

16.45 hrs.

MOTION RE SIXTH FIVE YEARS PLAN—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now continue further discussion on the 6th Plan. Shri Viridhi Chandra Jain.

श्री विरूध चन्द्र जैन (बाड़मेर) : राभा-पति महोदय, छठी पंचवर्षीय योजना के बारे में जो विचार विनिमय हो रहा है उस संबंध में अपने विचार सुनने के समक्ष रखना चाहता हूँ। पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना से न केवल छठी योजना जो कि अभी चल रही है उनमें जो योजनाएँ बनी थी वे योजनाएँ टाइम शैड्यूल और जो फंड्स का प्रावधान किया गया था उसकी अनुसार चलती, उनका अगर सही क्रियान्वयन होता तो हम विकास की गति और बहुत बढ़ते। जो गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे अभी 48 परसेंट लोग हैं 25 परसेंट तक अच्छी तरह से आ सकते थे अगर सभी योजनाओं का इमप्लीमेंटेशन अच्छी तरह से कर पाते।

कृषि उत्पादन के क्षेत्र में हमने जो सफलता प्राप्त की है, हमारे उत्पादन में जो बाधा पड़ी है, जो रुकावट आयी है वह सब से बड़ी यह आयी है कि नदियों के बारे में जो इंटर स्टेट डिस्प्यूट्स थे वे या तो ट्रिब्यूनल के पास जाते थे या प्रधान मंत्री अपनी शक्तियों का प्रयोग कर के कम्प्रोमाइज के रूप में उनका हल होता था। इसमें बहुत समय लगता था और अभी भी समय लगता है। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो इंटर स्टेट डिस्प्यूट्स हैं नदियों के बारे में और चल रहे हैं उनके कारण बहुत सी सिंचाई योजनाओं की गति धीमी रही जिसमें कृषि उत्पादन में अधिक आगे नहीं बढ़ सके हैं। सिंचाई के क्षेत्र में अभी भी यह स्थिति है कि 23 परसेंट सिंचित क्षेत्र में बढ़ सके हैं। इसमें आगे नहीं बढ़ सके हैं। पाकिस्तान में 67 परसेंट क्षेत्र सिंचाई में आया हुआ है जब कि हमारा क्षेत्र 23 परसेंट है। इसका मुख्य कारण यही है कि सिंचाई की जो योजनाएँ हाथ में ली थीं उनको समय पर इमप्लीमेंट नहीं कर सके।

मैं राजस्थान कौन्सिल के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ यह योजना 1958 में शुरू

हुई थी और 68 करोड़ का प्लान था। लेकिन अभी तक 350 करोड़ रु. खर्च कर दिये और अभी भी यह स्थिति है कि निश्चित नहीं है कि छठी योजना में इमप्लीमेंट कर सकेंगे कि नहीं यह प्रश्न अभी भी हमारे सामने है। अभी हमारे योजना मंत्री ने विशेष तौर से 40 करोड़ रुपये की मदद हमें दी है। परन्तु मुझे शंका है कि 40 करोड़ रुपये मिलने के बावजूद भी राजस्थान में कौन्सिल की जैसी योजना है, जो कि अभी सैकेण्ड फेज में चल रही है, हम यह चाहते हैं कि इस योजना में लिफ्ट कौन्सिल की योजना को भी साथ में लेकर चला जाए ताकि वहाँ के जोधपुर शहर, बाड़मेर, नागौर, बीकानेर आदि स्थानों पर पीने के पानी की स्कीम भी हाथ में ली जा सके। क्योंकि इसके अतिरिक्त वहाँ पीने का पानी पहुँचाने के लिए हमारे पास और कोई जरिया नहीं है, वह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती। इसीलिए हम चाहते हैं कि इस योजना को लेने में आपको प्राथमिकता देनी चाहिए।

उसके बाद सबसे बड़ी बात, जिसके लिए हमारी प्रधानमंत्री महोदया ने भी जोर दिया है, पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों के विकास की योजना है। सभी चाहते हैं कि पिछड़े क्षेत्रों की प्रगति की जाए, उनके विकास की ओर कदम उठाये जाएँ, कोई योजना बने। जैसे तो हमने डैजर्ट डेवलपमेंट नाम से एक योजना बनाई भी हुई है, जिससे हम रेगिस्तानी इलाकों का विकास करेंगे। इसके साथ ही देश के हिली एरियाज के विकास के लिए भी और शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स एरियाज के विकास के लिए भी हम योजनाएँ बनायें। अब तक हमने रेगिस्तानी इलाकों को जिस उपेक्षा की दृष्टि से देखा है, जितनी उनकी अवहेलना की है, मैं आपको बता देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे इलाकों में अभी डी.पी.ए.पी. की योजना लागू थी, लेकिन पीछे एक निर्णय करके उस योजना को भी बंद कर दिया गया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि ऐसी महत्वपूर्ण योजना जिसका संबंध सूखा पीड़ित इलाकों के विकास से है और मेरा क्षेत्र सीमावर्ती होने के साथ-साथ अकाल पीड़ित भी है, हर साल वहाँ अकाल की छाया पड़ती है,

[श्री वृद्धि चन्द्र जैन]

लेकिन वहाँ भी उस डी.पी.ए.पी. योजना को समाप्त करके सरकार ने हमारे साथ अन्याय किया है, हमारे साथ यह धार उपेक्षा की गई है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब हमारे योजना कमीशन ने उसको मान लिया था, हमारी नेशनल डेवलपमेंट काउंसिल ने उसको मान लिया था कि वहाँ के लोगों का वाकई में तकलीफ है, लेकिन मात्र एम.एस. स्वामीनाथन की रिपोर्ट की रिकमेंडेशन के आधार पर ही उस योजना को समाप्त कर दिया गया, यह हमारे साथ अन्याय है। उसके स्थान पर यदि आप हमारे डेजर्ट डेवलपमेंट की राशि को बढ़ाते क्योंकि आपने दोनों कार्यक्रमों को शामिल कर दिया है, इसलिए निश्चित रूप से उस कार्यक्रम की राशि बढ़नी चाहिए थी, तो भी बात कुछ समझ में आती कि आप न हमारे साथ न्याय किया है। परन्तु उस कार्यक्रम की राशि को न बढ़ाकर, पहले हमें जो राशि मिलती थी, उसको भी हमें नहीं दिया जा रहा है, इस तरह यह हमारे साथ अन्याय किया जा रहा है। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि डेजर्ट डेवलपमेंट के कार्यक्रम के लिए 100 करोड़ की रंगिस्तानी इलाकों के लिए जो योजना बनाई गई है, जिसमें 21 जिलों को कवर किया गया है, जिनमें कुछ इलाका राजस्थान का भी आता है, कुछ इलाका हरियाणा प्रान्त के, कुछ जम्मू और कश्मीर प्रान्त के तथा कुछ एरियाज हिमाचल प्रदेश के भी आते हैं, इन हिली एरियाज के लिए पांचवी पंचवर्षीय योजना में 170 करोड़ रुपये रखे गए थे, छठी पंचवर्षीय योजना के जिसको बढ़ा कर 560 करोड़ रुपये की राशि रखी गई है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप उसके बारे में मिड टर्म एप्रेंजल करवायें और उसको फिर से कंसीडर करें। क्योंकि हमारा क्षेत्र सीमावर्ती क्षेत्र है, वाडमर और जैसलमर पाकिस्तान से लगे हुए इलाके हैं। सिर्फ मेरा एरिया केरल से दो गुना है और हरियाणा से डेढ़ गुना से भी अधिक बड़ा है। मेरे निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के 50 प्रतिशत हिस्से में रेडियो की कोई आवाज नहीं पहुँचती। जब कि वह सीमावर्ती क्षेत्र है। श्रीमती गांधी जब 1965 में वहाँ गई थीं

तो उन्होंने वहाँ आशवासन दिया था कि वाडमर और जैसलमर के लिए एक रेडियो स्टेशन कायम किया जाएगा। चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में उसके लिए प्रावधान रखा गया, पांचवी पंचवर्षीय योजना में उसके लिए प्रावधान रखा गया लेकिन अब छठी पंचवर्षीय योजना में उसके लिए कोई प्रावधान नहीं किया गया है। उसमें कहा गया है कि फाइनेन्सियल कन्स्ट्रेंट के कारण वहाँ पर रेडियो स्टेशन की स्थापना नहीं की जा सकती। इस कारण मेरे निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के 50 प्रतिशत लोग हिन्दुस्तान के रेडियो को सुनने से वंचित रह जाते हैं, जब कि दूसरी ओर पाकिस्तान रेडियो वहाँ पर अपना प्रचार कर रहा है। उन लोगों को भारत के विकास के बारे में कोई जानकारी प्राप्त नहीं होती। लाहौर, कराँची और हैदराबाद सिंध रेडियोज की आवाज वहाँ इतनी बलवन्त आती है कि वहाँ के रहने वालों पर उसका सीधा असर पड़ता है। हमारे डिफेंस प्वाइंट आफ व्यू से भी उसका दुरा असर हमारे लोगों पर पड़ता है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि वाडमर और जैसलमर के लिए किसी रेडियो स्टेशन की व्यवस्था करने के बारे में आप विचार कीजिए।

मैं ड्रिंकिंग वाटर की प्रब्लम के बारे में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। यह एक बहुत ही सिरियस प्रब्लम है। रंगिस्तानी क्षेत्रों में अभी भी ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं, जहाँ पर कि लोग दस-दस, बारह-बारह मील से पीने का पानी लाते हैं। कई क्षेत्र तो ऐसे हैं जहाँ कतई पीने का पानी उपलब्ध नहीं है। अभी जो बक्स एंड हाउसिंग डिपार्टमेंट से एक इन्स्ट्रक्शन निकली है कि उन सीमाओं को लिया जाएगा, जहाँ पर कि हैण्ड पम्प स्क्वैसफल हो सकता है। हमारे क्षेत्र में यह योजना विकसित नहीं हो सकती है। इसके तहत पीने का पानी वहीं पहुँच सकता है, जहाँ पर कि योजना विकसित हो सकती है। हमने बहुत सी योजनाएँ बनाकर सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को भेजी हैं, लेकिन उनमें से किसी को भी मंजूर नहीं किया गया है। हम आशा करते थे कि छठी पंचवर्षीय योजना में रंगिस्तानी क्षेत्रों के लिए पीने की समस्या का समाधान हो जाएगा, लेकिन ऐसा नजर नहीं आता है। इसलिए हमें वहाँ के पीने के पानी की

समस्या के निकारण के लिए प्राथमिकता देने चाहिए। इसके लिए जो प्रावधान किए गए हैं, उन प्रावधानों के अन्दर हमें राशि को बढ़ाना होगा, ताकि पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों में जहां पीने का पानी नहीं है, वहां पीने का पानी पहुंच सके।

रेलवे के बारे में भी, इस्टन एरियाज के बारे में भी पूरी तरह से ध्यान रखा गया है, लेकिन ईस्टन एरियाज के लिए अव-हेलना की जा रही है। इन 35 सालों की आजादी के बाद भी वहां रेलवे लाइन का विकास नहीं किया गया है। मैं इस बारे में बराबर अनुरोध करता रहा हूँ। इसमें आप डिफेंस की मदद ले सकते हैं। रेलवे लाइन हमें बीकानेर से जैसलमेर और जैसलमेर से बाड़मेर और बाड़मेर से कांडला तक, जो कि एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है। यदि इसको गहरा तर्क लाया जाएगा तो रॉजस्थानी क्षेत्रों की काफी तरक्की हो सकती है। राजस्थान कनाल में जो प्रोजेक्शन होगा उसको बहुत ही अच्छी तरह से ट्रांसपोर्टेशन हो सकता है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपको इस ओर भी ज्यादा तवज्जह देनी चाहिए ताकि वहां के लोगों को बहुत ही सुविधा हो और वह क्षेत्र प्रगति कर सके।

मैं एक बात यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि राजस्थान में भी अकाल पड़ता है। यदि वहां पर राजस्थान नहर समय पर बन जाती, तो अकाल का जो हमारे ऊपर इतना वजन आता है, वह नहीं आता और हम प्रगति करते हुए चलते जाते। इस लिए इन पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों के विकास की ओर आपको विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिए। मिडटर्म एप्रोजल में जो पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्र हैं, उनको आगे बढ़ाने के लिए फण्ड्स की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आपकी धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया।

17 hrs.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jaipur):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, the House is currently debating the Sixth Five-Year Plan. This Plan has come into existence from 1980 and will cover the periods from 1980 to 1985. It is really a sad

commentary that this House did not get the opportunity to debate the Draft Plan prior to approval of this Plan by the National Development Council. The Hon. Minister for Planning has appealed to the Members of this House that they should cooperate with the Government in the implementation of the Plan. This is a well-known principle that unless somebody is made a partner in decision making, he is not going to be a partner in the implementation of the same.

In all Plan documents, in various articles and speeches of this Hon. Finance Minister and of the earlier ones also, an appeal has been made that this implementation of the Plan is not the responsibility of the Government, but of the people at large. But I really find no effort on the part of the Government to involve the people at large either in the decision making, or in the formulation of the Plan or in the implementation of the Plan as such. And this is one good reason that right from the very beginning, since the inception of the Planning era in 1951, the people of this country at large have not been involved in the total Planning process and in implementation thereof; and this is one good reason why our Planning or Plan targets have not been achieved despite a massive investment of Rs. 88,700 crores up to the end of the Fifth Five Year Plan and another Rs. 50 to 55 thousand crores during these two years, roughly by the end of 1982-83. In other words by the end of the three years of the Sixth Plan, approximately Rs. 150,000 crores have been spent over Planning so far as the public sector outlay is concerned.

Now when the Government speaks from its ivory tower that Rs. 150,000 crores have been spent over the Planning by the end of March 1983, let us examine and scrutinise whether the benefits of Planning have reached those people for whom it was meant.

Planning was not a new concept for this Government, for the personnel managing this Government in 1951. When this Plan was introduced, they had this concept of Planning right in

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

1937 at the Karachi Congress when Subhash Chandra Bose became its President and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was there. Even the concept of Planning in a limited way was introduced by the Congress Party when they had the opportunity to rule in 1937. So, it is nothing new that way. Of course, the area of Planning has widened, dimensions of Planning have widened, activities of Planning have been widened, resources have been widened, but it is not absolutely new to the Congress Party. The Congress Party is committed to Planning since 1937 and earlier to that too, but I am sorry to say that since 1951, when this Planning era was brought into force, there is one point about it that I would like to make a mention here. The point is that Planning has to be more economic oriented and less political oriented. But what we find is that when Planning document was brought in, every Plan came into existence one year earlier to the elections. The first Plan in 1951 was launched one year prior to the elections; Second Plan in 1956 was prior to elections; the 1961 Plan was prior to election, the 1966 Plan was prior to elections. Then there were certain annual Plans also. So, naturally this national document of Plan which should have a national acceptability in favour of all sections of the people, irrespective of the fact whether they belong to this side or that side, has got bogged up in political partialities or political considerations. This should not have been so. But because the Plans had been launched on the eve of elections, naturally 40 per cent of the people belonging to the ruling party supported the Plan and 60 per cent of the people though agreed in broad principles to the objectives of the Plan opposed various proposals because it was used as an election manifesto of the ruling party in every election. This was very unfortunate. It should not have been done. Because on this date, there is no disagreement, so far as the broad objectives of the Plan are concerned. Who is that Member belonging to any particular party what-

soever in this country, who does not want the removal of unemployment, does not want the removal of poverty, who do not want the removal of inequalities and who does not want the improvement in the quality of life of our people? These are the broad objectives of the Plan; and these have been made the objectives of the Plans right from 1951. But since 1951 till now, these objectives, as targeted, have not been achieved. Either the targets were very ambitious and very high; or—I would like to come to it later on, as to what has been the snag. But in respect of the three decades of planning, right from 1951 onwards, we have a document of the planning Commission. It is called the "Draft Sixth Five-Year Plan, 1978-83," which gives an evaluation and a scrutiny of the planning process and the achievements during the last three decades.

At page 4, paragraph 1.121, it is said I quote:

"The preceding assessment of India's economic development over a quarter of a century of Planning has indicated some fundamental failures and it is on account of these that the need has arisen for a re-appraisal of the development strategy. We must face the fact that the most important objectives of planning have not been achieved. The most cherished goals seem to be almost as distant today as when we set out on the road to planned development. These aims—implicit in all our plans, but more explicitly stated in the later formulations of our development strategy—are universally accepted by the Indian people; they are the achievement of full employment, the eradication of poverty and the creation of a more equal society."

This is the evaluation of the 25 years of planning made by the Planning Commission itself, and it is contained in their Plan document. Now, we must face facts. What has been the main reason for all these? We created a mechanism of Planning Commission. Planning Commission, as on

date, is very well equipped, so far as the formulation of the Plans are concerned, their projections are concerned. It is much better equipped than what it was a decade ago. So, so far as that aspect is concerned, I have no grievances.

But the main grievance is: why has this planning process not been able to bring the desired results? We have been planning for the have-nots, for the removal of poverty, for the removal of unemployment and for removing inequalities. These are the three broad objectives of the plan. I would like to know from the Minister as to what has been the achievement during the two years.

You can yourself see it. After every plan, there has been an appraisal, after every plan there has been an increase in the unemployed people, people living below the poverty line have gone up after the end of every Plan. You can very well say that the population has grown. I am not tagging it with that. You are trying to find excuses. But the fact of the matter is that after every Plan, whether it is First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, or the Annual Plans or this 6th Plan the number of people living below the poverty line has been going up. The number of unemployed persons is going up. Thirdly, inequalities are growing. Twenty per cent of the rural poor people, that is, people of the lowest strata are controlling 1 per cent of the total assets, and 4 per cent of the highest strata are controlling 30 per cent of the national assets.

Where is socialism? Now everybody is talking of socialism. It may be qualified by Marxist Socialism or Gandhian Socialism. But I would like to know, as a student of public finance, where socialism is.

I would like to ask this Government, and I would like to give a suggestion also here. In all these periods, the whole fault has been this. So far as the planning mechanism is concerned, it is all right. But so far as imple-

mentation is concerned, it is lagging behind. There is a tardy implementation of projects. Where is the money going? Fifty per cent of the money is going down the drain. At present, what is being planned? We are planning three-bed room house, with a latrine, bath etc. etc., providing one lakh, next year we revise the design and the Plan, add one more lavatory, provide one lakh more. Next year we provide one more staircase and one more lavatory and we provide one lakh more, the plinth area remains the same every year. In each developmental project the cost is going up and it is eating away 50 per cent of the public money.

Now, hon. Minister, can you cite even one single instance of even one single project, during the last 30 years in this country, a major project which has been completed within the approved sanction, as sanctioned by the Planning Commission and the Government? Can you cite even a single project which has been completed during the time schedule during the 30 years, any major project involving Rs. 10 crores, or Rs. 20 crores? Every project in this country during the last 30 years is eating away major portion of the money provided by Parliament or by the Government so far as development is concerned.

You know, the Metro Railway was to cost Rs. 140 crores. It is reaching Rs. 1,000 crores! Salal Project was to cost Rs. 58 crores and it is reaching Rs. 400 crores. Rajasthan Canal, Kosi, Gandak, Nagarjuna Sagar—there are eight various irrigation projects in this country which have not been completed for the last 20 years! And as a result the cost escalation in the developmental projects increased and it has been debated last time also here. I made these points at that time also and also during the discussion on the Budget. And I am making these points now for the kind consideration of the hon. Members of the House. I have made these points on earlier

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

occasions also, so far as the implementation aspect is concerned, cost escalation is concerned, time run-over is concerned, that there is not even a single project which is completed in time and the community is deprived of the fruits of development for all these years. If the irrigation projects like Rajasthan canal are not completed for want of funds, or Nagarjuna Sagar, or Kosi or Gandak or any other project, if they are not completed, what happens? Irrigation is your main strategy for agriculture. Then your fertilizer will become useless. Now what is the situation today? After spending Rs. 10,000 crores at the end of the Fifth Plan, or major irrigation etc., what is the position? A ten per cent less rainfall this year, or 15 per cent less rainfall adversely affects our agricultural production! I used to read in 1945 when I was a student of B. Com. in Pilani that our Indian agriculture depends on the vagaries of the monsoon. This is the position even after 40 years! Even today we depend on the vagaries of monsoon! If the monsoon is good the agricultural production is good. Then what is the use of providing funds for irrigation? All this has to be provided because the country is not to face drought or famine. But if we have not been able to provide these irrigation facilities and the situation created on account of less rainfall, even 10 per cent less, what is going to be the production in 1982-83? It is not going to cross even the 1978 production level. You projected 138 million tonnes for 1982-83. It is going to be less than 130 million tonnes! We are not happy with the situation. We are not happy on your failure. Your failure is not a party failure. Your failure is a national failure. It is a failure of the Plan which causes anxiety to everybody. We are not happy over your failure on this ground. So, your project costs are going up. If you take any hydel project, or fertilizer project, power project, everywhere, as I said earlier, there is not even a single major project of the Government of India or

even the State Government which has been completed within the approved sanction and within the targeted time. If there be any one, I shall be thankful to the hon. Minister if he can enlighten the House.

So, what has been done? The implementation mechanism has to be strengthened. Unfortunately, there is no mechanism for monitoring implementing at the moment. Costs go up. The project reports are defective. They have become fait accompli. And not only that: In certain States projects are started even without the approval of the Planning Commission! And then the approval of the Planning Commission becomes a fait accompli. You have just to stop it. There is no other way. Why this lachari? Why is this situation so? If the State Governments go ahead with some projects, even without the approval of the Planning Commission, then you have to be ruthless about it and say to the State Governments, that Planning Commission is not going to approve and tell them 'you have started this without the approval of the Planning Commission.' Political compunctions should not come in your way. In that way, you will not be able to do justice to the matter. The whole economy behaves and the whole economic performance depends how tight you are. If you are as soft as you are in personal life, then of course, there is going to be a catastrophe. You should not be like that. So, this is the major question, that confronts us.

Secondly, you should not try to condone it. Have you taken any action against any officers for the delay in the implementation? In the private sector, if there is a time-bound schedule, if there is an approved amount, and if the Manager or the Executive Director is not able to complete that project within the approved sanction, or time schedule then that man is checked off. I think this House will be with you if you bring in any amendment in the Constitution or in the Conduct Rules, that is, somebody is made in charge of

a project. There should be a time-bound implementation. Well gentleman, X, Y, Z, you are in charge of this project this has to be completed in three years, this has to be completed within 100 crores. Then per cent margin is there. So, not beyond 110 crores. If it is not completed, you go lock, stock and barred and go to your house. But, there is not even a single officer in the Government of India, all throughout, who has been charge-sheeted, who has been punished for the slackness. At the most he is transferred from X place to Y place, from Y place to Z place, that is all. There is no incentive, there is no disincentive. That may be the position. (Interruption) I am not putting premium on such persons whether they join us or they join you. I am talking, Mr. Bhatia, on a higher plane. The criticism is not partition. It is not motivated by party considerations because I sincerely feel that the destiny of this nation is now committed to the broader implementation of the plan formulations. If we do not achieve it, the future generations will not forgive us, whether you are there or we are there. So, this is very essential that we have to do it. And, Sir, one more suggestion I would like to give here. I do not want to go into all that. What about the jugglery of facts and figures? In the earlier years there used to be a Committee of Parliament which could discuss the plan formulations at some stage or the other. What is the harm for the Government to accept it? In U.K., Australia and Canada, there are so many Standing committees of Parliament which have to oversee the functioning and working of various important Ministries of their country. Why not abolish the Consultative Committee which do not serve any purpose in planning? You have a Standing Committee of Parliamentary Members, composed of all sections of the House, and you discuss the Plan threadbare there. We shall be giving more constructive suggestions there, we shall be able to scrutinise the allocations there. Now what allegations we can scrutinise here? We can simply say broader

principles that we can make out here and not go into the details. For details there is no time. We can only make broader principles. So, unless the Parliament is involved in it, which unfortunately could not be involved, and even the mid-term appraisal was not made available to Members of Parliament and of course, you had an excuse, you wanted the debate. Debate could not be possible but after the mid-term appraisal is with you, you hold annual plan discussions every year. So, you must have the mid-term appraisal with you so far as achievements of the last two years are concerned. But you are withholding that document. That document will ultimately come to us, if not, this session, next session. It would have been better, mere generous, on your part to make available these documents to the Members of Parliament. Then the discussion would have been more fruitful and meaningful and more purposeful. We would have communicated to you that look here, here are the shortfalls. Now shortfalls are there in every sector. So, that is the most important problem that this country is faced with. We have to look to it. We have devised the agricultural sector development strategy. What about the land reforms? Forty lakh acres was to be surplus. Hardly fifty per cent you have distributed, hardly eighteen lakhs. Now what is the position? Unless you distribute the land, unless the poverty in the rural areas is removed, you will not be able to cope up with this. Lastly, you are very much worried about the resources. It is a socialistic society, it is a socialistic constitution. Practically for all purpose we are considered a socialist egalitarian society, which believes in the removal of inequalities. But may I ask a question? While you are imposing excise duty on almost everything used by the common people, including clothing, why have you spared the rich class from paying wealth-tax? I am an advocate. I am paying income-tax for the last 30 years and I am also paying wealth-tax. But, you will be surprised to know that Tata is not paying a pie

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

as wealth-tax; so also Birla, Singhanias, Modi and even Ambani, who in the last 15 years has increased his wealth to Rs. 500 crores. Even he, during the last 15 years, has not been paying any wealth-tax. He has not contributed a pie to the Consolidated Fund, he has not paid anything to the national exchequer, he has not contributed a single penny to the development of this country. Why? Because this socialist Government, by one single line in the Finance Bill of 1960, made a provision in the Wealth-Tax Act of 1957, exempting the levy of wealth-tax on all industrial houses, industrial estates and these people, which remains in force till this day. You have not amended that one line provision of the Finance Bill of 1960, which said that there will be no wealth tax levy hereafter on these wealthier people, these industrial houses of Tatas, Birlas, Modis, Singhanias etc. Since 1960 there is no wealth-tax on these people. The retained profits of Tatas after depreciation, reserves, bonus, dividend and payment of taxes is Rs. 120 crores. The retained profits of Birlas is Rs. 110 crores. If you just charge a wealth-tax of 5 per cent on the retained profit, which in the case of the large industrial houses comes to Rs. 15,000 crores, it will give you Rs. 750 crores. Yet, you are not tapping this source.

SHRI A. K. ROY: Why did you not impose it when you were the Finance Minister?

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: So, you are replying on behalf of the present Government. I am very happy to see it. So far as I am concerned, firstly, I was not the Finance Minister; secondly, I was not in charge of the subject of income-tax; thirdly, it was a Government which was in office for only three years; finally, it was a government of various constituents and it was not a cohesive one party government, backed by a party organisation.

But the present government, backed by a party, has more cohesion with one supreme commander, before whom nobody can speak. So, this Government can do it. Further you cannot say that because it was not done earlier, so it should not be done. I am surprised that Shri A. K. Roy is opposing my demand for imposing wealth-tax on Tatas, Birlas and Singhanias.

SHRI A. K. ROY: I am not opposing it.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: If he is not opposing it, then he should not have interrupted me.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He was paying homage to the Janata Government.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Now the Planning Minister is very much worried about resource mobilisation; we are also equally concerned about it. I am only suggesting one sector from where you can have resource mobilisation, provided you bring a one line amendment to the Finance Bill of 1960, deleting that provision, so that the wealth-tax provision can come into force in the case of retained profits, which are of the order of Rs. 15,000 crores. Even if you levy 5 per cent wealth tax on that, you will get Rs. 750 crores from one sector alone, and it is justified in equity and morality. There is no question of inequity or immorality in it. Why not impose wealth-tax on those rich people?

They have created private trusts. Sir, you will be surprised to know that one single industrial house, Sarabhai Chemicals, have created 1,600 private trusts and they have invested the whole wealth in those trusts. So, they do not pay a single penny as tax. Even the jewellery they have put in the company so that there is no wealth tax, because you have exempted it. Whenever they want to use the jewellery for their family marriage

purposes, they take the jewellery out of the company by paying a hire charge of Rs. 5, and return it to the company after the purpose is served. These are some of the methods adopted by these industrial houses.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: An-tulay created trusts out of that.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: You have to think of these laws, the whole gamut of governmental activities should be within your purview and you have to examine the suggestions for amending the various laws.

I am sorry, this subject cannot be dealt with in 20 minutes.

17.25 hrs.

[SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please conclude. My friend, the time allotted is limited.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am making a submission that it would have been better, and it would be better even now, that the hon. Planning Minister takes Members of the House into confidence, forms a Standing Planning Committee, which was there in existence previously. There was a standing Finance Committee; Mr. Ranga must be knowing it, was after 19, 'here were so many Committees of Parliament existing. The Standing Finance Committee was there, the Committee for Railways was there, but they were all abolished after 1954. Mr. Venkataraman strongly pleaded for a Standing Planning Committee for planning better, which should be above party. It is better if we sit in a room, discuss better, we ask you for information, you have our suggestions and all that. Then, naturally, we will be able to suggest to you as to how you should have resource mobilisation, not by

printing notes; that will be inflationary. And what is the position with regard to unemployment, poverty, education and medical care? What is the position in the villages now? There is no medical care worth the name. And you are talking about population growth! You seem to be very much worried about it and we are all worried about it, absolutely very much worried about it. But how to bring it unless you involve people? There are many political parties and political leadership in this country. There are 4000 Members of the Assemblies, there are 800 Members of Parliament. So there are nearabout 5000 people. Then there are members of panchayats and municipalities, the total comes to nearabout a lakh or a hundred thousand people the total members of panchayats, municipalities, Assemblies and Members of Parliament. These are the leaders of public opinion. Make it compulsory, amend the law to the effect that whosoever has more than three children which is the accepted norm of family life, will not get a ticket. I will give a commitment on behalf of my Party that if you adopt this norm, then we will not give a ticket to a Member who has got more than three children, which is the accepted norm of this country. Otherwise, how do you control population? We are against forcible sterilisation, you are also now against forcible sterilisation in view of your experience of 1976. But how to do it? The climate has to be created. Nobody can go and preach on a platform. No Health Minister can inspire confidence among the people to resort to family planning if he has got a team of 8 children. Mr. Shankaranand unfortunately cannot inspire confidence if he has 8 children. How can he do that? I can tolerate up to three. I mean, this is something psychological. It cannot be done without that. So, unless you do that, things will be improve. You make this norm for every political party, call a meeting, discuss the issue and say that, explosion of population is more dangerous than the atom bomb explosion. It will ruin the whole country. It will negative the whole developmental pro-

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

cess, it will negative all our achievements in this country. So, you will not be able to achieve that. But don't take a cover under it because we have not been able to achieve it. The per capita income has gone down, the national production is not going up, agricultural production is not going up. We are not doing well on this front or that front because population is growing. I have not time to show how it is growing. But despite all that, our achievements should have been much more all these factors being taken care of, and therefore, when you talk of consensus, when you talk of cooperation, then you have to seek it and seek it in a purposeful manner. You have to discuss the issue, you have to deliberate the issue, have our constructive suggestions, have a meeting for a day or two or three and then thrash out the issue, then try to find out if there is a fault somewhere in the implementation aspect, which is the most vital aspect of the achievements of the objectives of the Plan. Unless implementation is effective, unless it is speedy, unless it is corruption-proof, you cannot hope to achieve the objectives, the laudable objectives, which are enshrined as the Directive Principles of the State Policy in the Constitution and which have to be attained through this Plan formulation, through this document which is not a party document, which has to be a national document. The commitment of all people has to be there, but it cannot be there with this outlook, keeping people aloof, bringing the document and taking a decision to implement it, not making the midterm appraisal available to Members. And after three years we just have a ritual of discussing the Plan here, in this House, so that nobody can say that we have not discussed the Plan. It is not an approval of Parliament, it is not a discussion, it is not a partnership in your decision-making. I am sure that in future you will take these corrective measures and then and then along we shall be able to see

that the laudable objectives enshrined in the Constitution under the Directive Principles of State Policy are achieved, poverty is removed, unemployment is reduced and inequalities are removed and this country's quality of life is improved so as to have a national pride in the comity of nations when we go abroad. What is the per capita income? We simply say, 125 dollars. What is the per capita income in U.S.A.? It is \$ 6000. Then we feel belittled that way. We want to have a place of pride in the Comity of Nations by saying we are improving the plight of our own people. With these words I finish my speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I need guidance of the House. There are a number of speakers still on the list as given. The list is a large one. Some of the parties representatives have not spoken.

The total time consumed so far in discussion on the Sixth Five Year Plan is more than five hours.

According to the List of Business for today which has been circulated, item No. 18 has three hours at its disposal. The last item is Half-an-Hour discussion by Dr. Karan Singh. Today no time for this has been indicated against Half-an-Hour discussion. Normally, it is usually taken up at 17.30.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: As a convention it is taken up at 5.30 p.m. It is a very important issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When should this Half-an-Hour discussion take place? How long do you purpose to sit for discussion on the Plan?

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: (Durgapur): We can take Half-an-Hour discussion now. We may adjourn at 6 O'Clock. We can take up discussion on the Sixth Five Year Plan tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid, it is for the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN : The same point was posed to the House. It was decided that the discussion of the Plan will be over by 7 O'Clock today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time do you propose to take? When would you like to speak?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I would be taking about forty minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As per calculation 20 minutes will be at the disposal of the House for discussion of the Plan. Quite a few speakers are there—Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, Shri Yadav, Shri Roy, are from the Opposition. There is a long list of speakers from the Congress side.

DR. KARAN SINGH: (Udhampur): We can have Half-an-Hour discussion now because the hon. Minister for External Affairs is also there. It will give a little change from planning. Then after that discussion on Planning can be resumed. The hon. Minister can perhaps extend his stay from 7 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. In this way it can be finished today.

... (व्यवधान) ... तो फिर कल कर लें।

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: In the Business Advisory Committee it was stated that the House would not sit beyond 7 p.m. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think let Dr. Karan Singh start with Half-an-Hour discussion.

Dr. Karan Singh, you should be very brief as it is Half-an-Hour discussion only.

17.33 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

EXCLUSION OF OCCUPIED AREAS OF JAMMU & KASHMIR FROM THE MAP PUBLISHED IN INDIAN GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENT.

DR. KARAN SINGH (Udhampur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have raised this Half-an-Hour discussion on the basis of certain replies given to Starred Question No. 174 relating to inaccurate maps published in the Government of India advertisement showing only part of Jammu and Kashmir as Indian territory. This betrays the continuing carelessness on behalf of the Government agencies. I recall, in fact, looking through some of the records as far back as 1970, I had to answer a similar question in the Rajya Sabha, because Air India at that time was responsible for the map which was inaccurate. Although at that time some directions were issued, it seems that they are not being really followed as forcefully as they should. There are lot of publications that show Kashmir either as a disputed area or as divided. I have with me Arabic, the Islamic World Review. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has seen it or not. It has very clearly shown Kashmir as separate from India as well as from Pakistan.

On this limited issue, with regard to the maps, I would suggest.

(a) fresh directions be issued from the Ministry of External Affairs to all Government Departments and agencies to ensure that there is no inaccuracy in the maps;

(b) where such maps come to their notice published by non-Government agencies Indian or foreign—they should immediately seek rectification.

But, Sir, this question of the maps does highlight an uncomfortable fact. For the last 35 years—1947 and then from 1962 vast areas of the State of