. Thank you.

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, यह सान्नीय योजना उत्पादन, काम और रोटो के नारे से शुरू हो रही है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इन तीनों कामों के प्राप्त करने का जोड़ है, वह ऐसा आपने अपनाया है जिस से लक्ष्य प्राप्ति नहीं हो सकती जैसे कि आपने जाना हो कलकत्ता और आप बम्बई की गाड़ी में बैठ गए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे आप अपने लक्ष्य को प्राप्त नहीं कर पाएंगे।

श्रीमन्, उत्पादन दो जगहों पर हो रहा है। खेती में या कारखानों में। मान्यवर, खेती की जो दुर्गति आपने बनाकर रखी है, आपके दिमाग में कोई खास योजना नहीं है। चलती जाए, बला टलती जाए, यही आपकी योजना है। कभी भी आपने इस देश की एक-एक इंच जमीन को पानी देने का मास्टर प्लान नहीं बनाया। जहाँ जैसा मन में आया वहाँ वैसा बनवा दिया। कहीं आपने कोई ऐसा अवक्षेप नहीं कराया कि

जहाँ पर केवल ट्यूबवेल से सिंचाई हो सकती है वहाँ पर ट्यूबवेल बने, जहाँ नहरों से सिंचाई होती है वहाँ नहरें बनाई जाएँ और जहाँ नहरें या ट्यूबवेल नहीं हो सकते वहाँ तालाबों से सिंचाई हो। लेकिन आपने ऐसा नहीं किया। कोई प्लान नहीं बनाया। एक ही जगह पर तालाब भी है, नलकूप भी हैं और नहरें भी हैं। तो आपने उसको खुला छोड़ दिया। जैसा मन में चाहा बनाते चले गए। यही आप आज भी करने जा रहे हैं। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आपके दिमाग में यह बात बैठी हुई है कि अगर खेती के माल का दाम बढ़ेगा तो शहर का आदमी नाराज हो जाएगा और शायद हमारे ऊपर असर पड़ेगा। लेकिन मान्यवर, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक तरफा मोहब्बत नहीं होती। जब तक खेती में जो लागत आती है वह भी किसान नहीं पाएगा तो उत्पादन कैसे बढ़ेगा? आप कोई काम बता दीजिए जिसमें घाटा सहकर कोई आदमी काम करता हो। लेकिन किसान तो मजदूर है खेती करने के लिए। अगर न करे तो खुद भी मरे। लेकिन जिन्दा रहने के लिए कुछ तो करना है। पर उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए यदि वह घाटा सहता रहेगा तो उसे उत्पादन बढ़ाने की प्रेरणा नहीं मिलेगी।

मान्यवर, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक आंकड़ा है चन्द्रशेखर आज़ाद कृषि विश्वविद्यालय का। किसान की लागत कितनी लगती है खेती में उसके आंकड़े इसमें दिए गए हैं। 1981-82 के। इसके अनुसार धान 157 रु० प्रति क्विंटल की लागत आती है। मक्का पर 173 रु०, बाजरा पर 225 रु०, ज्वार पर 153 रुपए, रई पर 557 रुपये से 594 रुपये गाँठ, गेहूँ पर 211 से 215 रुपए, जौ पर 199 से 213 रु०

प्रति क्विंटल, मटर पर 303.79 रुपए, चना पर 295.89 रुपए, सरसों पर 525.36 रुपए, आलू पर 62.63 रुपए, गन्ने पर 32.48 रुपए प्रति क्विंटल की लागत आती है। मान्यवर ये आंकड़े कृषि विश्वविद्यालय के हैं, हमारे नहीं हैं और आपका ऐसा कोई फार्म नहीं है जो मुनाफे में चलता हो। आपके भी हर फार्म में घाटा होता है। फिर भी आप दाम इतना कम रखते हैं कि किसान का शोषण होता है। अगर उसको मजदूरी देनी पड़ जाए तो शायद किसान खेती करना ही छोड़ दे। इसीलिये खेती छोड़कर शहरों में भीड़ होती जा रही है। क्योंकि खेती लाभकारी नहीं है। जहाँ एक तरफ हमारी लागत है, 210, 215 रुपये लागत थी 81-82 में वहाँ इस वक्त 225 रुपये से कम लागत नहीं है। इतने में हम अमेरिका से मंगा सकते हैं लेकिन अपने किसानों को नहीं दे सकते। गन्ने का लागत मूल्य 32 रुपये प्रति क्विंटल है जो कृषि विश्वविद्यालय बता रहा है लेकिन आप देंगे नहीं। कैसे उत्पादन बढ़ेगा? खर्च भी उनका देख लीजिए। नहाने का साबुन 1980 में जो 1.40 पैसे था, हमाम वह अब हो गया है रु० 2.40 पैसे। धोने का एक किलो का पहले जो दाम था रु० 4.20 पैसे अब हो गया रु० 9.55 पैसे। सरसों का तेल जो पहले 10 रुपये लीटर मिलता था वह अब हो गया 26 रुपये 50 पैसे। चाय पहले 16 रुपये किलो मिलती थी वह अब 40 रुपये में मिलती है।

दियासिलाई, जो पहले एक रुपये में मिलती थी वह अब 2 रुपये 90 पैसे में मिलती है। सीमेंट पहले 25 रुपये बोरा मिलता था अब वह 70 रुपये बोरा मिलता है। नमक (टाटा) पहले 50 पैसे किलो मिलता था अब वह 1 रुपये 50 पैसे मिलता है। कोयला पहले 40 रुपये में मिलता था अब वह 122 रुपये में मिलता है। कंट्रोल का कपड़ा एक मीटर, जो पहले एक रुपये 89 पैसे मिलता था अब वह 5 रुपये 16 पैसे में मिलता है। धोती पहले 15 रुपये 54 पैसे में मिलती थी वह अब 32 रुपये 65 पैसे में मिलती है। इसी तरह से आप इसकी आमदनी घटाएँगे और उनको कोई प्रेरणा नहीं मिलेगी तो कैसे चलेंगे वह। इस तरह से खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ने से रहा। अब मजदूरों में जितना बढ़ जाता है अपनी जिन्दगी गुजारने के लिये, बढ़ जाता है। जो आप आशा करते हैं वह तब तक नहीं बढ़ेगा जब तक आप खेती के दाम को, कारखाने के माल के दाम को और बढ़ने वाले वेतन को, तीनों में समन्वय स्थापित नहीं करेंगे। एक तरफ तनख्वाह बढ़ती है तो आप नहीं मानते कि मुद्रास्फीति बढ़ती है लेकिन आपके कई जगहों पर सरकारी डाकुमेंट में आता है कि अगर कृषि मूल्य उचित दे देंगे तो मुद्रास्फीति बढ़ जायेगी। मुद्रास्फीति बढ़ती है, बढ़ेगी और आप बढ़ाएँगे। क्योंकि जब वही भी रोक नहीं लगाएँगे, एक तरफ तनख्वाह बढ़ाएँगे और दूसरी तरफ बढ़ाएँगे माल के दाम और किसान के माल के दाम घटाएँगे तो खपता बाजार में आयेगा। माल कम बनेगा और महंगाई बढ़ेगी। जब तक दाम संतुलन की नीति नहीं अपनाएँगे तब तक पैदावार नहीं बढ़ेगी खेती की। कारखानों में अब

[राम नरेश कुशवाह]

तक 25 हजार करोड़ रुपया लगभग लगा चुके हैं सरकारी कारखानों में; फिर भी कारखाने घाटे में जा रहे हैं। उनका घाटा लगातार बढ़ता जा रहा है। जब तक आप मजदूरों को प्रबन्ध में भागीदार नहीं बनायेंगे, घाटे और मुनाफे में माझीदार नहीं बनायेंगे तब तक उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ने वाला है। मैंने पहले भी कहा था और फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी हो जाने के बाद नौकरी आपकी है, तनख्वाह आपकी पाते हैं। जब यह दो काम हो गये तो काम सब हो जाता है छुट्टी का। इसमें यह होता है कि सरकार भी अपनी और माल भी अपना। अगर मजदूरों को प्रबन्ध में भागीदार बनायेंगे, घाटे में और मुनाफा में भागीदार होंगे तो मुनाफे में भी वह हिस्सेदार होंगे और घाटे में भी वह हिस्सेदार होंगे। जब वहाँ मुनाफा हो तो उसको मुनाफे का हिस्सा दीजिए और जब हानि हो तो तनख्वाह में से काट लीजिए तो आप देखेंगे कि उत्पादन बढ़ जायेगा। लेकिन आपने इनको नजरअंदाज किया है। केवल कह देने से मनोकामना कर देने से उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ने वाला है। जहाँ तक काम का सवाल है, आज लगभग दो करोड़ सरकारी आंकड़ों के मुताबिक बेकार हैं। यह बेकारी बढ़ती जा रही है। जितनी आप योजना बनाते जा रहे हैं उतनी ही बेकारी बढ़ती जा रही है। इसका कारण यह है कि आपने बड़े उद्योगों को मानदण्ड मान रखा है। मुझे एक बात याद आती है -

जाकै मति भ्रम भवेये खगेसु

सौ काउ उत्तर देऊ दिनेसु ॥

र जगह आपने रेणनेलाइजेशन और कंप्यूटराइजेशन कर दिया है। समझ में नहीं आता कि जहाँ पर बेरोजगारी हो, जहाँ पर लोगों को रोजगार देने की समस्या हो, वहाँ पर इन चीजों से क्या फायदा होने

वाला है। इससे आप इस देश में रोजगार देने की समस्या को हल नहीं कर सकते हैं। इससे देश में बेरोजगारी बढ़ती जाएगी। केवल फारवर्ड बनने के लिए आप यह सब कुछ कर रहे हैं। मैं इस संबंध में एक मिसाल देता हूँ। पहले उत्तर प्रदेश में हाई स्कूल और इन्टरमीडिएट बोर्ड की परीक्षाओं में कोई गड़बड़ नहीं होती थी क्योंकि रिजल्ट अध्यापक तैयार करते थे। लेकिन जब से आपने कंप्यूटर से यह काम करवाना शुरू किया है तब से सारी गड़बड़ी पैदा हो गई है। रिजल्ट समय पर नहीं निकलते हैं। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप लघु उद्योगों और कुटीर उद्योगों को बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं और बेरोजगारी दूर करना चाहते हैं तो आपको छोटे कामधन्धों की तरफ ध्यान देना होगा। जब तक आप कुटीर उद्योगों और लघु उद्योगों को बढ़ावा नहीं देंगे तब तक हमारे देश से बेरोजगारी दूर करना असंभव है। आप नारा तो देते हैं कि छोटे उद्योगों को बढ़ावा दिया जाये, लेकिन मान्यवर, जितनी भी सबसीडी देते हैं वह सब धूस में ले लेते हैं। जब तक छोटे उद्योगों के लिए धूस नहीं दी जाती, तब तक लायसेंस नहीं मिलता है। कोई भी गरीब आदमी कारखाना नहीं लगा सकता है। सबसीडी का सारा पैसा भ्रष्टाचार में चला जाता है। जब तक हमारे देश में छोटे उद्योगों और बड़े उद्योगों में प्रतिस्पर्धा चलेगी तब तक छोटे उद्योग पतन नहीं सकते हैं। जब तक आप ऐसा प्रावधान नहीं करते हैं कि छोटे उद्योग जो माल पैदा करते हैं वह माल बड़े उद्योग नहीं पैदा कर सकते हैं तब तक छोटे उद्योग आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं। हमारे देश में सरकार सबसे बड़ी मुकद्दमेबाज और सबसे बड़ी खरीदार भी है। यदि सरकार यह निश्चय कर

दे कि जतनी भी सरकारी संस्थाएं और एजेंसी हैं वे कुटीर उद्योगों का माल खरीदेंगी तो निश्चित है कि कुटीर और लघु उद्योगों को बढ़ावा मिलेगा। मैं इस वक्त मुकुन्दमेवाजी की बात नहीं करता हूं, लेकिन सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि उसको सिर्फ कुटीर उद्योगों और लघु उद्योगों का ही माल खरीदना चाहिए।

जहां तक रोटी का सवाल है, हमारे देश में अभी भी छोटी योजना के अन्त तक 37 प्रतिशत लोग गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे हैं। छोटी योजना पूरी होने के बाद भी इतने लोग गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रह जाएंगे। जब तक आप बड़े उद्योगों और छोटे उद्योगों को समान स्तर पर रखेंगे तब यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है। जो बड़े बड़े मगरमच्छ हैं उनकी अगर आप इस तरह-से साथ-साथ रखेंगे तो इस देश में गरीबी नहीं मिट सकती है।

एक संग नहीं होइऊ भुआलू,
हसय ठाय फुलाऊ गालू ॥

बिरला, टाटा आदि बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों के पास इस देश के 14 करोड़ लोगों से भी अधिक की पूंजी है। इसलिए जब तक आप बड़े उद्योगों के मुकाबले कुटीर और लघु उद्योगों को बढ़ावा नहीं देंगे तब तक यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है।

अब मैं कुछ शब्द शिक्षा के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। मनुस्मृति में लिखा है कि वैश्य और शुद्र को नहीं पढ़ाना चाहिए और उनको नहीं पढ़ना चाहिए। अगर उसके कान में कहीं संस्कृत के शब्द पड़ जाय तो उसके कान में शोशा

डाल देना चाहिए। आपने यह तो नहीं लिखा है कि गरीबों को नहीं पढ़ना चाहिए, लेकिन स्थिति यह है कि गरीब लोग पढ़ नहीं सकते हैं। इस बार तो शायद लिख भी दिया है। इस देश में गांवों का गरीब आदमी अपने बच्चों को नहीं पढ़ा सकता है क्योंकि उसके लिए स्कूलों का ठीक इंतजाम नहीं है। गांवों में जो प्राइमरी स्कूल चलते हैं उनमें कहीं तो भवन नहीं है और अगर कहीं भवन है तो वहां पर टीचर नहीं है। टाट-पट्टी और ब्लैक बोर्ड, कुछ भी नहीं होते हैं। अगर हमारे बच्चे अपना बोरा लेकर स्कूल में जाते भी हैं तो उनको पढ़ाने वाला कोई नहीं होता है। और एक तरफ कान्वेंट स्कूल चलाते हैं। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि कान्वेंट में जो लड़के कुर्सी पर बैठकर पढ़ते हैं, उनके पीठ से कुर्सी सट जाती है और वे सारी जिन्दगी कुर्सी पर बैठते हैं और कुर्सी उनको मिलती है और जो बोरे पर बैठकर पढ़ने वाले हैं उनकी किस्मत में बोरा ही लिखा जाता है और उनको सारी जिन्दगी बोरा ढोना पड़ता है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि आप शिक्षा को हतोत्साहित कर रहे हैं। जब ऊंची शिक्षा के लिये एडमिशन की बात होगी तो वह उन लड़कों को मिलेगा जो कान्वेंट से पढ़े हुए हैं, लेकिन गांव के स्कूलों में पढ़े हुए लड़कों को नहीं मिलेगा। तो प्राइमरी शिक्षा आप चलने नहीं देंगे। हाई स्कूल की दुर्दशा, इंटर की दुर्दशा कर दी गई है, ऊंचे स्कूलों में उनको जाने नहीं देंगे। इससे आपने मनु स्मृति की व्यवस्था के अनुसार गांव के लोगों की शिक्षा से वंचित करने का और कान्वेंट स्कूलों से पढ़े हुए लोगों को हायर क्लास में बढ़ने देने का और उनको ऊंची कुर्सी पर बिठाने की धंधा अपनाया है।...

श्री उपसभापति : समाप्त करिये ?

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : मैं बी० एच० यू० का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। वह आपकी यूनिवर्सिटी है। वहाँ तीन वर्षीय कोर्स आपने शुरू किया। क्या किसी गांव के लड़के का उसमें एडमिशन होगा ? मैं समझता हूँ कि गांव के तमाम लड़कों के एडमिशन को रोकने के लिये यह वहाँ पर किया गया है। और यहाँ पर आप सामाजिक न्याय की बात कर रहे हैं।

एक बात और आपने अपने नीति पत्र में कहा है मान्यवर, देखने को सब धर्मशास्त्र बड़े सुन्दर होते हैं और पढ़े जाते हैं लेकिन उसकी बात को कोई मानता नहीं। ठीक इसी तरह से मान्यवर, आपने भी बहुत सावधानी के साथ और चालबाजी के साथ हरिजनों के आरक्षण को भी बदलने की व्यवस्था की है। पृष्ठ 84 आइटम 13 में आपने कहा है कि :

‘विशेष रूप से शैक्षिक संस्थाओं और सरकारी सेवाओं में आरक्षण के मामले में आर्थिक मापदंडों के बनाने के प्रश्न की जांच की जानी चाहिए।’

मान्यवर, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आर्थिक प्रश्न तो आप करिये। योजनाएँ आपकी कहाँ गई ? गरीबी मिटाने की योजना आपकी चल रही है और सातवीं योजना आप शुरू करने १११ रहे हैं और आर्थिक आधार पर आपने गरीबी मिटाने की कोशिश की है। लेकिन क्या यह हुआ ? आप समीक्षा-सोधा कहिये कि हमारी योजनाएँ वफल हुई हैं। मान्यवर, हरिजनों के कल्याण के लिये कितना आपने खर्च

किया है ? डेढ़ प्रतिशत से अलग तो कहीं खर्चा हुआ नहीं। पूरी योजना में, मान्यवर, मुझे कागज नहीं मिल रहा है, लेकिन एक और डेढ़ प्रतिशत से कम हुई। पांच पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में जो भी आपने खर्च किया है, उसका इतना ही प्रतिशत खर्च हुआ है।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, अब समाप्त करिये।

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि ...

श्री उपसभापति : आपने मुख्य बातें कह दीं, अब समाप्त करिये।

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : आपने हरिजनों को कितना ऊपर उठा दिया है ? आपने पिछड़े वर्गों को कितना ऊपर उठा दिया है ? आप मापदंड बलदना चाहते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि 37 प्रतिशत जो भी निर्धनतम लोग रह जायेंगे, ये कौन लोग ये। मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूँ कि केवल एक चौथाई इस देश की अबादी के लिये यह सारा शासन है, सारा प्रशासन है, सारी योजनाएँ हैं और केवल 17 करोड़ लोग हैं जो इसके निरपेक्ष हैं। लेकिन बाकी जो आधी अबादी है वह पूरी की पूरी इन 17 करोड़ लोगों की चरामाह है।

श्री जे० के० जैन (मध्य प्रदेश) : मान्यवर, उपसभापति महोदय इनको कह दीजिये कि फिर भी बोलने का मौका मिलेगा।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप समाप्त करिये।

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : मान्यवर इन्जिनो को अभी मुश्किल से ढ़ी नौकरियों में 5-6 प्रतिशत स्थान हो मिले हैं, आदिवासियों की भी यही हालत है। आज जितनी गड़बड़ियाँ पैदा हो रही हैं, आप चाहे जो भी कह लें कि विदेशों के षडयंत्र से विद्रोह हो रहे हैं, फलों से षडयंत्र हो रहे हैं, लेकिन मान्यवर, पहली बात तो यह है कि विद्रोह को रोकने और विदेशी हस्तक्षेप को रोकने की जिम्मेदारी सरकार की है। अगर सरकार यह मानती है तो सरकार को अपनी विफलता माननी चाहिए कि हमने विदेशी हस्तक्षेप होने दिया है। लेकिन मान्यवर, यह जितना होगा इसको सरकार अच्छी तरह जानती है।

दुनियाँ को आदमी धोखा दे सकता है लेकिन खुद को नहीं दे सकता है। आज जो लड़ाई चल रही है, क्षेत्रीयता बढ़ रही है, अलग अलग प्रान्तीयता उभर रही है, तनाम दुनिया भर के आत्म में विद्रोह हुए, पंजाब में हुआ, दक्षिण भारत में हुआ, बिहार में 12 जिलों में नक्सलवाधियों की सरकार है, मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह रोजनल इम्बैलेंस, क्षेत्रीय विषमता और घोर गरीबी इतका कारण है। अगर आपने इनको मिटाने का उपाय नहीं किया तो वे सारे के सारे डूब ही रहे हैं आपको भी ले कर के डूब जाएंगे।

अन्त में मान्यवर, मैं विकास खण्डों के बारे में एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। विकास खण्ड केवल पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना में कारगर रहे उसके बाद वे भूतफरकात के दफ़्तर बन गये। वहाँ से जितनी रिपोर्ट आपको मंगानी हो मांग लीजिये। उनको अधिकार कुछ नहीं है, बजट कुछ नहीं है आप केवल विकास खण्डों में कर्मचारियों को तनखा दे रहे हैं। अगर

उनसे विकास का काम सचमुच लिया जाता और जैसे कि भाई रामानन्द जी ने कहा नौकरशाही को हटा कर के किनारे कर के जनता को भागीदारो ली जाती तो विकास खण्डों को सक्रिय बना दिया जाता हर गाँव में कर्मचारी है, बजट अलग से नहीं लगाना है लेकिन उनका नाम अलग अलग विभाग दे कर आपने कर दिया है और हर कर्मचारी विकास की रिपोर्ट दे देता है। वहाँ जितने कर्मचारी रहते हैं सभी अपनी अपनी रिपोर्ट दे देते हैं और नतीजा यह होता कि काम अगर एक हुआ है और आठ कर्मचारी रिपोर्ट करने वाले हैं तो आखों अपनी अपनी 8 रिपोर्ट दे देते हैं और आप उनको यहाँ जोड़ लेते हैं कि सब हो गया।

लेखा जोखा थाएँ, लइका डूबा कांहे

मान्यवर, आप सब लेखा जोखा लगाएँ, हिसाब लगाएँ अगर आप इसको वास्तविकता की धरातल पर नहीं उतारेंगे तो सारा काम चोपट हो जाएगा। आज तक आपने यह मान रखा है कि रुपया खर्च हो गया, इसलिए विकास हो गया लेकिन जब तक आप काम को कसौटी नहीं बनाएंगे कि कितना काम हो गया इतकी जाँच नहीं करेंगे तब तक आपको योजनाएँ सफल नहीं होंगी। इन्ही चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Approach to the Seventh Five Year Plan is very routine and does not give any new direction to the economy of our country.

We have got many problems, Sir, a few of which I will mention: One is our under-utilisation of the capacity of the industries. I was reading on the 11th August a report in the "ECONOMIC

(Shri S. N. Dhabe)

"TIMES". It says that 71 per cent is the under-utilisation of the capacity, capacity not utilised in the engineering industry. Similar is the story of the thermal stations, and the result is a huge backlog. The other problem which we are facing in this planning is, our planning has failed for two reasons: Firstly, the programmes we have not completed within time, and we have got a huge backlog not only in manday generation but also in the irrigation projects, power generation and others. And the other deficiency which we find is, there is no effective and faithful implementation machinery so far as Plans are concerned. The result is, even the Third Five-Year Plan schemes are still going on and are not complete. No approach to this problem has been given in this Approach. It was expected that the Government will see that at least the new year's schemes and programmes, whatever you want to make, were completed within the period in which they were to be completed. On the other hand, this Approach paper is mere platitudes given at many places without grappling with the real problems which we have to face.

In this connection, what are the main problems which we are facing? In a stable democratic way of life we want the problems of poverty or unemployment should not come in the way.

Communal riots and many other evils which we are facing today are due to lack of national employment policy by our Government. Sir why it is not possible for us to have full employment so that and employment could be provided to all and many problems which we are facing today could be eliminated. In this regard I find nothing in the Report. It is rather disappointing and discouraging. Sir, even the benefits which the people are receiving they are not to be continued.

My friend has just now said about reservations. Sir, the reservation policy has been followed by the Government and the people of our country have accepted it for the last so many years. It has been a part of our life. It has been included under Article 46 of the Constitution that reservation we accept, and the States shall promote with special care the

educational and economic interests of weaker sections, and particularly of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Article 335 of the Constitution also provides for reservation to SCs/STs in the services. In this regard, why the Government is giving a second thought and creating apprehension in the minds of the entire Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes community in the country that they want to curtail their benefits by including a new economic criteria. Sir, at page 28, para 13, in the matter of reservations particularly in educational institutions and public services, the question of building an economic criteria should be considered and examined. I plead with the Hon'ble Minister to delete this paragraph from the document so that there may not be any confusion in the minds of the people.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : We are not going to implement it.

SHRI S. W. DHABE : Then, you please delete this paragraph from the document. Why do you want to include this paragraph at all? This will give rise to some suspicion in the minds of the people and same authority may take advantage of this. Even the State Government can also take advantage of it. We know that the Approach Paper is meant for the entire country. I plead with you to give us an assurance on the floor of the House that this paragraph will be deleted from the document.

Sir, the other two points that I want to mention is about regional dimensions of development. The regional disparities are there despite planning. Even in States which are called progressive States many regions/areas within the State have remained under-developed. There are neither any industries nor any economic development. Therefore, in that perspective we have to admit that our planning has completely failed to have a balanced economic development throughout the country. We have to add new norms to remove regional disparities and consider their problems on top priority. Otherwise in the State itself the new problems are being created. The concentration of in-

dustries and employment at some place has resulted in under-development of other areas. The people are not getting benefits of the planned economy.

Sir, in this connection, I also wish to point out that in the Plan programme the two other evils which we are facing today is corruption and the other is lack of integrity in the country. There is no attempt made in the document as to how to solve these problems. Otherwise, whatever approach we may have towards the plan, if these problems are not solved our democracy is in peril and our way of life is also endangered. Therefore, this is very essential in our life and in the administrative machinery, total discipline and integrity has to be created. One of the reasons for corruption is the lack of national price policy. Even in Russia and other countries, for 50 years the prices are stabilised and the same prices prevail there. At least why cannot we have the same price policy at different places of our country? If a national price policy is evolved, it will go a long way to ward off the effects of inflation on the poor and working classes. Sir, today the worst sufferer in our country is the daily wage earners who are having lower wages. In the document I do not find anything about this aspect.

Lastly, I would only like to point out that there is not a single word on sports or recreation in the whole Approach paper. We have not given any priority to it in our planning. Only there is a paragraph about secondary education and elementary education. All over the world, recreation is given importance. In France—I had been there—they have a Ministry of Recreation. The working class has two days of holidays in a week and the employers are expected to provide for them healthy recreation. In our country, we are not giving any importance to it. Therefore, if we want to have a healthy society and a strong, healthy community, we must have a national policy on sports and recreation. But there is not a single word on it in the whole Approach document. Therefore, my suggestion to the hon. Minister is that looking to the whole approach of the Plan, he should review the Plan, keeping in view

the social perspective for which we stand and the democratic way of life, and he should revise the Plan according to the need of the society and of the country. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister, please.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): What happened to our names?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the time is over.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: We have given our names. This is an important subject. You are not giving us an opportunity.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Members of this House for the constructive suggestions that they have made and for their views on the Approach to the Seventh Plan.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH (Punjab): Sir, I want to make a submission. This is an important subject, and I do not cast aspersion on anybody.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: It is again coming on the 21st.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: It is not coming on the 21st, and we may not get a chance. I am not casting any aspersions on anybody. But so far in the discussion which has taken place, no substantial things have come up to bring to the notice of the Government that such and such things, (a), (b), (c), etc., should be done. Nothing has come out. We would like to put forward certain suggestions and we are not getting time. Everybody from the Opposition got time. What is the fun in not giving us time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every party gets time. Four hours were allotted for this...

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: You cannot say, "the discussion ends". It is not like this. I would object to it. What this?

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): The major share of the time was taken by the Opposition. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your Minister will take care of all these things.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Then what for are we here?

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: What for are the Members here?

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Point of order. Please, one minute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time is not there. It is already over. Please take your seat.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: Time is not given in proportion to the strength of the parties. The Opposition has got more time. We got less time. I would like to know why it has been done.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: We have to make our suggestions. We have given our names four days back.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will have other opportunities. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: This is national planning. Why don't you give us a chance? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: To register our protest, we walk out.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: I protest against this and I walk out.

[*At this stage, some hon. Members left the Chamber.*]

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I had dealt with the important basic issues in my opening speech. I shall now deal with some of the specific points made by the hon. Members.

The hon. Member, Shri Nirmal Chatterjee stated that the public sector share in total investment has declined in the proposed Seventh Plan compared to the Sixth

Plan. This is not correct. The percentage of public sector outlay to total investment likely to be achieved in the Sixth Plan comes to nearly 52.5 per cent. The corresponding target for the public sector outlay for the Seventh Plan will be 56.2 per cent. Public sector outlay consists of two parts: (1) public sector investment and (2) the current expenditure, which is related to Plan investment, and is financed by the Plan budget in our Indian planning practice. Since both these heads are financed by the total public sector resources available for the Plan, which is expected to add up to Rs. 1,80,000 crores, the share of the public sector outlay should be accordingly calculated as a percentage of total investment. This would also be in line with the past practice.

According to Shri Chatterjee's contention, the growth rates of GDP for agriculture and industry in the Seventh Plan are lower than in the Sixth Plan. This contention is also not correct. Agriculture is expected to grow by 3.8 per cent over the Sixth Plan. Since Mr. Chatterjee is not here. I will not refer to the point made by him.

I can assure the honourable Shri Ramachandra Rao who emphasised the need for mass application of science and technology, that our aim is to make science and technology an essential and integral part of activities in all major socio-economic sectors. There will be particular emphasis in Central and State Plans on S&T in programmes relevant to very large numbers in the society, namely, agriculture, water, rural development, new energy sources, irrigation, small scale industry, health and family welfare.

The honourable Prof. C. Lakshmanan referred to the observations of the Eighth Finance Commission regarding the erosion of the States' share in market borrowings and suggested rational allocation of market borrowings between the Centre and the States and an increase in the States' share in total borrowings.

The Finance Commission has, it is true, pointed this out, but the States' share in market borrowings has to be viewed together with the Central assistance given for the State Plans. An increase in mar-

ket borrowings of the States would reduce correspondingly the borrowings of the Centre, and, consequently, the availability of funds with the Centre for providing Central assistance to the States. Since Central assistance is being given on the basis of the objective criteria approved by the National Development Council, which are weighted in favour of the backward States, the trend in the Fifth and Sixth Plan periods has been to increase substantially the quantum of Central assistance to the States. Thus, the Central assistance for State Plans has increased from Rs. 3572 crores in the Fourth Plan period to Rs. 7953 crores in the Fifth Plan period and further to Rs. 18619 crores in the Sixth Plan period. This has enabled the States and especially the disadvantaged States, which are the six north-eastern States, and Jammu and Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh, to have a reasonable step-up in their Plan outlay. Therefore, the States, in spite of a considerable shortfall in their own mobilisation of resources, particularly from State enterprises, have been substantially assisted to have a viable level of Plan outlays. This perspective has, therefore, to be borne in mind when considering the question raised by the honourable Member.

The honourable Prof. Lakshmananna also felt that there was no involvement of the States to the extent they ought to be involved in the planning process. This is not correct. The States are fully involved in the planning process. Firstly, their views are elicited for the formulation of the Approach Paper which in turn is approved after discussion by the National Development Council of which the Chief Ministers of all States are members. The Draft Plan is prepared in accordance with the objectives, policy and programme thrusts as approved by the NDC. This Draft Plan becomes the National Plan only after it is further discussed and approved by the National Development Council.

Centrally-sponsored schemes, including those such as the integrated rural development programme and national rural employment programme, are, again, formulated from the overall national angle. These are implemented through the States with

the Centre providing a major contribution, sometimes even 100 per cent of the outlays involved. The States have taken advantage of these schemes, as these have, by and large, proved useful for the economic development of the country.

The States have full liberty in preparing Plan proposals according to their resource endowment, potentialities and requirements, etc. and sending them to the Planning Commission for discussion and finalisation. Generally the State Plan proposals are accepted by the Planning Commission if they can be funded with available resources and the overall national priorities are not affected by such proposals.

The Hon'ble Member, Prof. Lakshmananna, referred to the need to improve the quality of functioning of public services, hospitals and educational institutions. I would like to assure him that this will be given the utmost importance in the Seventh Plan and that improvement in both volume and quality of coverage will be the aim.

The Hon'ble Member, Shri Gurupadaswamy, referred to the need to reduce costs, raise productivity and ensure that the technology used in our industries is up-to-date. We too are deeply concerned about this and the Approach Paper deals quite explicitly with these issues. I refer to the section on Efficiency and Productivity which indicates that the Seventh Plan will lay down not just production and investment targets but also specific targets for productivity. If these gains in productivity can be realised, costs and prices will be reduced and these reductions will help to stimulate demand in certain key-sectors.

Science and technology also finds a prominent place in the Approach. So far we have tended to plan for science and technology as a separate sector. In the Seventh Plan we propose to integrate S & T planning...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If you allow me...

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Let me complete.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI KALP NATH RAI) : After he completes, you can ask clarifications.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Just a small point.

I am deeply grateful to you. There is a small point. I have heard of public sector and private sector. It is only this Approach Paper which has devised the S & T Sector. I do submit that science is an endeavour or an attempt to reach something. Technology is the technological aspect. Please do not reduce Science and Technology to S & T sector. You should change it. If you call it S & T Sector, it will get fixed up there and it will be neither science nor technology.

SHRI P. C. SETHI : In the Seventh Plan we propose to integrate S & T planning with sector planning. We also propose to introduce the idea of 'techno-

logy missions' which has been so successful in Atomic Energy, Space and Defence to other sectors.

The basic theme of the Seventh Plan is food, work and productivity and we intend to lay as much emphasis on the objective of productivity improvement as on the others.

I am grateful to you and to the House and to the Hon'ble Members for the interest that they have shown and I have taken down all the points they have made and we shall take care of them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Thank you.

सदन की कार्यवाही 21 अगस्त, 1984
मंगलवार को 11.00 बजे तक के लिए
स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at forty-nine minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 21st August, 1984.