

[*English*]

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO: Our State Government is helping the poor people as well as the farmers. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRIBHAJAN LAL: I do appreciate that you are a well-educated intelligent Member and have made good points about farmers. You are a great sympathiser of farmers. I am also not less than that and none of the hon. Members of the House is unsympathetic towards them. Hon. Shri Ranga has made good suggestions. I will consider all these points seriously. The Central Government will make efforts to implement all the good suggestions and I will also endeavour to ensure their implementation to the maximum possible extent.

With these words, I am very grateful to those hon. Members who have expressed their valuable views here.

---

15.31 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS'  
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

[*English*]

**Fifty-Seventh Report**

SHRIMATI PATEL RAMABEN RAMJIBHAI MAVANI (Rajkot): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 16th November, 1988."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-seventh Report of the Committee

on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 16th November, 1988."

*The motion was adopted*

---

15.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: IMPLEMENTATION  
ON NEW 20-POINT PROGRAMME—  
*Contd.*

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up further discussion on the Resolution regarding implementation of New 20-Point Programme moved by Shri Somnath Rath on 19th August, 1988.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO (Vijayawada): I congratulate Mr. Somnath Rath for bringing this Private Members' Resolution. I fully agree with his view that in the implementation of the 20-Point Programme the much needed commitment is lacking.

This Programme was initiated in 1975, modified in 1982 and re-modified in 1986. Its main and primary objective is removal of poverty. Though several thousand crores of rupees have been spent during the last 13 years, still only marginal change is there in the situation. I do not say that there is no change at all. I do accept that there is some change, but much more is needed to be done. I will quote one instance. You are aware that in northern India especially during the winter months not less than 300 to 400 poor people die because they do not have adequate clothes to protect themselves from the cold wave. Now, IRDP and several other programmes are intended to help the poorest of the poor in the rural areas. If this was really done, if really the poorest of the poor was helped, this situation would not have arisen. This is mainly because during the process of its implementation there are certain deficiencies at different levels. Actually the Government's intention

is that these programmes should be implemented properly and those people, who are below the poverty line, should be helped from a long range point of view. It will ultimately help them to develop socially, economically and educationally. But in many cases this is more on paper rather than on the ground. I shall quote only one instance. When we want to give IRDP loan benefit to a poor person to purchase a milch animal or a pair of bullocks and a cart, or sheep and goat, sometimes it so happens that actually the beneficiary does not purchase that milch cattle or bullocks and cart, or sheep and goat, but the three of them—the beneficiary, the bank officer and the Block officer—will collude. They will not really purchase the animal but will distribute the subsidy due in that particular scheme, to the beneficiary, to this bank man and to that Block official and repay this loan amount, which is given by the bank, after a few days to the bank, whereby the bank's interest is protected and the bank manager is quite satisfied. Now, what is happening in this process? The Government subsidy amount is being distributed but because that poor fellow has not purchased the animal or the bullock and cart, in the long run he is not going to be benefited. We think that he has already crossed the poverty line because he is given an IRDP loan, but in practice he is not going to be brought out of that poverty line. These are the examples which we practically see sometimes. So, my submission is that in such instances; when these lapses have been brought to the notice of the Government, the Government—not only the Union Government but all the State Governments—should strictly act. Whenever such lapses come to the notice of the administration, they must take very drastic measures and penalise the persons who are responsible for such types of things. Only then these programmes can be implemented in letter and spirit. Sometimes it is also happening in another way. The Government of India has given the guidelines. All the States are following them. In our State also, our State Government is strictly following those guidelines. There is selection committee of officers and they select the beneficiaries. "The bank official is also in-

involved. But after a particular poor beneficiary is identified, after the selection is over, the bank officer says: "No, the scheme is not viable, so I do not give the loan." In that process what happens is that the poor fellow who is sanctioned the loan, who is expecting to get self-employment by implementation of that particular scheme, is mentally tortured. He is made to run from pillar to post and he is made to go to the bank any number of times. Many a time this type of non-cooperation from the bank official's side is leading to a stage where we are not able to reach the targets well in time. Only in the last minute somehow those targets may be fulfilled. So, my submission to the Government is that they should kindly issue fresh instructions so that the banks must compulsorily give the loan to the beneficiaries who are identified as per the guidelines given by the Government, and in the process of selection, the bank official should be involved from beginning to the end.

By and large, these funds spent for RLEGP, NREP and IRDP are really helping the rural people a lot. I should say that because of these NREP and RLEGP funds, the hitherto neglected rural areas are able to get some all-weather roads or schools buildings or buildings constructed for community purposes, for the necessity of the people in the entire village. Several such developmental works are going on in a considerable way which is also bringing a lot of change in the face of the rural India. So my suggestion is that more funds should be earmarked for these rural programmes.

My another suggestion in this respect is this. Now, I personally feel that a stage has come where more employment opportunities can be generated from the service sector. Suppose you want to start an industry, it might require Rs. 100 crores or Rs. 200 crores. Because of the sophistication of the process, advanced technology involved, such industries would require more capital but there will be lesser employment opportunities. Now, what we find in our rural areas is, when we go round the villages, a poor fellow goes on his two wheeled cycle having some

[Sh. V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao]  
 baskets behind his cycle with some vegetables, fruits or cloths selling them to the rural consumers and he gets something on which he is able to live without going in for a job to another place. Similarly, in semi-urban areas, we find people people going with their 4-wheeled carts keeping some vegetables on them, going round the streets and selling them to the women-folk thereby earning their livelihood. It is just like you find in developed countries where a number of people working in the service sector is nearly 1/3 of the total working forces in those countries. Now, of course, not to that extent but surely a beginning can be made and a situation has come where in the service sector job opportunity can be created by providing the requirements of these people with a very very marginal investment. Supposing the poor fellow is given a cycle with a working capital of Rs. 500 or Rs. 400, then the total cost of his small business is not more than Rs. 1000 So, if you consider giving facility like this to these small people then you will be giving employment opportunities to about one crore people. So, Sir, some such innovative measures can be identified, can be thought of. Then the schemes can be given higher and over-riding priorities in these IRDP loan programmes where more number of poor people can be benefited.

Sir, 20-Point programme is a very vast subject. I do not want to touch all of them. Now, I would like to refer to the housing facilities. Next to food, housing is most important for these poor people. It is the basic need of the people. The Government is admitting that in spite of the fact of houses having been constructed, that is, about 16.2 million dwelling units constructed during the Seventh Plan period, still at the beginning of the 8th Plan, there may be about 29.3 million housing units required. So, Sir, that itself will make clear the gravity of the situation. Now, the Government of India has started observing the housing programme that has been going on in Andhra Pradesh. They have started this programme through Indira Awas Yojana Programme under RLEGP for the benefit of the Scheduled Castes and Sched-

uled Tribes. I do appreciate it. But what I want to suggest in this connection is that by merely giving a help, that is giving them money for construction of their houses free of cost, I want to ask whether it is advisable to help them like this. Should we not encourage the poor men to work and save something and also encourage them to construct their own houses? Definitely, the Government must help them. To some extent you can give them subsidy in that cost of the house, say for the total cost of Rs. 6,000 or Rs. 8,000 or Rs. 1000 for the construction of the House, you may give them subsidy to the extent of Rs. 2000 or Rs. 3000. He must be made to know that he has to work and he must save something to construct his own house. If he gets loan for this purpose, he must be able to pay back the loan in equal instalments. Till now you might have given a few lakhs of persons throughout the country. But there are many crores of people who are to be provided with housing facilities. So, my submission is that you kindly think of extending assistance to the poor people for construction of their houses on this basis. In our own State, for the social welfare measures, our Government has spent nearly Rs. 35 crores during the last five years and it has helped in the construction of 8 lakh houses for the poor Harijans, Scheduled Castes, backward class people, economically backward class people and so on. It has given some Rs. 2000 as subsidy whereas the balance of the construction cost is given as loan and I suggest to the hon. Minister to consider and take it up at the level of the Union Government. So that your assistance, your help may help the State Government in taking up this housing programme in a very very big way so that we may be able to come nearer reaching our target of 29 million units in the coming Eighth Plan period. In this process my suggestion is this. Earlier, my colleague was speaking—he only comes from Bihar—that there is a lot of wastage and corruption in the matter of construction of these houses where sub-standard bricks or lesser quantity of cement and such things are being used. The hon. Member has brought this to the notice of this House. Our experience in our State is, we are involving

the beneficiaries themselves, they are forming a samiti, they themselves are constructing, they are completely utilising the materials, bricks cement, steel that are being required for that are being given by the Government and I hope the Government will adopt a similar policy.

In respect of slum clearance in several cities, the slums are coming up in a very very big way, and I do not understand, while some years back the DMK Government in Madras could tackle the slum clearance and slum improvement programme in a very very big way on a massive scale constructing several thousands of units in that short period, why not the Government take some such measures in other metropolitan cities to clear the slums and provide permanent housing to those economically weaker sections people. In this connection, in our Andhra Pradesh also, in the cities of Hyderabad, Visakhapatnam and Vijayawada as well as several towns the Government of India has a plan to assist the efforts of the State Governments with the assistance from overseas development agencies. The hon. Minister for Urban Development very recently came to Vijayawada in connection with a Seminar and she assured that the Government will make available this assistance, and I once again urge upon the hon. Minister to see that this help is made available at the earliest for clearance of these slums in several cities as well as towns in our State of Andhra Pradesh.

We have committed ourselves to the health for all by 2000 A.D. And it was reiterated in the National Health Policy also adopted in 1983. But I ask the Government: Are we really going to achieve that target? The infant mortality is still very high especially in very big States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Gujarat and Orissa. Still the infant mortality is very high and the Government should seriously think about this and take necessary steps to bring down this infant mortality rate. And about population control, I do not know why our Government is not able to act in a declared manner, that means, not that the

Government is not doing many things; it is doing many things to induce the people to go in for sterilisation or birth control measures. But my suggestion is, while in Communist China the Government could convince the minority people in China to undertake family planning operation and while in a Muslim dominated Indonesia it was done, why this Government is not able to succeed in convincing the minority people to take up family planning programmes? Because ultimately it is only when the population growth is retarded, the results can go to all the people and there the religious heads are also convinced. They have agreed to the Government programme and those religious heads are cooperating with Government efforts. Similarly, why not our Government confer with the heads of religions? Several people may be there, you convene all of them and tell them that unless family planning programmes are implemented to the maximum extent, unless the population growth is retarded or arrested, the great efforts of this Government are going waste and much change is not being witnessed and the poor people are not getting the real benefits. So, you also kindly cooperate, you also kindly advocate. Through your disciples or your followers, you take up this family planning education and programme. There is nothing in the religious faith that family planning should not be adopted. But the Government has not taken up this measure till now. They have exploited several other avenues, several other methods for family planning but this particular measure has not yet been tried by the Government. I request them to try this method also.

In respect of giving justice to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people, whatever has been done is practically a drop in the ocean. Even now Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people are suffering a lot and the Scheduled Tribes people belonging to some States have come to such a desperate situation that they are wanting for a separate State to be administered by themselves. That only shows that much care was not given to them. There may be budgetary allocations on the paper, in the books,

[Sh. V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao]  
but how far have these benefits reached these tribal people?

For example, our Government of Andhra Pradesh has constructed nearly 1210 new hostels for Scheduled Tribes in a matter of 5 years. Similarly, for backward Class communities, while there were only 600 hostels, our Government have constructed 1030 hostels. Similarly for Scheduled Tribes, 470 new hostels have been opened. Even now, with all these things, our literacy rate is not above the national average. In spite of doing all this, in spite of doing so much for the benefit of those weaker sections, still much more has to be done and I hope the Government will similarly help for the amelioration of the poor people belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, for their development in social, economic and educational fields.

Lastly, I would like to point out the public distribution system. Just now, the hon. Minister was telling that the farmers were not satisfied with the prices they were paid. They are not getting remunerative prices whereas poor persons in the urban areas and semi-urban areas are compelled to pay very high prices. In this scenario, the Government's main responsibility comes in the form of public distribution system. I am told, in some States, this public distribution system is not so well established, as a result of which, even the essential commodities that are being supplied by the Union Government are not reaching the poorer sections to the fullest extent. In fact, my suggestion is, why do the Union Government not further reduce these prices? You are now for example, subsidising to some extent the supply of rice or what, in the cost of procurement, handling etc. But our State Government, with limited resources, in the year 1986-87, spent Rs. 285 crores as subsidy in addition to the subsidy element which is involved by way of Food Corporation of India issue prices and are making rice available at the rate of Rs. 2 per k.g. per family. Nearly one crore families are getting this benefit. My submission is that the Government can and should increase its

subsidy on the Food Corporation of India issue price, so that the State Governments' burden will further be reduced and they may be able to utilise that amount for other sectors.

Lastly, I would like to make only one suggestion. Now you are aware that this cloth is another item which is to be supplied to the poorer sections. I would like to bring to your kind notice that the interests of the handloom-weavers have not adequately been taken care of by the new Textile Policy. For example, I would like to say that our State Government is subsidising nearly Rs. 30 crores taking dhotis and sarees from the weavers and giving at 50 per cent of the prices to the consumers. But one item is there. The *Lungis*, which are being manufactured by the handloom weavers in our Prakasam and Guntur Districts as also in some other parts, are lying idle. Regarding the export orders to Ceylon and Burma, they have almost closed their doors. These weavers are suffering like anything. I would like to bring to your kind notice a few instances where suicides have also taken place and the weavers are very much worried. So, I would request the Union Government to purchase such stocks and distribute through the PDS system to other parts of the country and help those poor weavers.

With these few words, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI SATYENDRA NARAYAN SINHA (Aurangabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are discussing the implementation of the 20 Point Programme. We are all agreed that these programmes represent our resolve to bring about a qualitative change in the rural scene and also to bring about a change in the socio-economic structure. That is why, we have included all these programmes and when almost all the programmes are properly implemented, they would improve the quality of life of the people and bring about social justice and economic development. The report says that almost in all cases except one or two, the targets set have been achieved. Our Prime Minister has been

going round the country, visiting the rural areas particularly the villages inhabited by Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe and poor people. He has discovered that in the implementation of these programmes, there has been distortion. In his speeches, he has been saying that the funds allocated might have been utilised but the benefits actually reach those for whom they are intended in a very small percent. The other day while addressing a big rally here in Delhi, he said that out of Rs. six that is intended for a particular scheme, for example only one rupee reaches the actual target group. That shows the faulty implementation of these programmes and yet the figures show that we have achieved the targets that we had set.

15.58 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

Sir, I have just heard the hon. Member of Telugu Desam asking the same submission about the implementation. Now, I would also like to say the same thing. For instance, I would say that we have been trying to show that we are achieving the targets but what has been found in the study made on the NREP is different. One of the C&AG Report says: "Faulty planning, misappropriation of funds and large-scale bungling have marred the implementation of the NREP in Bihar". This is from CAG's Report. This is an example of how our implementation is faulty. When we come to actual evaluation of 20 Point-Programme — for instance, Bihar got 52 marks out of 57 in 1987-88 — how this achievement was recorded passes my comprehension because as has been found, at the grassroot level the implementation has not been as it should have been and the benefits of the programmes are not reaching the target groups. The Government is aware, the Prime Minister is aware, of the difficulties and has been exhorting the administration and his partymen and others to cooperate in proper implementation of these programmes because, as I said earlier, these programmes represent the soul of our development effort and on this depends

the success of our planning. If we are properly implementing these programmes, we will be actually eradicating poverty and minimising unemployment, which is the need of the time. Therefore, I would suggest that we cannot always depend on governmental machinery because funds are spent hundred per cent whereas the physical targets in actual terms would be even fifty per cent. Therefore, I would say that the time has come when we should undertake a study on the cost of delivery for each one of our developmental schemes.

As the Prime Minister himself indicated some time back "it is pointless if we have to spend 80 per cent of the funds of the project on administration and 20 per cent on actual benefits to the people." Now here is our Planning Minister. I will submit to him to undertake a study of this position where the administration is costing 85 per cent of the total cost of the scheme and only 15 to 20 per cent is left for the beneficiary. This is a point which should be studied now and these distortions should be corrected if we want to make rapid progress.

We have the onerous task of reducing the number of poor from 37 per cent in 1987 to 25.8 per cent in 1990 and further five per cent by 1999. This task too cannot be accomplished only by Government alone. All these efforts have to be supplemented by voluntary agencies and voluntary efforts. In the complex and vast country like India we cannot achieve these things only through Government machinery. I would like to quote in this connection, observations of one of our top Sociologists, Professor M.N. Srinivas: He says:

"In discussing rural development programmes, there is a real danger of being boxed into a situation where rural development becomes synonymous with the activities of the government of the day and this can also happen with international programmes."

I would also refer to the observations of Professor V.K.R.V. Rao. He says:

[Sh. Satyendra Narayan Sinha]  
 "devolution of power is the basic pre-requisite for success of IRDP."

I am glad the Prime Minister is emphasizing this point and is going to enact a law for holding Panchayat elections on time in order to strengthen the Panchayati Raj institutions. If you want to involve people at the grass root level, I think this is the only way of doing so and the Prime Minister is very right in emphasizing this point.

We have also to give importance to voluntary effort. Where Voluntary action has been significant there the benefit of the funds spent is the highest. I would therefore urge the Government to upgrade the voluntary action in attaining the goals of 20 point programme.

As my friend has said just now, even in the distribution of credit there is *Go/Maal*. So the credit should be distributed in camps meant for the purpose among the rural poor. If you have the Panchayati Raj institutions, they will be working as watch dogs in regard to this and the credit sanctioned would go to the person for whom it is intended.

Identification of beneficiaries is already being done in many places, in Gram Sabhas. But in many states Gram Sabhas are not active, particularly in Bihar, Panchayat elections have not taken place for years. It is high time elections were held and these institutions are made active and alive. If this happens, it would be easier for us to identify the real beneficiaries. The programmes which are intended to lift the people living below the poverty line will be correctly implemented.

The Hon. Member who spoke before me has said about the selection of beneficiaries and the collusion that takes place between the officers as well as the bank managers and the beneficiaries. This is not an isolated case of Andhra Pradesh; this is happening elsewhere also. I think the Government is aware of this and is trying to deal with the situation. I would only say that we have to involve the people in this.

The otherday while I was speaking on the Budget I had suggested that at the block level although you have the 20 point programme committee, yet it is not functioning in the objective manner as it should. We should delink it from politics and we should provide representation to all those people, maybe belonging to all parties, who are interested in the real social work. They should see to it that proper implementation is done.

In technology mission evaluation, for instance, a process of people's participation has been tried through an organisation headed by the former Chief Justice Shri Bhagawati. Some such organisations could be set up to involve people in regard to 20 point programme.

Now we have been often receiving complaints about the land reforms. Here in this House also it is often stressed that land reforms have not been properly implemented and lands have not been properly distributed. If lands have been distributed, in some cases the possession has not been given, even where possession has been given, the wherewithal has not been provided for carrying or cultivation, etc. In this case also I would suggest that you need the support of the village Panchayats. They will be able to tell you who has got the land in excess of the ceiling, which lands are being held in Benami and whether the records are correct or not. Emphasis has been laid in this programme that village records must be updated. The records should correctly show who is owning how much land. I am sorry to say the land records have not been updated. In many places consolidation of holdings has not yet taken place, particularly in Bihar. In some areas it has been done and in some other areas it is still in the process of being done. On account of faulty land records you have not been able to identify the excess land and further where excess lands have been identified you have not been able to distribute the same largely due to litigation. We should have special courts so that these cases can be speedily decided and they are not prolonged in usual civil litigation courts.

A word about minimum wages. It is also a very vexed problem. We are often referring to this question. The Prime Minister is aware of this and because of this he has appointed National Rural Labour Commission headed by Shri Darji. I hope this Commission will submit its report soon but even before the report is submitted we should address ourselves to this problem. In many areas particularly in Bihar there is resentment, dissatisfaction and tension in the villages on account of this, leading to violent clashes. You must have come across such news in the newspapers where large number of people have been killed. Government have undertaken this 'Operation Sidharth' in Jahanabad and Aurangabad areas which are affected by this so-called naxal movement. It is not only a question of minimum wages. It is a question of all-round development of that areas plus the social outlook of the people. The national education policy which we are implementing does take into consideration the point of changing the social outlook of the people, and bring about equality. Through Operation Blackboard, you are going to provide quality education at the rural level and if it is properly implemented then the children of affluent families would study in the villages along with the children of the poor families. They will sit together, read together and talk to each other on equal terms and there will be a change in the mental outlook. In the Navodaya schools talented children from rich and poor families will get quality education. They will stay together and lead a community life and when they will go into society they will go with a different mental outlook. There will not be any complexion. This national education policy is bound to change the social outlook which is contributing at the moment to a large extent in creating social tensions coupled with lack of development in those areas. Therefore, altogether this 20-point programme has taken an overall view of the society as it is and how to bring about a **qualitative change** in the society. This is the main thrust of this 20-point programme and **instead of only criticising the implementation part of it, I think, we should all go about telling people to cooperate in the best of spirit in the**

implementation of these programmes.

Already an atmosphere of awareness has been created through this programme. But still there is a lot to be desired. We should, instead of telling here, go to villages, ourselves see the implementation of it and cooperate with the authorities concerned or with the people entrusted with the implementation of it and see that the schemes are properly implemented and the benefits of it do reach the persons for whom it is intended. Here the role of the voluntary organisations is vital. There are many voluntary organisations which are working in the field. I name the Sarvodaya for instance. Bharat Sewak Samaj can also take up this work. Like that, we can identify the voluntary organisations — if we have not already so — and entrust this work to them. So, they can motivate the people to work honestly because a large part of bungling, that has taken place, is due to corruption that is eating into the very vitals of our system. This can only be fought by public awareness and by rousing the social conscience against it. Then alone, we can create a wall of public opinion or a system against corrupt practices and see that those who are indulging in wrong practices, are brought to book or are terrified from actually indulging in this kind of malpractices. **because of a strong public opinion for which we have all to work in the villages to create that awareness.**

Prime Minister has been going about seeing things for himself and telling people where the fault lies and what should be done. He has talked of the responsive administration. It is a very good thing. I do hope that in times to come, the administration will become responsive and it would be possible for the Government to create that kind of machinery about which we have spoken. The Ministry of Programme Implementation has been engaged in institutionalising an effective monitoring system which would not only motivate the effective implementation of the programme but also see about the speedy communication of dependable information in the areas to enable the monitoring agencies to interpret signals and intervene in a



[Sh. Satyendra Narayan Sinha] prompt and constructive manner. I think, when you reply to the debate, you will be able to tell us the progress that you have made in this regard and what kind of institutions you have evolved for the monitoring system.

I will again say that in the implementation of 20-point programme, there should be no politics. It should be delinked from politics. We should all see to it that the social structure undergoes a change, the economic structure undergoes a change. We proceed towards the socialist goal that is set before us. This 20-point programme in that respect is revolutionary concept and is intended to take us faster towards that aim.

With these words, I commend this programme and hope that the Government will further look into the deficiencies in the implementation of this programme.

[*Translation*]

SHRI VIRDHI CHANDER JAIN (Barmer): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I support the proposals put forward by hon. Shri Somnath Rath for the eradication of poverty. Under the 20 point programme, two points, namely, the first and the twentieth are very significant. If these two points are implemented properly, the 20 Point Programme can be successful in eradication of poverty. Therefore I want to throw light on the first point here. In the first point, it has been stated that priority has to be given to fighting poverty. Along with the eradication of poverty more employment opportunities have to be provided. Removal of poverty, raising of agricultural production, increasing productivity, removal of social and economic disparities and qualitative enhancement of living standards are the main objectives of this programme. The programme which has been given top priority for eradication of poverty is the Integrated Rural Development Programme. Under this programme, certain families have been selected in the rural areas who are to be the beneficiaries under this programme. Now the question arises as to how far have we been able to implement

this programme successfully. According to the information available with me, in the beginning of the Seventh Five Year Plan, 39.9 per cent people were living below the poverty line. Under this programme our target is to reduce this percentage of poverty to 28.2 per cent by 1989-90 and to 5 per cent by the year 2000 A.D. However in view of the pace at which we are progressing, it seems that we will not be able to achieve our target by 2000 A.D.! The need of the hour today is that radical changes will have to be brought about in the Integrated Rural Development Programme. If we do not do it, we will never be successful in achieving our aim of alleviation of poverty and the people living below the poverty line will never be uplifted. I think even to this extent that the Government figures which claim that at the start of the Seventh Five Year Plan, 39.9 per cent people were living below the poverty line are not based on facts. I doubt if we will be able to bring down this limit to 28.2 per cent by 1989-90. The reason behind this is that earlier we considered those families as living below poverty line whose annual income was less than Rs. 3500 per annum. Later on the Government extended this limit to Rs. 4800 and when prices further rose, this limit has been increased to Rs. 6400. This means that now those people who earn Rs. 6400 or less per annum are considered below poverty line. The reality is that if we hold a survey throughout the country, 50 per cent of the total population will be found to be living below this limit. Then a new situation will arise. I want to describe about my own constituency which is drought-stricken for the last 5 years and even this year when the situation in the whole country is quite good, it is still in the grip of drought. Leave aside the whole country, the condition in even our neighbouring district has now improved whereas the situation in Barmer, Jaisalmer and Jodhpur is still bad. Drought condition has been prevailing there for the last 5 years. 27 per cent people of Barmer district falls below poverty line and in Jaisalmer district 20 per cent people are below poverty line as per the definition formulated by the Government. This is so because you have put a condition that beneficiaries families to be

taken up under the I.R.D.P. programme should not possess land in excess of the limit prescribed for it. Under that programme, the Government has prescribed a limit that if a person is in possession of more than 10 hectares of unirrigated land, he is considered as above poverty line. This decision taken by the Government is absolutely wrong. This criteria should not be applied in drought prone areas and where the land is infertile. Today the situation there is such that people are leaving their land to work in the mills in Haryana, Gujarat and Pali as labourers. They are migrating to Jodhpur to work in the factories. The people are now leaving their occupation of agriculture and becoming labourers. In fact, 80 per cent people are there living below poverty line as against 27 per cent under your criteria. I have gone through all the statistics and have estimated that the definition of a small farmer covers one owning land up to 62.5 bighas whereas a landless is allotted land by the Government not less than 75 bighas after the allotment of which, he becomes a big farmer as per the definition and is not considered as below poverty line, as a consequence of which he is not entitled to avail of the benefit of that programme. Under the present situation, in order to provide benefit under I.R.D.P. programme, a family comprising 5 to 8 members, all persons of 18 years and above are supposed to be owning a share in the land. Thus they are considered as small farmers and below the poverty line. If it has been done from this point of view, it is right. In order to improve the situation of the people living in desert areas, it is necessary to bring them under the definition of small and marginal farmers, lest they should not get the benefit of Government schemes. Only those who live below poverty line are benefited by these scheme. All the people in my constituency whose condition is bad are not able to get the benefit of these schemes, due to which they are getting poorer day by day. Therefore it is a point to be considered that these people belong to a special area which have peculiar conditions. Special attention should be paid as to how to remove the poverty of people living in areas where only one crop i.e. Khariff is grown in a year

and there is no Rabi crop.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the desert development programme was implemented in our areas only after I made a lot of hue and cry in the Lok Sabha. We have been benefited by it because under this the sand-dune stabilisation work has been done in our area, due to which grass and trees have started growing on the dunes, and the land is becoming stable. Therefore this programme needs to be expanded as it has proved quite successful. In this regard, my suggestion is that instead of getting the work done by the Government, local people should be provided assistance to execute the work. This will help in improving the economic condition of those people. Due to the stabilisation of the sand-dunes there, trees and grass have started growing and there has been a lot of gain out of it. This programme is meant to eradicate poverty in the real sense. This programme consisted of two schemes and the bureaucracy which knows nothing has stopped those schemes. I held talks with the officials frequently but they did not pay attention to it. It has come to be seen that the officials do what they determine. We have seen a similar situation prevailing at the Centre also. I tried my best to change their mentality but they stopped the schemes under desert development programme. Under this programme exploration of tubewell was taken but they said it clearly that this would not be taken under this programme. They did not give any reasons when I asked them as to what objection did they have in it. You know that water could be explored with the help of this programme which enables to provide irrigation facilities. Chandan tubewells have been sunk in Jaisalmer by means of which the output of water has been 40,000 gallon. My implication is that exploration of tubewell programme has been quite successful. It was a part and parcel of our desert development programme but it is regrettable that the officials completely stopped it. Similarly there were animal husbandry programmes but the Rajasthan Government misused it. They opened the dispensaries in this regard but did not do any significant work in this direction. This is not right that we should

[Sh. Virdhi Chander Jain]

be punished for their fault. This programme can bring a lot of development. You know that the livestock in our country is an important wealth. Cow is the backbone of our villages and gives good milk. There will be no objection if some expenditure is incurred to bring improvement in its breed. The Rajasthan Government has totally stopped this programme at present, and our Central Government is providing cent percent aid to the desert development programme. This is the reason why the extension of desert which was taking place earlier has stopped now. My submission is that this programme should be expanded in the Eighth Five Year Plan, and more funds be allotted for this. In the Seventh Five Year Plan, an allocation of Rs. 237 crores was made. My submission is that an allocation of Rupees One thousand crore should be made in the eighth Five Year Plan. In the Hill Development Programmes launched by the Government, a provision of Rs. 500 to 700 crores is made. Therefore it becomes necessary that a provision of Rupees One Thousand crore should be made for the desert development programme. This can bring in a radical change in the desert area and turn it into greenery. It is a man made desert. Today the situation is such that there is vegetation in even that area. The trees there are famous by the name of *Khejri* and are extremely useful. It is essential to make Rajasthan a developed area in order to eradicate poverty from there.

Besides, there is also a need to amend the definitions of small and marginal farmers suitably. The definitions of small and marginal farmers in the irrigated areas are also the same although they get canal water and the level of ground water in those areas is 30 to 40 feet deep. In our area the level of ground water is 200 feet. According to the definitions of small and marginal farmers, a person owing land between zero to 3/4th hectares comes under the category of a small farmer whereas that of owing land between 3/4 to 1 1/2 hectares is said to be a marginal farmer. The same criteria is applied to our area also. Both these limits should be doubled for our area so that the small and the

marginal farmers may really get the benefit, and after being benefited the people in our area may progress.

Secondly, besides the poverty eradication programme, programmes like better use of irrigation water, strategy for rain fed for agriculture and bigger harvest have also been started. About the Indira Gandhi canal in the desert area, which was called Rajasthan canal earlier, our former Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru had decided to get water for irrigation by making an agreement with the Pakistan Government in 1955. Its work was started in 1958 and Shri G.B. Pant even laid its foundation stone but 30 years have passed since 1958 and its progress is extremely slow. Had this scheme completed within 10 years, a radical change would have been brought about in the desert areas through this Indira Gandhi canal. Crores of rupees are spent when drought or famine strikes but there would have been no need of these if Rajasthan canal had got ready earlier. Rather it would have played a significant role in increasing the country's food production and making our country self-sufficient in foodgrains. My submission is that a provision of Rs. 100 crores has been made by the Government in the Plan but its cost goes on increasing with the progress in the construction of this canal. If a provision of Rs. 100 crores has been made, then according to my estimate its construction is going to take 25 years and then alone will this scheme be implemented and its benefit be met. But we can not wait for 25 years and therefore, it is necessary to expedite its construction work.

The Central Government has helped Haryana and provided cent percent assistance in case of the Yamuna-Sutlej Link Scheme. Therefore central Government can provide cent percent assistance for this project also or spend the amount and after spending the amount if this project is completed within a scheduled programme of 10 years, a sea change can be brought about in the desert areas. So it is very necessary to complete this project.

The biggest weakness of the various

poverty alleviation programmes like the I.R.D.P. is that they have a provision for giving subsidies. Today tribal areas get 50%, scheduled castes 1/3rd part and others 25% subsidy. But this subsidy is grabbed by development officers, doctors and the sarpanch. We made efforts to physically verify the assets. I went along with the authorities to 10 places. At 8 of these places people did not bring any thing e.g. cattle etc. for physical verification. At one place an honest sarpanch did come forward with his assets. At another place we detected a lot of irregularities. I mean to say that physical verification indicates that poverty still exists among them. The purpose for which they took the assistance has not been utilised for the same and they have not become self-sufficient. In the AICC meeting we passed an economic resolution on 4-5 November. It was decided to provide a productive job to one member of every family. To do this it is necessary to introduce a scheme in every State wherein one member of every family living below the poverty line should be provided with a productive job. Today a situation exists where only Government service is considered to be a productive job by the people. The Government's TRYSEM programme has also not been successful. There are no experts to impart training under the TRYSEM programme. Whatever training is given is incomplete. As a result thereof such training is of no use. The programme should be improved to make it more effective.

In programmes like I.R.D.P., the provision of giving subsidy should be withdrawn. The benefit of interest should be given in these programmes. Interest should be waived for the first 4-6 years. Instalments should not be demanded if famine-like situation exists in some area. In this way the various programmes can be made successful. There should be a monitoring system. In the absence of such a system the problems of the poor remain unsolved, denying them their due. The hon. Prime Minister rightly said that of every Rs. 100/- sanctioned for removal of poverty, only Rs. 15/- actually reach the poor. We accept that administrative expenses are unavoidable. Yet we must

ensure that no part of the Rs. 100 we spend for removal of poverty reaches the wrong pockets. Our objective is to strengthen the economic state of the poor. For this the money should reach the hands of the poor and this money should be utilised for the purpose for which the same has been taken. The N.R.E.P. and the R.L.E.G.P. have proved to be beneficial. Assets have been created and the entire rural picture has changed. But the 'Wells' programme should not be linked with the 'Jaldhara' scheme. Being useful in itself, the former should be independent. If wells are dug under the N.R.E.P. and R.L.E.G.P., roads will not be laid and the country's progress will slacken. So this programme should be kept independent. The 'Jaldhara' scheme is of tremendous use to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, poor and marginal farmers. The N.R.E.P. and R.L.E.G.P. should be combined because their common objective is the removal of poverty and solving the unemployment problem. The first step towards achieving this objective is to provide a job to at least one member of every family. Today a peon earns a salary of Rs. 1000/- per month while 75% of the country's farmers are not able to get that much amount.

Today the problem with land reforms is that at present cases are pending in the courts in respect of 25 lakh acres of land. The Government have not found a way to dispose of these pending cases. The State Governments should be directed to take action against persons involved in 'benami' transactions, however powerful they may be. 'Benami' transactions should be brought to light even if they have links with any political party. Land reforms should be implemented properly. We abolished Privy purses of the former rulers of the states and nationalised the banks but we could not eliminate vested interests. This country cannot progress unless vested interests are dealt with properly. We have to deal with vested interests who withhold money and create impediments in our efforts to remove poverty. We have to eliminate them.

With these words I support this proposal.

[English]

SHRI P.K. THUNGON (Arunachal West): While we talk about the 20-Point Programme, to me it appears that unless and until there is proper implementation, all these programmes are meaningless. Unless and until we have a proper machinery, proper administration and machinery, the implementation of these programmes is not feasible. I would like to touch upon the 20th point of the 20-Point Programme. It says that we shall simplify the procedure, we shall delegate authority, we shall enforce accountability, we shall evolve monitoring system from block to national level and we shall attend promptly and sympathetically to the public grievances. So far as we are concerned, unless and until our administration is responsive to the public need, I think, it is not possible to satisfy the public requirements and to carry on satisfactorily the developmental work.

We have inherited a colonial system of administration. It is 40 years now since we attained Independence. As you are aware, the colonial system of administration was a vested system. Their main purpose was to serve their own interest and mainly to collect revenue. That is why, the Deputy Commissioners which we call now, are, even at many places, called as Collectors. This very name represents that they were appointed to collect revenue. But after independence, the thrust of collection of revenue is not as important as the thrust of development so that we can generate more revenue, we can have more GNP and the overall development of the country is more. Unless and until we reform our administrative system according to the need of the time, it will not be possible on our part to satisfy the needs of the people and to have accelerated growth.

I have been hearing the hon. Members who spoke on this Resolution. Most of the hon. Members have said that there are delays and improper implementation of the 20 Point Programme. Why? Because the system is not working properly. I do not think we can deliver goods to the people. It is high

time that we thought very sincerely about some kind of improvement or some kind of a change in our administrative system so that it can be more responsive to the needs of the people.

We call government employees as public servants because they are the employees of the public. The government is elected by the people, by the public, and they are employees of that public. But when the people, who are supposed to be the employer, go to an employee, go to an officer, sometimes their plight is very deplorable. Therefore it is time that we think about this.

Our dynamic and young Prime Minister very rightly appears to be a little impatient in implementing particularly this part of the 20-Point Programme. That is why he has very rightly been saying that there should be some change, there should be more powers given to the local self-government, there should be more representation from the public themselves for planning, etc. I think the first change that we can think in any type of administrative reform within the framework of our democratic system is that unless we start the reforms from the grass-root level, it becomes difficult to bring the reforms. Therefore, we shall have to think about this and shall have to start the process as quickly as possible. I would urge upon the hon. Minister that from the Planning side also he should hasten up to delegate more powers to *Panchayat* system, not only up to the district level but up to the Block level and downwards. I think there are many programmes which are relevant for one place but which are irrelevant for other places. For example, some time ago there was a programme that if the rural people take up some work, they will be paid in terms of *atta*. But in some parts of the country, particularly I have the experience in Arunachal Pradesh, people do not take *atta*. Many of our people do not take *atta*. Therefore, the very spirit of the programme gets defeated because of the practical problems. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to stress that our administrative system has to be reviewed and in this regard, the *Panchayati Raj* sys-

tem should be revitalised. If need be, we should give Constitutional status to the District Panchayat, Zila Panchayat or Zila Parishad so that they can involve the local representatives as well as they can supervise the implementation. Also, Sir, as I said, because of local problems, planning can be done on the basis of particular local area with the help of the local representatives in that particular area or the District. I would request the hon. Minister for Planning to see that the Local Bodies are more and more involved in planning process so that the planning process is taken up in right earnest and benefit the local people. The planning process should start from the bottom instead of from top level. Then only the fruits of the planning can reach the poor people in the rural areas. The people at the grass-root level can benefit the achievements of the planning. Sir, I do not want to go into other points.

Sir, I have to make one point. While talking about the implementation, why should we only consider whatever we have? We should look forward to better and new avenues, even on the Administration side also. For example, we have computers even in Administration also. If the latest technology can be used, if the latest technology can be inducted into this system, it can be more efficient and then we can render quicker and better service for implementation of not only the 20-Point programme but the overall administration and the development of the country.

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY (Alipurduars): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this 20-Point Programme is a well-conceived programme and the intention of this programme is quite good but we have failed on the implementation side. Sir, lakhs and crores of money are spent for various programmes. The development work should be expedited and completed in time, as per schedule. The Government has spent money on these programmes, no doubt. But I should like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that in regard to the input given to every block, if you assess, you will find that money has been given more than the need of each block. The

Government has never assessed how much input has been taken by these blocks and how much money has been spent on these blocks. So, nobody is willing to take the risk or take the responsibility for the accountability of the money spent on each block. The Government does not know how many blocks we have in our country and how much money has been spent, for what purpose, for which item and to whom the money has been given. We have got block level machinery for the implementation of all the programmes. But have you ever asked the number of the items to be considered for implementation of each programme? Have you ever asked how much money has been spent for a particular programme, say, fishery? You will find that some blocks have received lakhs and lakhs of rupees, sometimes even crores of rupees, but what is the position there? The fish is sold at Rs. 40 per kilo there. So, Sir, if the money had been properly utilised, we would have been in a position to export tonnes and tonnes of fish to foreign countries.

17.00 hrs.

[SHRI SOMNATH RATH *in the Chair*]

Even, for instance, see in the case of poultry, how much money has been spent for poultry. You will find that every Indian, each one of us, should have two or three eggs a day for the money we have already spent. But what is the position? Perhaps, subject to correction, the average man's consumption in India for eggs is only 0.02. And see the money we have spent for poultry development or take the milk. What is the revelation? How much money we have given for good cattle, cattle of good breed, and how much milk we have got so far? Today, if I may speak subject to correction, perhaps it is correct that our per capita consumption is 68.8 grammes. So how much milk is for the per capita? It is just perhaps not enough for a cup of tea! That means, a good number of people, crores of our people, do not even reach the stage of a cup of milk still. The 20-point programme is supposed to alleviate poverty. But what is our living standard?

[Sh. Piyus Tiraky]

How much per capita we are getting? How much meat we are getting? How much per capita of eggs is available? How much of vegetables are available? The money has been lost for nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time for this discussion?

SHRI CHINTAMANI JENA (Balasore): Yes, by a minimum of two hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, we extend the time by two hours.

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY: It is because there is a mistake, everybody, even a chowkidar in employment, a public servant whoever he may be, whether it is I or my son or somebody else — 'public servants' means they are the boss of the public. They have to command, but not to work with the people. But they are called 'public servants'. In the villages also, the village level workers are there, they are supposed to assist, not assist but to tell them how to go ahead and also tell that a farmer can get more profit in the years to come. But no, in this scheme so much money has come and there is a middleman. Suppose some person is not knowing for what purpose the money has come, the village level worker will have to tell that 'this is for such and such scheme, so much money has come, please apply. I am there, I will get you the money.' He should not say, 'No, I will not be able to do this work, I do not know.' What for this Government is giving the money? Perhaps it will be written off if you can't pay it. So, first they have to get the money by loans or something. But 50 per cent of it is pocketed by the middleman. But just to get the money, a number applications are there. So, Sir, the block level machinery who are supposed to implement this 20-point programme must be accountable there. If the money is spent after years, then for which purpose that money is given. If the block could not spend money for the purpose for which it is given, then where has the money gone, where they have failed? So,

there must be accountability of the machinery. Unless you do it, you will not know how the money is spent, for which purpose it is spent.

Sir, I have my own experience. A loan is given to the farmers, especially to the tribal people. They are supposed to be inexperienced in other jobs. So, for poultry piggery and other things they are given the money. But you don't think that all the tribals are interested in all the fields. That is why, I am suggesting that you give training to these people, in the line in which they are interested. Unless a person is interested to go to some business, he will not succeed in that business. Similarly, when a person goes for rearing goat, he must have a thorough knowledge about goat, what kind of disease could afflict the goats and what is the treatment to be given to those goats afflicted by a particular disease, where is the veterinary doctor to whom he should go. So, there must be a training scheme. He must also know, what is the profit he will get if he rears two or three goat. What would be his assets after say 5 years and what would be the return? Everything must be clearly told to the beneficiaries by the Government officers, village officers. It is not that just you have got the money, just give him something Rs. 200 for one goat. Where would he get a goat? Here also, you have to guide him; you must assist him. All these services must be rendered to the beneficiary, who has really got interest in that line. If these steps are taken, everyone will be profited by that and our country will also be profited.

Similarly, for piggery, animal husbandry and poultry also, you should not distribute the money *at random*, just because money has come and therefore, you are distributing it without any exercise. It is not that, I am working as Chowkidar for Rs. 60 and just because, loan is to be taken, I will leave that job and take the money and spend it. If any person is having that kind of intention, then he should not be given the loan because that would not be spent purposefully. The Government should know before giving the loan that this person is very much devoted to this

line and he will always be interested in this job and he will devote most of his life to improve this. In every Block, you can find 10 or 12 such persons. If proper training and guidance is given to the beneficiaries, the village of this country would have another face, a very brighter face and our living standard will go high. What is our living standard? Don't see Delhi where we are all English speaking people with coat and tie. We have changed to English. I am also speaking in English because if anybody speaks in any other language, he is a "Bekhooph", he has no knowledge. He is a second class. Everybody wants to speak English whether it is good or right, yes or no. This is the understanding. The officers must have a tie. He must have a good suit. Our Government is also going to provide some dress for every Department. But what is the dress for the farmers, 67% of the population who are in the agricultural side? In the past, we were trying to amalgamate with the commonmen of this country. Now officers have the distinction; even Chowkidars, peons have distinction that the people should know. Government officer is not a public servant but he is a boss of the public. In Bihar, there are some districts where I have seen and experienced about the Block Development officers and other officers. They want so much *bakhshis* to do the work. They have meetings, clubs. They say, you have so much plantation, why don't you give something here. This kind of thing is going on. The officers are getting fat and not the actual beneficiaries. You also know that these things are happening which are not new. Everybody knows it. You know the social structure. We are following a system in which the fittest persons can survive. The villagers living in the rural areas will not be able to survive. All the exploiters, who cannot exploit the people living in big cities and towns, are moving to the villages and immediately within a few months and years, they become big men by exploiting these innocent people. These exploiters are seni there. Further, there is no accountability on the part of the people who are implementing these welfare programmes. Therefore, we have to stop this exploitation first. The Government

is satisfied if a lot of money is spent which is intended for the 20 Point Programme. But it should not be measured in terms of money that has been spent on these welfare programmes. We have to take into account the actual output. We have to take into account as to how much each block is contributing to the nation.

Sir, our standard of living is low when compared to some other countries. Another thing which I would like to mention is that our living standard should not be judged in terms of having a Radio or TV in every home. Our country is a poor country. We are boasting of being the biggest democracy in the world. We are boasting that our country is entering the 21st century and we will be landing on the moon soon. But what is our standard of living? Still, our people remain poor. There are people who are poorest of the poor in our country. What is the quantity of calorie we are providing for our masses? We are still not able to provide the required calorie for our masses. What is the reason? Our farmers have been neglected. Our developmental work in the block and village level, which feed the entire nation, has been neglected. The officers are not made accountable to the money they spend. Several hon. Members have mentioned about this fact. There is no question of party politics in this regard. We are all one, as far as this subject is concerned. If our country remains poor, if it is neglected, then it will be a shame to our country. There are rich countries with poor people living in them. It is a shame to India, if the people remain poor and neglected. It is not a problem for the Congress Party or any other party. This is a national problem. We are all concerned about it. We must sit together and work for the development of our country and to improve the standard of living. Big plants like Durgapur Plant alone cannot improve our standard of living. A few Iron and Steel plants alone cannot improve the standard of living of this country. But only our farmers can improve the standard of living of this country.

Sir, this 20 Point Programme is a very laudable programme. But the Programme



[Sh. Piyus Tiraky]  
itself cannot produce anything unless we are able to implement it properly. We are speaking of modernisation in the field of industry etc. But, why can't we think of modernisation and applying modern technology in the field of agriculture, in the field of Poultry, Animal Husbandry etc. Only they can help raise our standard of living.

Sir, I am fortunate enough to have been able to speak on this subject. At the same time, I would like to point out that speaking in Parliament without any fruit is also useless. Many of our friends have suggested that there should be accountability on the part of the officers who are implementing these programmes. Schemes remaining on paper and killing the time of Parliament would not do anything. The Government should not delay in fixing accountability. The hon. Minister is a young Minister. He is coming from the region where this kind of corruption is going on. He knows better than I know about such things. He is wielding power. The hon. Minister must make the officers accountable. If it is done within a year or so, the people of India will remember that the Ministry of Planning is doing well. For whatever money that has been spent, there should be results. There are several schemes and I do not want to go into the details of those schemes. Already, my other colleagues have said much about them. If I also speak about them, it would be a mere repetition.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Panaji): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I stand here to support your Resolution. In fact, the Hon. Minister Mr. Engti, the Minister of State for Planning is present here in this House to listen to us on various aspects of 20 Point Programme, but in my all humbleness, I would like to submit that your presence itself is not sufficient on behalf of all the Ministers. That is because, each point of the 20 Point Programme concerns various Ministries and except perhaps, Railways, Civil Aviation, Atomic Energy or Home, all other Ministers ought to

have been present here when a Resolution on 20 Point Programme is discussed in this House.

This 20-Point Programme cannot be allotted to a single Ministry under the Business Rules. It is not an independent portfolio to be allotted to an individual Minister. The point concerns various Ministries. In any case, you will convey our feelings to the respective Ministries on various points and also to the opposition MPs.

The 20-Point Programme, in my view, is not only a programme of the Government of India. I have always considered it as an economic constitution of the Government of India. Our Constitution has given us various rights of political nature, social nature and economic nature. But only it was Mrs. Gandhi whose vision could give birth to this 20 Point Programme to specifically lay down a sort of economic constitution for the country. And it is from that time onwards that a special stress is being laid on the economic programmes based on this document. So much so, we the Congressmen in this House and elsewhere have considered this as an important document for the purpose of achieving the goals of this country. And if the Hon. Members of the opposition today are scared of anything, it is this 20-Point Programme. They are not scared of our speeches; they are not scared of our ideologies; they are not scared of any other thing. But they are very much scared of the 20-Point Programme because it is only through this medium of 20-Point Programme, we have wiped them out and we are going to wipe them out because at no time, wherever they are, they have any programme, even akin to this 20 Point Programme. Therefore, this is our basic instrument of achieving our economic goals.

Whenever I refer to the 20-Point Programme, I always say, as my learned colleague Mr. Thungan has said that the 20th Point of the 20 Point Programme constitute the main soul of this programme because if this 20th Point Programme is implemented thoroughly, then with the same amount that

we are spending today, we can achieve results almost six times because as the Prime Minister himself has stated we get only one-sixth of the real thing that we spend in the villages. Therefore the 20th point is specific on the procedure and delegation of authority to enforce accountability, monitoring the system and hearing of public grievances.

Fortunately I am a member of one Consultative Committee which is looking into the aspect of various matters relating to administration. I have had occasions of reading and going through several reports concerning administrative reforms. Therefore I feel that our procedures should be simplified, accountability fixed and action should be taken. I had asked sometime in this House as to how many officers or employees of the Government of India or the State Governments have been suspended only on the ground of their failure to implement any of the 20 point programmes. Is there any statistics? Forget about other administrative aspects, if we have in mind of taking serious action against any officer or any employee who fails to implement or fails to discharge his responsibility with respect to implementation of 20 point programme as per the scheme, then I think another 20 to 25% achievement would have been there. In this respect I would like to state very specifically that this point should be taken into account.

Your Resolution speaks specifically of the first point, i.e. attack on rural poverty. In this respect I would like to state that the decentralisation of power is the most vital point. Today the Prime Minister has taken up this as a very vital task for him because it was the dream of Mahatma Gandhi to have Gram Raj in this country. Various states in our country so far have not been able to achieve any sort of a semblance of local self-governments. Therefore our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi has decided about this. He has first met the collectors, he met the Chief Secretaries and tried to assess from them what are the difficulties that they face at the local level, what are the problems of the

Panchayat and other local bodies. Having assessed the situation, through the medium of the party — through the Parliamentary Party and through our party — a study has been made. Today for our study not less than four or five documents are available only on this aspect of local self-government.

The Prime Minister is going ahead with giving Panchayat a proper status, of trying to have some sort of mandatory legislation to hold Panchayat election in time.

Not only that, of our districts which are the backbone of the administration and which are not so far recognised by the Constitution, we have to find some important place in the Constitution of India. If you see the third Resolution which stands listed in my name in the Private Members' Resolutions today, I am specific on this subject of inclusion of districts in the Constitution.

Secondly, just as we have three lists in the Constitution — Union List, Concurrent List and the State List — I have proposed through my Resolution — of course it may not come today — that a 4th list be added to the Constitution of India which shall be known as 'District List' and powers be given to the districts under the 4th List, allocating specific subjects to be handled by the district bodies. The time may come when a 5th list also is asked for so that the power percolates down. Because the Prime Minister has been stating that our power should not lie only in Delhi or in the State Capitals; but it should percolate down to districts and blocks. Therefore, in view of this aspect strengthening of panchayats is very important.

Secondly, we are today making an assessment of the achievements of the various State Governments and in doing so what we do is perhaps ask for figures from them. Once I was told that an officer from the Government of India secretly goes to a State and finds out how the programme is being implemented. But I have found it is not so. In fact, it should have been so. Instead of relying upon the figures submitted by State Governments on each of the points and then

[Sh. Santaram Naik]  
giving marks to the States makes no sense. Our assessment should not be how many wells have been dug in a village. Our assessment should be on the basis of a person who has gone there and seen whether those wells are existing. Our assessment should be on the basis whether cows or other animals which have been given are with the respective men and being utilised. The other day Prime Minister got a complaint in Amritsar that the same buffalo had been sold 16 times under the same programme. This is mis-utilisation of the programme. So the Prime Minister has said that he wants to give more powers to the districts and panchayats. This assessment in villages cannot be done through Delhi. Therefore, percolation of these powers down is required. As far as the hon. Minister is concerned some monitoring is being done. You are doing it on the basis of the information given by the States. With the coming of computers from here you feed figures and then send a man to assess the actual availability of those goods at a place. In this manner this aspect of actual fulfilment of the objective under 20-point programme has to be done.

Another aspect that I would like to touch upon is the twentieth point of the 20-point programme. It speaks of establishment of public grievances cells. At one time it was decided to establish such cells in Central Government departments. Various Central Government departments have established these cells but these cells are functioning on a skeleton basis. No systematic public grievance cell machinery in the Government departments has been established so far. As far as State Governments are concerned most of the State Governments have not taken up this aspect seriously. Only a skeleton thing has been done. Not State Government has taken up this aspect of establishing public grievances cells in their respective departments and, therefore, strict instructions have to be issued to the State Governments as far as this aspect is concerned.

Now, Sir, as far as land reforms are concerned in many places we know land

reforms have not been enforced. Who is responsible for this? Not necessarily the Government. In many cases because cases are pending in High Courts and Supreme Court that land reforms have not been implemented. In most of these cases, it is because of this. Government has enacted legislations. But these legislations have been challenged in the courts and stays have been granted. As far as my State is concerned, it is also there.

Once I had suggested here; let the Government of India make a list of these pending cases and through the Attorney-General make special mentions in the Supreme Court. Obviously, if the burden is taken by the Government Attorney, of course, the Judges will certainly listen and request the Judges of the Supreme Court or of various High Courts at various levels that these matters somehow be disposed of, say, within a period of six months or so. If this is done, this entire point — namely, point 5, if I am not mistaken — of the 20-point programme will be fulfilled by the Government. Once the court clears it, then further implementation part remains. Obviously, the Government is interested in that. Government is interested in giving benefits to the landless persons. They are not interested in becoming unpopular by not enforcing the land reforms. Therefore, the Government is interested. The only question is the legal hurdle which comes in the way of implementation of the 5th point of the 20-point programme which can be done away with.

Lastly, I would like to suggest to you that in the matter of implementation, the aspect of accountability — which I had suggested — should be strictly adhered to. Of course, there are various cadres of services of the State Governments. There are all-India cadres which are controlled by various authorities. There are service rules under which if a Government servant falters, action can be taken. There is no doubt about it. But if the Government of India issues instructions to the various State Governments on this line that faltering of employees of the Government in the implementation of 20-

point programme should be with independently and a more serious note should be taken of its faltering, then the seriousness will be realised by the State Governments.

I request you to issue such instructions immediately to the State Governments so that the authorities take this aspect very seriously. If this is done, the effect will be felt. What is that? The indirect effect is that you avoid delays and wastage. If you avoid delays and wastage, you get the results twice or thrice the results that you get today. Obviously, it has got an indirect effect. Therefore, in these circumstances, I support the resolution of Shri Rath so that on the basis of the discussions that we are holding here, the hon. Minister for Planning, Mr. Engti, should write to the various Ministries and ask them to take necessary steps in this regard.

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for having given me this opportunity to participate in this debate on an important topic like the 20-point programme implementation. This is a resolution moved by you and while I speak, you are in the Chair.

At the very outset, I would like to pay glowing tributes to the sacred memory of Madam Indira Gandhi whose birth anniversary we are going to observe tomorrow. On the eve of her birth anniversary, we are discussing this programme in this House. It was her brainchild. This programme is the brainchild of our beloved ex-Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. We all know that it was she who for the first time launched this programme in 1975 and she was quite sincere in its implementation. This programme actually under her guidance has done immense benefit to the people of this country.

While this is being debated in this House, there has been no point of difference so far. Even friends opposite while participating in the debate have welcomed it and have all praise for the programme. It is a laudable programme. They have also observed that its implementation should be improved. There is a lot of scope for im-

provement in the field of implementation. The implementation is not as satisfactory as it ought to be. It is faulty.

As you saw, friends opposite representing different States where non-Congress Governments are at the helm of affairs, for example West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh etc. also spoke. Shri Rao and Shri Tiraky spoke and before that one Member who spoke represents West Bengal, where there is CPM and the left-front Government. All of them were critical of the implementation. Obviously, in their States also, undoubtedly the implementation of the 20-Point Programme which has a very noble objective needs improvement. There is a lot of scope for improvement.

However, if you look at the figures given in the report, you will get a different picture. The Central Government after all collects reports from the different States. They compile the figures and present it before us. But what we find is that there is a lot of gap in the picture presented in the report and the actual position in the field. We are visiting the fields quite often and we have direct contact with the masses. I am giving you one example. On 8th last, about eleven days before, I attended a meeting of the District Development Board at Dhankanal in Orissa. I have two districts within my jurisdiction, Sambalpur and Dhankanal and in that DDB meeting, there was an item and it will be interesting for the Members to know what is happening. If you depend on the officials, if you put credence on their reports solely, you are gone. I am giving you this illustration. The District Magistrate, as you know, happens to be the Chairman of the DDB. It is again a misfortune that the District Magistrate presides over a meeting where M.L.As and M.Ps sit as ordinary members and address him as 'Sir'. There was an item in the agenda — drinking water. Some tubewells were sanctioned by the Government, without waiting for the Members to give their opinion, the Administration had gone ahead with the execution. What did they do? They just placed it before the Committee for *post facto* approval.

[Sh. Sriballav Panigrahi]

I can give you another instance. At least, we have a bitter experience in Orissa. Sir, we, the MPs preside over the DIC (District Industry Centre) meetings. We are the Chairmen there. It is very kind of the Government to nominate us as the Chairman. But the officers, the Secretary and the DIC General Manager and even the Collector come to us with a list and they say, "You approve it. You cannot change it, we have drawn this list"

MR. CHAIRMAN: For your information the collector, the working chairman, approves everything, and you only have to sign it.

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI: Let the Minister also know it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When it is questioned, it is said that is the direction of the Reserve Bank. The Finance Minister of Orissa said that it was the direction of the Reserve Bank and you cannot change it.

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI: I thank you for your observation. I was just coming to it. So, let the Central Government, which is represented here by the Hon. Minister, also know as to what sort of humiliation the MPs are subjected to in the district level meetings and other meetings. How can you expect miracles; how can you expect desired results if such a situation prevails. If they prepare the list honestly, we have nothing to say but when we go to the field we come across a lot of genuine allegations. For example, this block officer has collected money, this officer has done this and that officer has done this and so on. They prepare a list which we are bound to approve in the meeting.

Sir, I was referring to the drinking water problem. Shri K.P. Singh Deo also raised this problem. When we ask them what is the purpose in their placing the thing before us when they have already gone with the programme, then they say that since there was no meeting it was not placed, and that they

have covered all the villages where there were no wells. I stood up and congratulated the collector and said, "Anyway you have bypassed us but if you have covered all the villages where there were no wells, it is very good thing." He asserted that there is no well-less village now. But at the same time one Chairman of the Panchayat Sammiti came to me and requested that since there is not a single tubewell in some villages I should request the collector to include those villages under this programme. That is how the confrontation took place and the officer's version was proved wrong. So, if you rely hundred per cent on their report, where will you land up?

Now, I will come to the other point. During 1977-80 there was departure from the 20 point-programme. This programme was given a good-bye by the Janta Government. They did not believe in the eradication of poverty. So, whatever good work was done by Indiraji they did not follow it. In 1982 Madam Indiraji again came up with a revised 20 point-programme. Then in 1986, some points were dropped and some new points were included. I would say that really a practical approach was adopted while drawing up this 20 Point-programme by our present Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He is restless in one sense, to fight poverty, he is restless to see that poverty is eliminated; he is restless to see India playing a leading role in the 21st century. He wants India to be a leading light in the whole of the world. That is his anxiety. We have to cope with his dreams, and the anxiety which he expresses. But what about the health of the bureaucracy, the machinery on which we are dependent? Are they capable of implementing the dreams of our young Prime Minister who is very much a visionary?

The new 20-point programme renewed the commitment of the Government towards eradication of poverty, raising of production, reduction in income inequalities and the removal of social and economic disparities in general. This, in its entirety, is actually in tune with the economic philosophy of the Congress Government. The economic phi-

osophy and programme of the Congress Government is to achieve socialism. Naturally, we cannot achieve socialism so long as we have poverty, so long as we have imbalances, so long as we have inequalities in income and in social status. In general, it aims at improving the quality of life of the people. It is not a declaration of intent, but a charter of emancipation of the poor.

Again, as you know, we have discussed agriculture and the problems of farmers and the problems of agricultural labourers during the last two days. The hon. Minister of Agriculture was replying to the debate today. Of these 20 points, as many as four relate to agriculture, and rightly so. India being essentially and dominantly an agricultural country, the salvation of India, the progress of India basically lies in the promotion of agriculture, in the advancement of agriculture. That, in its turn, will also strengthen our industrial movement, because the raw materials for the industry are supplied from the agricultural sector. That way, the No. 2 programme relates to rain-fed agriculture, better use of irrigation water, bigger harvest and also enforcement of land reforms. These four are directly linked with agriculture.

What is the challenge, what is the problem in the agricultural sector? I was speaking yesterday in the other debate. I will not repeat what I said. As you know, concentration of land is there. Eightyfive per cent of the total land holdings consists of plots under 2.5 hectares each, whereas 10% or 20% people control about 80% of the total agricultural land. So, the problem is there in the eastern India. Unfortunately, Mr Bhajan Lal, our Minister of Agriculture thinks of agricultural conditions of India from one angle: that is, from the angle of Haryana and Punjab only. While talking of agriculture or looking at the conditions of farmers, he should set aside for some time Haryana and Punjab from his mind, and look to the other backward States like Orissa, Bihar, parts of Andhra, parts of U.P. etc.

What about productivity? To raise productivity is the challenge. Unless productiv-

ity is raised, naturally whatever we do, the lot of the agriculturists and farmers will not improve. Again, when I say that increase in productivity has to be achieved, it has to be done without much increase in the cultivation cost, because if you spend much, and put a lot of fertilizers, that is spend much more money on that item and thereby get some high yields, where will it lead us to? Naturally, some technology has to be utilized in agriculture. Productivity will no doubt go up, but the cost of cultivation will not be proportionate. Of course, prices are going up. The price is going up. Even the procurement price you are increasing from year to year. But whatever increase you are giving in the procurement price gets nullified because in the field of essential commodities and inputs on which the agriculturists depend, the increase is much more; it does not have any relationship. So, that is the problem.

This is very important. The dignity of labour has to be manifested in the field of agriculture. Our officers must know how to respect the poor farmers, poor people in the villages; they should not forget, however educated they may be, that they had been educated, they have come up to this level, on the sacrifices of those poor people, who are starving in the villages, who are half-naked in the villages. So, naturally, they have to salute them because it is their effort which is feeding them.

Their salary is drawn from the State Exchequer which is enriched, which is contributed to by the poor people in villages, regardless of their poverty; whether they have got food to eat or not. It is they who are paying for these people; it is they who are paying for the salary of the bureaucrats. We have to respect them.

Now, I would like to say something about the importance Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is giving to the 20-point programme. It will be evident from this. Out of the total public sector outlay of Rs. 1,18,000 crores for the Seventh Plan, the outlay for this 20-point programme is Rs. 60,500 crores, which represents 36.6 per cent of the total outlay;

[Sh. Sriballav Panigrahi] and the share of 20-point programme in the total central pool is 22.6 per cent. Now, in entirety, the total outlay of the Central Government for this 20-point programme accounts for 22.6 per cent, and in the States, it is much more; it is 46.1 per cent. The total outlay for 1987-88 is Rs. 44,698 crores of which the outlay relating to 20-point programme is Rs. 13,507 crores that is 23.4 per cent.

According to the Seventh Plan target, in the field of bringing down the percentage of people below the poverty line (it was at that point of time about 40 per cent) our programme is to bring it down to 28 per cent at the end of the plan period and further to 10 per cent, at the end of Eighth Plan and to 5 per cent by 2000 AD. My request to the government will be let there be such a plan, programme that by 2000 AD, there should not be anybody left in the country below the poverty line. So, this should be our ideal; this should be our contribution to the new generation and also in regard to the 21st century.

About land reforms — earlier it has been said how large number of cases are pending in law courts. The government should find out way to fight out the bottleneck. It is ridiculous that even the minimum wage is not ensured in some government firms. In a Central Government Agricultural Firm in Orissa, the labourers are thus exploited. Some contractors say that in the tender papers the rates that were given were for less. So they cannot pay at the rate of prescribed minimum wages. For solving the problem of drinking water and to make it more realistic, the block meetings should be attended by P.H.D. engineers and the list could be drawn in consultation with the representatives of the people. The 20-Point Programme a movement of the people is to be implemented. Unless we involve the people in general and their representatives actively in particular and remove corruption in the field of implementation of the 20-point programme, it can not be implemented properly.

As you know, corruption is the enemy of the democracy. If the poverty continues like this, it will endanger democracy.

Before concluding, I request the Government to give serious thought how we can fight out corruption and ensure the success of the Twenty-Point Programme, which was launched by our late Madam Prime Minister Indiraji and being continued by our present Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

With these words, I conclude.

[Translation]

SHRI SHANKARLAL (Pali): Mr. Chairman Sir, to remove poverty from the country and for the country's all-round development our late Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi introduced the 20-Point Programme in 1975. It was revised on 14 January, 1982. When it was evaluated in 1984-85, it was found that under the 20-Point Programme 100 million people who were below the poverty line had been uplifted: But 272 million people still remained below the poverty line. For their upliftment our hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi placed a 20-Point Programme before both the Houses of the Parliament on 20th August, 1986. When this programme was introduced in April, 1987 everyone in the country had high hopes that its implementation would rid the country of poverty and unemployment, bring drinking water to villages and increase productivity in the country. But, Mr. Chairman Sir, the implementation of the programme has not been upto expectations. The first reason for this is improper identification of people living below the poverty line in villages. Consequently, money which is supposed to reach the poor ends up in the hands of the corrupt. This is due to improper implementation of the programme at the rural level. Identification of the poor should be done at the 'Gram Sabha' by members of the Panchayat Samiti and officials from the block level and Panchayat. Only after proper identification can the poor get maximum benefits of I.R.D.P. and other such programmes.

Mr. Chairman Sir, another problem is the process of giving loans through banks. There is so much of red-tapism that the poor are not able to get much benefit. For this banking rules have to be changed, particularly those related to payment of subsidies. These changes would simplify the procedure by which the poor can seek the assistance they desire.

18.00 hrs.

Mr. Chairman Sir, of all the programmes of the Government, the most important one is that of the limited family. If we are not able to limit our families, good effects of all pro-

grammes will be nullified by the unchecked growth of population. Therefore, the family planning programme needs to be implemented in an effective manner.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will continue next time.

18.01 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, November 21, 1988/Kartika 30, 1910 (Saka)*