

Meanwhile, a huge claim of transport subsidy to the tune of Rs. 24 crores made by the State of Arunachal Pradesh has got accumulated in the last four years. Therefore, any further delay in the matter will have a negative effect on the various measures initiated by the State Government for the fast industrialisation of the State.

Therefore, I appeal to the Central Government, through this august House, to release the transport subsidy to Arunachal Pradesh and to the other North-Eastern States as early as possible. Thank you.

SHRI BHADRESWAR GOHAIN (Assam): Madam, I also associate myself with the points raised by Mr. Nyodek Yonggam. These States are suffering in all major areas like communication, transport and other areas. So, the points made by him are very important and genuine and they should be attended to by the Union Government immediately.

SHRI KARMA TOPDEN (Sikkim): Madam Vice-Chairman, I also wish to associate myself with the issues raised by my hon. friend. Sikkim is also suffering from similar problems as that of Arunachal Pradesh. While we are very enthusiastic about liberalisation policy, open market, competition, etc., we are concerned about the remote States which suffer from locational disadvantages. There is a lack of market centres. There is a lack of resources and infrastructure. In this era of liberalisation and competition the gap between the mainland and the States in the border is slowly increasing. So, we need not only transport subsidy but also much more meaningful aid from the Central Government to help these States to come up like other States. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): I adjourn the House for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at forty-three minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at fifty-one minutes past two of the clock, The Vice-Chairman (Shri Md. Salim) in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Now we will take up the Budget (General), 1995-96.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1995-96
—Contd.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मेरा एक सुझाव है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद सलीम): किस बारे में?

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी बजट पर बहस के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम इसकी केवल एक औपचारिकता पूरी कर रहे हैं क्योंकि लोक सभा से बजट पास हो गया है और मैं दूसरी प्रार्थना यह कर रहा हूँ कि पांच मंत्रालय हमारे विचाराधीन हैं... (ध्वजबाज)...

तो मेरा सुझाव यह है कि इसे आज पास कर दिया जाए और मंत्रालयों के संबंध में चर्चा प्रारंभ कर दी जाए क्योंकि समय बर्बाद करने में कोई फायदा नहीं है।

श्री ईश दत्त वादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं हस्तक्षेप नहीं कर रहा हूँ, इनमें और उनमें समझौता हो गया है कुछ बातों में।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, I agree with him because this time we have to discuss five Ministries. We have also to pass the Finance Bill which was passed by Lok Sabha. It has to be passed quickly. Today we can sit a little late and complete these things.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): If hon. Members agree, some Members can sacrifice their speeches. They can withdraw their names. Those who want to speak can be brief. Now, Mr. Rahman Khan.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Budget proposals presented by the hon. Finance Minister for 1995-96. I congratulate the hon. Finance Minister for presenting the Budget for the fifth consecutive year. Thereby, he has created history. In his opening remarks, the hon. Finance Minister has rightly analysed the task given to him by the nation. When Shri P.V. Narasimta Rao assumed the leadership of the nation, his task was to save the nation from the relentless slide, abysmal fall in production, severe inflation and deepening poverty. I quote

the hon. Finance Minister :

"In these four years, the nation has transformed into an economy showing strong growth in industrial output, a strong revival of domestic investment, a strong increase in the direct foreign investment, a renewed growth of employment and comfortable foreign exchange position..."

In order to remind the hon. Members of the Opposition, he has highlighted the state of affairs of the nation during the grim days of 1991 and in the stable year of 1994-95. I would like to ask the Members of the Opposition: Can they deny the grim days of 1991 ? Can they deny that there was a recovery of the economy? Can they deny that the nation has not recovered from the shameful year of 1991?

Sir, no political party or Government can claim that it has achieved everything that it wanted to achieve. There are still various areas where the Government has not been able to achieve success or to tackle the problems. But what we have to look for is whether the Government in the last four years has brought the economy back on the rails or not.

I am sure even the worst critics of this Government will not deny the fact that the economy has been brought back on the rails. Sir, today the Opposition is more vocal in its attack only because the elections are round the corner and in such a situation, in any political system, the ruling party cannot expect bouquets from the Opposition. We can only expect brickbats. But the Government has its own ideology and its own commitments and it will continue to endeavour and work for that ideology and for those commitments.

The Finance Minister has rightly admitted, in para 6 of his address, that there still exist some weak spots which need to be addressed urgently. One such weak spot is the fiscal deficit. He has admitted that the increase in the fiscal deficit and the inflation are causes for concern. Sir, inflation is an epidemic and all-out efforts have to be made to contain the inflation. The Finance Minister has rightly taken certain steps to contain the inflation. One step which he has

taken is the adjustment of the interest rate. The other step which he has mentioned is the liberal import of essential commodities. Sir, I am afraid that inflation cannot be contained only by these two measures. We have seen that inflation cannot be contained only by these two measures. The major problem is our faulty Public Distribution System. The faulty PDS and the corrupt Government machinery at the lower levels in the PDS are the main causes for the problem of price rise. Whatever reforms we are introducing, whatever measures we are taking to control the prices, those are failing because there is no proper machinery to implement the reforms and to implement the measures to control the inflation. We just cannot achieve this objective by totally depending upon the machinery. We have to revamp the entire PDS so that essential commodities are made available to the common man. Sir, the price rise is a major phenomenon to which the Government has to address itself. We have seen that the prices are rising, particularly of the essential commodities, and there is no check. Whenever we ask the question as to why the prices are rising, the easy answer that is given is the increasing cost of production. There is no proper machinery in the Government, to my knowledge, which can control the prices. There is no price control mechanism. The hon. Minister, in reply to one of my questions, had answered that the prices of all commodities, including those of consumer items, are determined by the forces of demand and supply in the open market. Sir, this should not happen. The prices of commodities should not be left to be determined by the forces of demand and supply. Otherwise, we will be playing into the hands of the market forces. And, we know that today the market forces can exploit the situation. They are not interested in the common man. They are not interested in giving him goods at reasonable and affordable prices. My appeal is that you should not leave the prices of commodities, particularly of the essential commodities, to be determined by the process of demand and supply only. I suggest that the Government should establish a statutory, a Constitutional, body as a price control mechanism.

3.00 P.M.

Today we do not have any statutory body

for price control We may be having a Cabinet Committee on *Prices we may* be having the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices all these are only for monitoring. They have no statutory power to control or give protection. So, I request the Government to consider the establishment of a Constitutional body to control prices, particularly of the essential commodities, and see that the excess profiteering is curbed and the prices are kept at an affordable level.

Now, the other thing is about poverty alleviation and the social equity. Sir, the hon. Finance Minister has come out with some schemes for poverty alleviation and social equity in the society. Some of the details he has highlighted in paras 10 to 23 of his Address. I specially welcome the National Social Assistance Scheme, Group Insurance Scheme, Mid-day Meal Scheme and providing employment through *khadi* and village industries. These are some of the very good schemes which the hon. Finance Minister has introduced in his Budget for bringing social equity and poverty alleviation.

Sir, coming to the taxation proposals, we are all disappointed that there was a demand that the Income-tax limit should be raised to Rs. 50,000/-, but the Finance Minister has not considered that He has just increased it to Rs. 40,000/- only. I still appeal to the hon. Finance Minister to increase it to Rs. 30,000/- because there has been a unanimous demand from the Members of Parliament and various bodies in this regard. I request the hon. Finance Minister to consider this..

Sir the tax evasion is a major problem which is causing a lot of concern. I fully agree that the laws should be effective. But, at the same time, they should not be complicated. Today I am of the opinion that one of the greatest obstacles to tax compliance is the Income-tax Act itself. This Act was enacted in the year 1961 and has remained there for the past 34 years. Every year this Act has been loaded with several amendments through the Finance Bill. It is impossible for the Income-tax payers to keep track of all these amendments. If you see section 3 and also sections 80A, 80B, 80C, you will see that you are only loading them. You are

complicating the Income Tax Act so much that it is very difficult for a common man to understand the law. So, if you want to collect more revenues, the laws should be simple and understandable. The common man should be able to understand the law. He should feel proud to comply with the taxation laws. There is no need to burden the taxpayers with the complexities of law.) am sure that the hon. Finance Minister will look into this aspect.

Sir, now I come to the credit flow to the minorities. First of all, I congratulate the Prime Minister for establishing the National Minorities Development and Finance Corporation. The Finance Minister has given exemption under section 80G whereby he has exempted the income of the Corporation. Sir, here I would like to mention that this Corporation was the subject matter of a lot of publicity and the Prime Minister on 15th August in his address, announced that a Corporation with Rs. 500 crores was being set up. Now, the general impression among the people and the minorities is that a Rs. 500 crore Corporation is being set up. It is almost three years back that the announcement was made. Now, this Corporation has been established with a paid up capital of Rs. 50 crores. It is being said now that in the Eighth Five Year Plan, the Central Government is going to give Rs. 125 crores.

The balance of Rs. 375 crores has to come from the States. Now, the major portion of the amount for the capital of Rs. 500 crores is envisaged from sources other than the Central Government. The State Governments are not going to co-operate in the changing scenario. Then, how are you going to fulfil the aspirations of the people and the promises made by the Prime Minister from the Red Fort that you are going to have a Rs. 500 crore Corporation? I can understand the difficulty of mobilising the resources from the Central Government. But the fact remains that the Prime Minister has promised that a Rs. 500 crore-corporation will be established and that this Rs. 500 crore-Corporation has been promised by no less a person than the hon. Prime Minister himself. The State Governments are not taking interest, to my knowledge, and the capital required for it

is not coining forth. That is why I would suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that 51 per cent of this Corporation capital should remain with the Government and the rest 49 per cent you can get from the WAKF institutions because most of the WAKF institutions in the country are capable of developing and generating their income. Why don't you collect the share capital even from the public or from the minorities or from the minority institutions so that there will be a proper corporation with adequate fund? Another aspect is that banks are not coming forward. You have said in your 15-Point Programme that banks have to address themselves to the problem of credit flow. Unfortunately, I had asked a question—what is the credit flow to the minorities? The reply which I received from the Finance Ministry is that they are not monitoring it! But in your Annual Report you have given the figures of the credit flow to the minorities, whereas the answer given in the Rajya Sabha is that the Reserve Bank is not monitoring the credit flow to the minorities. I want the hon. Finance Minister to look into this matter and properly direct the banks to see the credit flow is there. Why are the minorities crying? They are not getting their due share. If they are getting their due, there will be no complaints. As the minorities are not getting their due share, they are crying and saying that they are not getting the benefit. Then, Sir, I am sure that these two aspects you will look into. Coming to the last point, you have mentioned on search and seizure that will be accounted for in the year of Search and Seizure. It is a good measure that you have introduced. You are not giving any benefit of slab, you are totally charging at 60 per cent, and I feel that 60 per cent is deterrent and it is better if you consider a slab rate of 40 per cent. Several suggestions have been given to you, and I hope you will consider them. Then, coming to the last point. Sir, regarding accounting standards— you have mentioned that you are going to introduce accounting standards. It is a good suggestion and a good move from the Finance Ministry to have a common accounting standard. But in one of the Finance Ministry's Explanatory Notes it has been said that the Institute of Chartered Accountants has prescribed different accounting standards, and that is why the

Ministry of Finance is going to have its own accounting standards. Sir, the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India is a Statutory body established to regulate the accounting profession and I would request you to kindly have consultations with a body which has been set up for establishing the accountancy profession and regulate the accounting procedures and after consultations, the accounting standards could be established. Then the last point is about surcharges in the indirect taxes. You have one form of tax, only one type of tax, surcharges on tax should go. These surcharges were imposed for certain purposes and now it they have become a part of the revenue collection. My request to the Finance Minister is this: He should have one type of tax only, and the surcharge should go. With these I commend the Budget. I support the proposals of the hon. Finance Minister. Thank you.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister, while presenting the annual Budget, was not realistic in regard to the situation on the economic front. Of course, he said many things on the positive side. In one or two respects, I can also concede; particularly, in regard to the external front, where some reserves have been built up. The foreign exchange reserves have increased from one billion to twenty billion dollars. Also, there is no big, additional, burden from foreign sources. It has been contained, to some extent. As far as these one or two aspects are concerned, he has achieved something.

However, the economy is not in relation to <the external front alone. Even if we do not have any additional burden from foreign sources-external debt-it does not solve our problems.

One alarming thing which I have observed during his four-year stewardship of the Finance Ministry is that, during this four-year period, the excess of liabilities over assets has increased. The assets have not increased to the extent of the increase in the liabilities. We find from the Economic Survey and the various documents

that it was 14.5 per cent. This is as a percentage of the G.D.P. It is 19.5 per cent now. This shows that though there has been some restraint on the external front, in foreign exchange matters, or, external debt as such, the liabilities, as a whole, over the assets, as a percentage of the G.D.P., have increased. An increase in the quantum may not be a big problem. They would always be increasing. But this is as a percentage of the G.D.P. Why has this happened? Does it show any positive trend as a whole? This means, our country has, more or less, go: into a debt trap. The liabilities are increasing. This is one aspect to which he has not paid any attention.

The other area is the fiscal deficit. He himself has admitted in his speech that the fiscal deficit has been increasing. He has accepted the fact, though the reasons cited by him may not be acceptable to me. Some feeble attempts were made during these four years to contain the fiscal deficit. The fiscal deficit was 7.4 per cent in 1993-94. It was 6.7 per cent last year, as against his promise to keep it at 6 per cent. Even in absolute terms, in 1991, the deficit was of the order of Rs. 44,632 crores. Last year, as per the Revised Estimates, the fiscal deficit increased to Rs. 61,035 crores. This indicates that our financial health, as a whole, is not conducive to economic growth. Our fiscal deficit has been increasing. During the last twenty years, it has been hovering between 5 and 8 per cent. The situation has been more or less, the same during these four years also.

One glaring omission in his speech is any mention about the growing revenue expenditure.

There is no control over the revenue expenditure. It has been going up by leaps and bounds. When he took over and presented his first Budget, that year, the revenue deficit was Rs. 18,562 crores, but now, according to the revised estimates of the last year, it is Rs. 34,132 crores. That means, we are borrowing money and we are spending money from our borrowings even for the day-to-day expenses. So, this is one of the main reasons. Though he is a great economist, he could not contain this revenue deficit. Though he talks about the fiscal deficit, he is conveniently silent on this aspect.

The revenue deficit, as a percentage of the DGP in 1993-94 was 4.3 and in 1994-95 it was 3.6

Mr. Vice-Chairman. I would like to emphasise a point here. The figures for these two years, 1993-94 and 1994-95, are the highest in the last 20 years as far as the revenue deficit, as a percentage of DGP is concerned. He has not said anything about this. So, there is no control on the revenue expenditure. It has been increasing.

The main reason for this is the interest payment. The interest payment has been increasing during his period. I am not talking about the earlier period. In 1990-91, it was Rs. 21,498 crores, and the revised estimates of the last year were Rs. 44,000 crores. There was more than a hundred per cent increase. So what do they say? How to control this? Instead of reducing the debt burden, they are increasing the debt burden, by which we are paying more interest from the Government side. So, it is a burden on the revenue expenditure. Out of the revenue receipts, the interest payment is eating up almost 50 per cent. So out of whatever revenue receipts we are earning, we are spending 50 per cent on payment of interest. This is not a very happy situation for any Finance Minister.

The interest payment constitutes 38.7 per cent of the revenue expenditure. This is also another negative feature. As a percentage of the GDP, the interest payment, when he took over, was only 4 per cent. Now it is more than 5 per cent. He has not reduced this burden in terms of the interest payment. That is why, our country has not advanced, though he might have given some statistics about the growth-rate and about how there was some recovery on the industrial front. I admit that it might be there. I am not denying it. But, that is only because of the excess capacity in the industry, which was dormant in the first year of his reforms. So, that must have come up like that. There must have been some growth, but that is not on the basis of any vibrant economic principles, unlike what he was trying to present.

Moreover, there was a steep fall in the expenditure on the capital side. So, this more or

less indicates the trends of our economy. While there was an increase in the interest payment and in the revenue expenditure, there was a decrease in terms of the capital expenditure. I am talking of this in terms of the GDP. It was 4.7 per cent when he took over, and, now, it is only 3.6 per cent. So, the capital expenditure is not increasing. That means, we are unable to increase the capital assets also. I collected from his papers the figures of the gross capital formation out of our budgetary resources. When he took over, it was 33.4 per cent, but, now, it is 30.5 per cent. SO, the capital formation out of his budgetary resources also has decreased during these four years. I am not referring to the earlier period. The gross capital formation as a percentage of the GDP, when he took over, was 6.5, and, now, it is 5.3.

Everybody mentioned here about the domestic savings. They were 23.7 per cent at that time. Now they are 20 per cent. All these facts or statistic are there in his books, but he conveniently forgot to present these facts. If you present proper facts and statistics, on that basis, we will come to some correct conclusion, and there can be some rectification or correction in the policy parameters also.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): All the facts are there.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: Then, what is the conclusion? His speech must contain all these things. There must be some analysis, whatever it is. It is missing.

He has been advancing one reason not only now, not only in his speeches, but everywhere else. He has been attacking the subsidies as being the main reason for the stagnation in the situation or for the financial difficulties we are facing. It was not only he, but, just a few days back, the hon. Prime Minister was replying to the debate on the Presidents Address in this House. I am quoting a small sentence from his speech. This is a quotation from the Prime Minister's reply. I collected it from the Rajya Sabha Secretariat records. He says:

"We cannot endlessly go on increasing the food subsidy. It will add to our economic difficulties."

So, the difficulty that the Government is

facing on the financial sector is due to the subsidies! So, all other things are all right!

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: यह कब को रिप्लई है।

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: This is the Prime Minister's reply to the debate on the President's Address, concluded about ten days back or fifteen days back. That means that the whole burden for the difficult financial situation is due to the liberal grants given for the subsidies! Subsidies are mainly on two accounts, (hat is, food and fertilizer which go to The peasantry which is producing more.

The Finance Minister has given some credit to the farmers. I appreciate that There was some criticism or a painful assertion that because they could not increase the issue price there was some increase in the burden of Rs. 2,000 crores or Rs. 2,500 crores, like that on the expenditure side. There was some comment in his speech. Leave that aside. I do not want to argue on that point.

But, whatever it may be the subsidies are provided mainly to the poor people to develop agriculture which has been neglected and also to provide some snecour- to the poor people in the villages and towns. Now they are saying this. Their main idea is that the subsidies are the main culprit.

I want to say that this also is not based on facts. I have tried to collate all the data that is in my possession. In 1990-91, the subsidies that were given at the time when he took over as Finance Minister, were Rs. 12,158 crores. Now, last year, it was only Rs. 9,463 crores. So, there was a reduction. This is in terms of quantum, not in terms of percentage. Even in absolute quantum terms, there is a reduction. So, he cannot say that he has increased the subsidies and that the people are eating into the resources. He cannot claim that. Even in absolute quantum terms also, it has been reduced by about Rs. 3,000 crores of Rs. 2,500 crores. Have the subsidies, as a percentage of the GDP--this is more important-increased during these four years? His whole philosophy is: "poor people need not be fed. We are unnecessarily giving the subsidies. The subsidies are eating into the economic resources of this country." This is his entire philosophy.

Perhaps the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister and everybody else, the whole Government, depend upon this. What are the subsidies as a percentage of the GDP? When he took over, it was 2.3 per cent. Now it is only 1 per cent. Has there been a growth in the economy? At least, the subsidies are not increasing to that extent. They are decreasing. During these four years, they have decreased by almost 50 per cent. How can they claim that our economy is going down because of the subsidies?...and we are able to provide resources for development. So, this is an attack on the poor people. That is why everybody was saying that they have no human face. Where is the human face? If they accept that they are giving subsidies to the poor people, there is

some human face.. (*Time bell*)-. Please give me

some more time. I have got some data; otherwise, I would have kept quiet. I would like to know whether the percentage of Government expenditure has increased. The Government is spending a lot of money for many things. These subsidies as percentage of Government expenditure, amounted to 10.2. Now it is 6.1. It has gone down to almost 50 per cent. So, all these arguments that because of subsidies our economy is collapsing is all bunkum. There is no basis. It does not stand on any reason or logic or statistics.

Moreover, some calculations have been done about this increase in employment. In the first year, 3 million jobs were provided. In the next two or three years some 3 million jobs were provided. I do not know whether it is correct or not, because it is only an assessment I have not gone through any data on which they have based these figures. It may be correct We all know that when this Government came to power, they have promised to provide 10 million jobs. Even if we accept that 6 million figure is correct on the basis of economic recovery or whatever it is, what has happened to the remaining 4 million jobs? Why did they not provide 4 million jobs? I would like to know about this.

As far as the poverty level is concerned, they said it has been reduced to 30 per cent. But as far as the latest survey conducted by the Planning Commission is concerned, it is 37 per cent. Why is there so much discrepancy in these

figures? If it is 37 per cent or 40 per cent or 30 per cent, poverty is a living reality in our country. It must be our effort to reduce that poverty. Poverty alleviation programmes must be taken up in right earnest. But the Government has not taken up any such programme except providing some welfare funds for agricultural development or funds for the welfare of the SC/ST people. They must have shown some figures in this Budget. But the main thing is that development work will be undertaken by the private sector. The Government will look after the welfare measures. The Prime Minister was also harping on this thing, "When the foreign private sector capital comes to our country, more and more funds will be provided for the poverty alleviation programmes or some welfare measures which will tackle these problems." So, while the Government will look after these sectors, the economic, financial and industrial areas, and the other areas will be looked after by the private sector, including foreign capital. So, this is another philosophy on which they are depending. But there is one biggest..

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Will you yield for a minute?

SHRI GIRI PRASAD: Yes.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I will give you the correct picture. I do not know from where you got these figures. The correct picture is this. In 1990-91, the total subsidy was Rs. 12,058 crores, out of which Rs. 2,747 crores was for export purposes. If you take it there, in 1990-91, it was about Rs. 9000 crores. In 1994-95, it was Rs. 12,000 crores. So far as food subsidy in 1990-91 was concerned, it was Rs. 2,050 crores. Now it is Rs. 5000 crores. This is what I wanted to say.

SHRI GIRI PRASAD: Okay, Sir. All these statistics are subject to correction. Whatever it is, subsidies have not increased to the poor people. Either they are stagnant or decreased. If my statistics are correct, they have decreased. If your statistics are proved correct, they are stagnant. So, there is no increase. I don't want to quarrel on those points.

Regarding the public sector, the Government has taken a very negative attitude from the very beginning. One day in this House our Finance

Minister became angry when Members were asking for the revival of the public sector. He was not forthcoming with proper replies. Either there is some stagnation or reduction in grants, budgetary support to the public sector. So, this is one of the biggest capital reserves or industrial reserves, we are having, maybe even bigger than the private sector. But unfortunately the government has not properly utilised this sector. First of all, they should have concentrated on revamping or reviving the public sector.

....wherever there is sickness in that sector. That would have produced good results. Instead of during that, they have been taking a very hostile attitude from the beginning. That is why they could not produce good results. And, fifty per cent of the public sector which is ill could not be improved because of their ideological opposition to the public sector. I can say that.

There are so many other important matters like this. Now, inflation is causing a lot of trouble to the people. We could not control this inflation. It is hovering around 10 per cent. Maybe, it was 11 per cent at one time and nine per cent this time. But you could not control the effects of inflation where the people's living standards are being adversely affected. Their purchasing power is going down. That is why, there is discontent among the people. Unless the Government controls inflation, the impact of inflation on the poor people's living standards, you will not be doing any justice to the poor people here. And there is the talk of poverty alleviation and providing a human face to it. It may be a human facade, but not a face. There is no face here. The people are suffering. The people are also reacting to their economic plight these days. Hence, there is no justification for talking such a very positive attitude towards these Budget proposals. Thank you.

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair].

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I call the other speaker, I want to say this. The leaders of political parties are not here. I think they are having a meeting in the Home Minister's chamber. There is a technical problem which we are facing. We have been discussing the

Budget in small bits and pieces, so spread out. Today, we got reported the Finance Bill also, which has been passed in the Lok Sabha. We have got the Appropriation Bill still to finish. The Business Advisory Committee allocated 12 hours for this which we have not done. We can really have eight hours for the Budget and three hours for the Finance Bill. Now, there is the problem of paucity of time. The hon. President is leaving here on a foreign tour which is committed. We have to finish the financial business and return it to the Lok Sabha and the Lok Sabha has to send it to the President, before he leaves, for his signature. Otherwise, there will be a technical crisis. So, that responsibility is there. As I was trying to say in the morning also to Members, we can always have the Special Mentions. The House is yours. We should take upon ourselves the immediate responsibility of the House. We could have started the Budget. We have got the Appropriation Bill which we can pass without discussion. That decision is being taken. It is being done most of the time. There may be a few names from every party. Some parties do not have any names sent. All those names which are here can be accommodated in the Finance Bill. Maybe one or two names, we can accommodate at that time. But we have to finish everything. I do not know how the House...
(Interruptions).

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Madam, the House is always co-operative. Whenever there is an exigency, we are sitting even beyond the scheduled time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We want this.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Madam, it should be done on the lines suggested by you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. But the thing is, the leaders are not here.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA (Bihar): Madam, today, we cannot take any decision. The leaders are having a meeting, as you said, with the Home Minister on a very important piece of legislation that is still being discussed in this House. My request to you will be, today let us not take any decision about the taking up of these two Bills. Maybe, tomorrow, we will take them up. We can pass them tomorrow before the President goes, for his assent.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I should go back to the Lok Sabha and then it will go to the President.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: We can do it tomorrow, Madam.

श्री संच प्रिय गौतम: उपसभापति जी, मैंने प्रारंभ में ही यह कहा था कि एक औपचारिकता मात्र है। इस बिल को हम पास तो करा दें, लेकिन यह कठिनाई अवश्य है, नेतागण यहां नहीं हैं, उनको आ जाने दीजिए।

उपसभापति: हमारे लिए तो आप भी नेता हैं। हमारे लिए तो हर मैम्बर नेता है।

श्री संच प्रिय गौतम: नहीं, मैं तो नहीं हूँ। मैं तो छोटा सा वर्कर हूँ। (व्यवधान)....

SHRI MD. SALIM: Madam, since we have decided earlier that the Finance Bill would be taken up separately and the general discussion on the Budget separately and since not only the leaders but also most of the speakers who are supposed to speak on the Finance Bill, are not present over here, all of a sudden if you combine the two, and take them up, it will be difficult for them, Had it been done in the pre-lunch session, it would have been all right. But, in the afternoon, you cannot take such a decision.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the problem is, as the Home Minister has suggested that he would take up the Criminal Law Amendment Bill tomorrow, we have to take it up because for the last three days we have been discussing it by deferring the other business. There is a Calling Attention Motion also for tomorrow. Mr. Jaipal Reddy was very kind to have agreed to shift it to the next day. But, tomorrow, somehow, we have to finish everything, whatever is there. If that is the thing, then I feel that some decision has to be taken and if the Members who are present in the House are agreeable to it, then I suggest that they can now just speak fast. Don't take more time. Don't think that you can speak for a long time; just speak for five minutes. In the meanwhile, I will discuss it with the leaders who are in the Chamber of the Home Minister and I will come back because everybody's opinion should be taken so that we do not have any unpleasant scene later on. By tomorrow, we should get this thing reported in the Lok Sabha, that is, before 25th. Now, somebody should relieve me to go.

श्री रामजी लाल: रामजी लाल जी, आप संक्षेप में बोल कर अपना भाषण खत्म करने का कष्ट कौजिएगा।

श्री रामजी लाल (हरियाणा): मैडम, मैं बीस मिनट लूंगा। इससे ज्यादा नहीं लूंगा।

उपसभापति: नहीं, बीस मिनट नहीं। पांच मिनट बोलिए।

श्री रामजी लाल: पन्द्रह मिनट बोलने दीजिए। बड़ी तैयारी की है, हरियाणा की कुछ महत्वपूर्ण बातें हैं।

उपसभापति: नहीं, पन्द्रह मिनट बहुत है। दस मिनट, पांच मिनट आप बोलिए। इस मामले में सभी सदस्यों को कोपरेट करना चाहिए। आप तो सत्ता में बैठी हुई पार्टी के सदस्य हैं, आप ही कोपरेट नहीं करेंगे तो सारे लैंग कैसे करेंगे।

श्री रामजी लाल: ठीक है, मैडम।

श्री संच प्रिय गौतम: मैडम, हरियाणा तो बीसे काफी खुशहाल है।

उपसभापति: इनका नाम कितना अच्छा है। रामजी लाल।

श्री रामजी लाल: बैंक यू, मैडम। मैं जनरल बजट, 1995-96 का समर्थन करता हूँ।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा) पीठसीन हुईं]

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय वित्त मंत्री महोदय का धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि इन्होंने इंडियन इकोनोमी को 1991 की ग्रेव सिंचुरेशन से निकालकर काफी अच्छा कर दिया नवम्बर, 1994 में इंडस्ट्रियल ग्राथ 8.7 परसेंट हो गई, फूड ग्रेन जो 185 मिलियन टन था, वह इस वर्ष 1-1-95 तक 31 मिलियन टन हो गया। हमारी फॉरेन करेन्सी रिसोर्स जो जून, 1991 में एक बिलियन डॉलर था वह इस वर्ष बीस बिलियन डॉलर हो गया। पावर सेक्टर में भी इन्वेस्टमेंट से लग रहा है कि स्टेट इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड की फाइनेन्सियल हालत ठीक हो जाएगी। मैं चाहूंगा कि केन्द्र सरकार पावर के मामले में गारंटी, काउंटर गारंटी दे, जिससे पावर सेक्टर ज्यादा से ज्यादा उन्नति कर सके। नबाई जो स्थापित किया गया है, इससे एग्रीकल्चर सेक्टर को बल मिलेगा। ग्रामीण विकास के आठवीं योजना के 30,000 करोड़ रुपये में से 1995-96 के लिए सरकार ने 7700 करोड़ रुपये रखे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं ज्यादा समय न लेता हुआ सिर्फ 6-7 पार्सेंट का जिक्र करना चाहूंगा। हमारे यहां जो डिफेंस रोड हिसार से पीली बग, पाकिस्तान बोर्डर तक पहुंचती है, उसकी बुरी हालत है। हमारे मंत्री महोदय बैठे हैं, आपके माध्यम से मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि डिफेंस रोड जो होती है उस रोड को अच्छी तरह से रखना चाहिए। मैडम हिसार में बड़ा भारी कैंप है इस कारण वहां से जो मिलिटरी को गाड़ियां निकलती हैं, यह शहर के बीचों-बीच से निकलती हैं, जिससे हर रोज एक्सीडेंट भी होते हैं। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से यह प्रार्थना करूंगा कि यह मिलिटरी गाड़ियां के लिए हिसार शहर के दक्षिण साइड से एक बाईपास बनाया जाए। स्टेट गवर्नमेंट इसको नहीं बनवा सकती। स्टेट गवर्नमेंट ने शहर हिसार के उत्तर साइड से अपनी सड़क बना दी है, यह दूसरी साइड से बाईपास हिसार शहर के लिए सड़क आपको बनानी चाहिए। ताकि डिफेंस की गाड़ियां भी ठीक चल सकें और एक्सीडेंट से भी बचा जा सके। दिल्ली से हिसार, रोहतक, सिरसा और आगे पाकिस्तान बोर्डर तक सड़क जाती है, जिसका नाम नेशनल हाइवे नम्बर 10 है, इस सड़क को फोर लेन किया जाए क्योंकि यह पांच जिलों से गुजरती है।

महोदया, इसके अलावा मैं एक बात और कहूंगा कि आज हम सदन में, इस महान सदन में ग्रामीण साइड से ज्यादा सदस्य आए हैं। एक बात की चर्चा मैंने बहुत दफ्त की है कि आज एक ही जिले का डी.एफ.सी. राशन कार्ड बनाता है ग्रामीण का भी और शहर का भी, लेकिन ग्रामीण लोगों को एल.पी.जी. के लिए एंटी कराने या रजिस्ट्रेशन कराने की कोई परमिशन नहीं मिली हुई है, जबकि शहर का कोई भी आदमी जाकर राशन कार्ड में यह दर्ज करा सकता है और नम्बर में लग सकता है, उसे एल.पी.जी. मिल सकता है। ऐसी कोई छूट ग्रामीण लोगों के लिए नहीं है। महोदया, मैं आपके द्वारा सरकार से और माननीय मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि उसके साथ भेदभाव नहीं होना चाहिए। आज हम कहते हैं कि हमारी 80 फीसदी आबादी देहात में रहती है और यह भी कहते हैं कि लोगों को शहर में नहीं आना चाहिए, देहात में रहना चाहिए, जब इतना भेदभाव होगा तो ग्रामीण लोग क्या करेंगे? झूठे राशन कार्ड बनवाते हैं और शहरों में एंटी करवाते हैं। मैंने पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्ट्री की स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में भी कहा है लेकिन इस बात पर गौर नहीं किया जाता। मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस भेदभाव को समाप्त करके, चाहे जितनी गैस हो, चाहे ग्रामीण हो या शहरी हो हरेक को उसके राशन कार्ड में एंटी की इजाजत होनी चाहिए और जो गैस एजेंसी हैं, उनको यह आदेश जाना चाहिए।

एस-थर्ड-एल नहर के बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह पिछले 20 सालों से अधूरी पड़ी है। इस नहर पर 500 करोड़ रुपया केन्द्र सरकार का लगा हुआ है, 120 करोड़ रुपया हरियाणा सरकार का लगा हुआ है। यह नहर 20 साल में जितनी बनी, सारी टूट चुकी है। महोदया, मेरी आपके द्वारा सरकार से प्रार्थना है कि इस नहर को जल्दी से जल्दी बनाकर तैयार किया जाए ताकि किसान जो हर वक्त बरसात की ओर देखता है, बरसात नहीं हो तो नहर की ओर देखता है, उसको पानी दिया जा सके क्योंकि 95 प्रतिशत नहर बनकर तैयार हो गई है। आज हरियाणा का आप रिकार्ड देखिए, पंजाब और हरियाणा सबसे ज्यादा अनाज देते हैं। जो अन्नदाता हैं, उनकी ओर भी आप ध्यान दें और इस नहर को जल्दी से जल्दी बनाएं।

वाटर वर्क्स के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हरियाणा के हरेक गांव में पानी मिल चुका है। जब यह वाटर वर्क्स बने थे, उस वक्त प्रत्येक व्यक्ति को 15 से 20 लीटर पानी मिलता था लेकिन आज के इस जमाने में कम से कम 40 लीटर पानी की जरूरत है। इसे 40 लीटर तक पूरा करने के लिए हमें केन्द्र सरकार जो रुपया देती है, वह बहुत कम है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि उन गांवों को पानी जो मिला हुआ है उसे कांटेन्यू रखने के लिए हमें 10 करोड़ रुपया हर साल मिलना चाहिए, जब यह रुपया मिलेगा तभी यह काम सही तरीके से चल सकेगा। जैसा मैंने कहा हरियाणा के सभी गांव को पीने का पानी दिया जा चुका है और 6 जिले जो डेज़र्ट डेवलपमेंट प्रोग्राम के तहत आते हैं, उनको सरकार जो रुपया देती है, उसे बढ़ाया जाए।

महोदया, चूंकि आपने कहा कि जल्दी से समाप्त करना है, मैं केवल एक-दो प्वाइंट और कहना चाहूंगा। एग्रोकल्चर यूनिवर्सिटी के बारे में मुझे यह कहना है कि हमारी एग्रोकल्चर यूनिवर्सिटी है और आज से पहले जो हाइब्रिड सीड पैदा हुए, आज देश की 92 करोड़ की आबादी हो चुकी है, आज और नए-नए बीज निकाले जाने चाहिए। इस 92 करोड़ की आबादी को अनाज सप्लाई करने के लिए यदि एग्रोकल्चर यूनिवर्सिटीज़ ने और प्रगति न की तो हम पीछे रह जाएंगे। तो मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि हाइब्रिड सीड्स नई-नई किस्म के और निकाले जाने चाहिए और ऐसी और यूनिवर्सिटीज़ बनाई जाएं ताकि हमारे देश की बढ़ती हुई आबादी को अनाज की पूर्ति करने के लिए और ज्यादा उपज पैदा की जाए और देश के लिए अनाज की कोई कमी न हो।

महोदया, मुझे टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज के बारे में कहना है कि हिसार क्षेत्र में सात-आठ हजार लयर्डें हैं। इसका

एक्स-एक्स नं-1 बदलवाया जाए। यहां के स्ट्रुज्जर एक्सचेंज में हर समय फल्ट रहता है। यह 7200 लाईनें हैं। इसको इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स एक्सचेंज में बदलवाया जाए। इसको शीघ्र अर्थात् शीघ्र बदल जाए और 1000 डिजिटल स्क्रिन की बजाए 2000 टी.ए.एक्स. (ट्रंक ऑटोमेटिक एक्सचेंज) चालू किया जाए, ताकि वहां दिक्कत न हो। टेलीफोन विभाग की क्या स्थिति है महोदया, आज आप देख रही थीं। बहुत बुरा हाल है। मैं सुबह अपना भी हाल बतला रहा था, मैं फिर बतलाए देता हूँ। मेरा टेलीफोन नं. 3782414 है। पिछले साल जब मैंने राज्य सभा से रिजाइन किया था तो सरकार ने कहा कि या तो इसे आप अपना निजी टेलीफोन बनाओ, इसको अपना करो। मैंने उसका रूपया भी डिपोजिट कर दिया। महोदया, पिछले मई से मेरा टेलीफोन कट गया था और आज मई चल रहा है। इस एक साल में मैंने कितने ही टैटर्स लिखे। वहां से जवाब आया कि बीस हजार रूपए थरो। मेरे पास कोई बिल नहीं आया। मैंने बहुत कोशिश की कि वह ठीक हो जाए परन्तु नहीं हो पाया। महोदया, अब आखिर में मैंने हारकर सोचा है कि मंत्री जी के बजाए मैं किसी आफिसर के पास जाऊं वह मेरा बिल ठीक कर देगा। अब ऐसा मैंने सोचा है। मंत्री जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं। मैंने इनको पर्सनली जाकर भी खुद रिक्वेस्ट किया परन्तु कुछ नहीं हो सका। जो बिल मैंने सापिस भेजा था वह बिल मेरे पास आ गया। तो महोदया, टेलीफोन विभाग का बुरा हाल है, जैसा कि मैं आपसे कह रहा था।

महोदया, एक बात मुझे और कहनी है। पिछले दिनों एक क्वेश्चन आया था जिसमें संस्कृत भाषा की बात हुई थी। यह सबसे पुरानी भाषा है, इसी से सारी भाषाएं बनी हैं। आज देश में जहां भी गुरुकुल हैं, पहले तो उन्हें मान्यता नहीं दी जाती और अगर मान्यता होती है तो उनको क्या ग्रांट मिलता है, वह 10800 रूपए सालाना मिलता है। हम चाहते हैं कि संस्कृत भाषा को बढ़ावा दिया जाए। महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि देश में जहां भी जो भी गुरुकुल है मान्यता मांगे, उनको मान्यता शीघ्र दी जानी चाहिए और लाखों रुपयों की उनको ग्रांट दी जाए, ताकि पुरानी सभ्यता कायम रह सके और हमारा भारत देश सबसे आगे बढ़ सके।

महोदया, जैसा मुझे कहा था, मैं ज्यादा समय न लेते हुए थोड़े समय में थोड़ी बात कहता हुआ मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी से और सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि मैंने जो चार-पांच प्वाइंट कहे हैं-वह हैं, एस.वाई.एल. नहर का, डिफेंस रोड का, नेशनल हाईवे का, गुरुकुल और टेलीफोन विभाग के बारे में हैं। माननीय संचार मंत्री जी

बैठे हुए हैं। हिसार एक्सचेंज को इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स में कराया जाए ताकि वहां फोन की व्यवस्था सही हो जाए। हमारे आदरणीय मुख्य मंत्री जी विदेश गए हुए थे। सिर्फ पहली रफा डायल करने पर उनसे इस टेलीफोन पर हैलो हुई। फिर दोबारा डायल करने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ी। ऐसी स्थिति है कि हिसार में लोकल से लोकल तो मिलता ही नहीं है। महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि यह जो मैंने बातें रखी हैं उन पर गौर कराया जाए, खास तौर से एस.वाई.एल. नहर के बारे में। देश के हित में तथा हरियाणा और पंजाब के लिए इस नहर को जल्दी से जल्दी बनाया जाए। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Shri Digvijay Singh. Not present. Shri K.M. Khan. Not present. Shri Sanjay Dalmia. Not present. Shri Moolchand Meena. Not present. Shri Chimanbhai Mehta. Not present. Shri V. Gopalsamy. Not present. Shrimati Mira Das. Not present. Shri Biplab Dasgupta. Not present. Shri Tara Charan Majumdar.

SHRI TARA CHARAN MAJUMDAR (Assam): Madam, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the General Budget, 1995-96. This Budget does not hold any hope for the backward regions Hkc my State, Assam. It has been admitted by all that Assam and for that matter the entire North-Eastern Region is in an object state of backwardness. Problems like insurgency are the result of such backwardness which in turn result in the frustration of the youth. Everybody agrees that the package programme aimed at removing the backwardness and bringing the regions at par with the rest of the country is of the utmost need. The hon. Finance Minister who represents the State of Assam in this House is well aware of the state of affairs, but it does not appear from the Budget that he is in any way concerned about the overall backwardness of the State. There are no industries worth the name in Assam.

Necessary infrastructure for establishment and growth of industry is not there. The Government also does not have the political will to see that the State is industrialised. Natural gas worth hundreds of crores of rupees is being flared up in Assam. There is no arrangement for utilisation of this national wealth by

establishing suitable industries. The Government was thinking of importing natural gas from Oman and other countries by establishing pipelines at huge expenses. There is also a talk of moving the natural gas from Assam to other States for setting up gas-based industries or utilising the natural gas in other ways.

Madam, Assam is very rich in water resources. There is immense scope for building hydel projects which can generate power for serving the entire country, but Assam is the worst power-starved State in the country. In the absence of any scheme for building hydel project or any other project for generation of power, it will take decades to bring the State at par with other parts of the country. There are vast deposits of minerals and other natural resources in the region, but there are no programmes to tap the said resources and utilise them by establishing industries.

Madam, budgetary provisions are made every year for all departments and for the welfare of the people. It is due to financial indiscipline and chaos that the funds meant for the benefit of the people, do not reach them. There is no probity at all and there is no accountability for anyone. There is also diversion of funds by the State Government. Money meant for development and welfare is spent for paying salaries to the State Government officials or for paying the T.A. bills of the officers.

Practically no developmental work has been done in rural areas for decades. There is an inadequate number of PHCs which are running without doctors. Not to speak of medicines, most elementary materials like cotton and bandages are not available in the PHCs and medical centres. There is acute shortage of life-saving and other medicines in the hospitals including the Medical College hospitals which cannot cater to the medical care of the poor people. The Government is turning a Nelson's eye to a large number of Nursing Homes which are coming up in towns and semi-towns without any control of the Government. The said Nursing Homes are fleecing the people at their sweet will. Of late, Assam is reeling under the devastation caused by the malaria epidemic which has already taken a toll of one thousand

lives and affected thousands of others. The disease has not been contained and it has spread to the entire State. The authorities are not in a position to control the disease for want of adequate doctors. There is a dearth of medicine, slides and other materials. That is why the disease has not been controlled. In this connection, I beg to refer to the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister in his Budget speech. In the statement he said that he has increased the amount for the National Malaria Eradication Scheme by 32 per cent and has provided an amount of Rs. 139 crores for 1995-96 for this purpose. Madam, I would like to draw the attention of the House and of the Government to the contradictory statements made by the Central Government and the State Government. When the Minister of State in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare visited the malaria-affected district, he openly accused the State Government stating that the State Government has not utilised the funds properly which were provided in connection with the Malaria Eradication Scheme. The State Government contradicted the statement by saying that the Central Government did not release the funds in time and so they could not utilise the funds. It appears that the scheme was sabotaged either by the State Government or the Central Government and it appears that nobody is answerable for the same. Hundreds of people have lost their lives and thousands have suffered with no prospect of the disease being contained. All this amounts to criminal dereliction of duty on the part of the Government of India or the State Government.

In the field of transport and communication, the less said the better. All roads managed by the PWD and the local authorities have become totally unusable.

In the field of primary education, the schools have no proper buildings and there are no tables, chairs or benches for use by the teachers and the students. The State Government is openly selling the post of primary teacher for Rs. 30,000/- or Rs. 40,000/- and undeserving persons are being appointed as teachers, thereby, ushering in an era of darkness in the field of education in the State.

Agriculture is in its primitive stages in my

State. There is no provision for making available modern methods of agriculture to my people. There is no arrangement made for supplying water although it is said that crores of rupees have been spent on irrigation. There is no provision for utilisation of power, manure or for improving the seeds, etc., and the State is not self-sufficient in food. By simply making provisions in the Budget under different heads, will not achieve anything unless there is some mechanism to ensure application of the fund for the purpose for which they were meant and also to ensure that the benefits reach the people for whom they were meant. With this, Madam, I beg to oppose this Budget. Thank you.

श्रीमती मीरा दास: मेडम, मेरा नाम बुलवाया गया था।

उपसभ्यक्ष (श्रीमती कमल मिश्र): ठीक है श्रीमति मीरा दास।

श्रीमती मीरा दास (उड़ीसा): मैं अपना वक्तव्य देने से पहले दो लइन उड़ीया में बोल रही हूँ। हमारे उड़ीया में, जो है इसके मायने यह है कि अगर दीया जलता है कुछ समय के लिए तो अंधेरा दूर हो जाता है। अगर कहीं धूआ देता है तो इससे अंधेरा दूर नहीं होता है। काफी देर तक धूआं रह सकता है लेकिन अंधेरा दूर नहीं होता है। अगर ऐसा मकसद हमारी सरकार का काफी दिन तक रहने का है तो धूआं जैसे रह सकती है लेकिन दीये कि तरह से अंधेरा दूर नहीं कर सकती। आज तक ऐसा ही हुआ है। हम इतना फॉरेन डेट में डूब गये हैं, आज तक इंटरैस्ट देते देते डूब गये हैं, इससे पता ही नहीं चलता कि हम देश को कुछ नयी चीज देने वाले हैं। अगर हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर का इतना कमिटमेंट है। हमारे जितने आफिसर लगे होते हैं अगर इनकी पोस्टिंग फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री में होती है, फॉरेन मिनिस्ट्री में होती है तो यह लगे बोलते हैं कि इनकी प्राइवेट पोस्टिंग है। अगर किसी की रूल डेवलपमेंट या एग्रीकल्चर में पोस्टिंग होती है तो बोलते हैं कि इनका पर्सनल पोस्टिंग हो गया क्योंकि इसमें खर्चेकली लोगों के साथ काम करना पड़ता है और इसमें कुछ करना पड़ता है क्योंकि इसके लिए कुछ कमिटमेंट भी होता है। मुझे मालूम नहीं हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के साथ कमिटमेंट है या नहीं देश के लिए क्योंकि इनका यह कहना है—

"In the head of political debate, we lost track of whatever we have achieved."

4.00 P.M.

ये हमारे माननीय अर्थ मंत्री जी पोलिटिशियन नहीं हैं। कैसे इनको मालूम हो गया कि पोलिटिकल डिबेट में हम

भूल जाते हैं क्या करना है। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि इनको ऐसे बोलने में कुछ कष्ट हुआ कि नहीं। क्योंकि आजकल अगर हमारे देश में कुछ भी हुआ है तो बही है जो पोलिटिशियन देश के बारे में सोचते हैं, और कोई नहीं हुआ है। जितनी फाइनेंसियल ग्लोबल है, इस सेक्टर में जो इधर उधर होता है, जो पोलिटिक्स के साथ जुड़े नहीं है इनके जरिए होता है। ऐसा नहीं है कि पोलिटिकल डिबेट हम भूल जाते हैं। लेकिन जिनके पास कमिटमेंट बहुत सारे हैं हमारे देश में ऐसे पोलिटिशियन हुए हैं, देशभक्त हुए हैं जो देश के बारे में सचमुच सोचते हैं, देश के लिए कुछ करने के लिए उनके मन में सोच रहती है। देश को कुछ देने के लिए इनके मन में बिंता रहती है। खासकर ऐसा बोलना मैं नहीं समझती हूँ कि ठीक है।

हम कितने बेटे हैं जो इंटरैस्ट पेमेंट करते हैं। मैं आंकड़े नहीं देना चाहती हूँ। इंटरैस्ट देते देते हम बहुत डूब गए हैं। कोई देश के लिए इंडिपेंडेंट पालिसी, या इंडिपेंडेंट थाट कर पाएंगे कि नहीं यह कहना मुश्किल है। हमारे अर्थ मंत्री की कोशिश रही है कि अपनी सरकार की डूबती हुई नाव को बचाएँ। लेकिन ये बचा नहीं पाएंगे। हमने पहले देख लिया है। बचना भी मुश्किल है और इसके लिए वक्त बहुत कम है।

आप बार-बार 1991 का जिक्र कर रहे हैं क्योंकि 1991 से पहले जो सरकार थी उसके बारे में आपको यह भूत सवार है कि ऐसा नहीं बोलने से लोगों की मंशा हो जाएगी कि फिर से जनता सरकार इस देश में आ जाए तो जो कुछ करने के लिए उनके बादे थे वे पूरे हो जाएंगे, आपको यह डर है इसलिए आप बार-बार जो सरकार 1989, 1990 और 1991 में थी उसके खिलाफ शुरू से ही जब से आप आए अर्थ मंत्री बनकर तब से बोलते जा रहे हैं। जनता सरकार का क्या दोष था? यही था कि उन्होंने लोन वेडिंग की थी। किसकी लोन वेडिंग की थी? वे कौन लगे थे? वे लगे थे जिनके खिलाफ आप हैं जैसे कि गांव में जो कृषि की कमाई पर निर्भर रहते हैं। जनता सरकार के जितने प्लान और प्रोग्राम थे वे सब उनके लिए थे। इसलिए आप इनके खिलाफ हैं। सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि हमारे अर्थ मंत्री को बहुत बड़े-बड़े लोगों से इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स से प्यार है। लेकिन गांव में जो लोग कृषि करते हैं पता नहीं ये क्यों इनके खिलाफ हैं। हमारे पहले मेम्बर बोल रहे थे कि फूड सप्लाय की खिलाफ हैं। खाद्य कौन उत्पन्न करते हैं? एग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स, जो देश को बचाते हैं। फर्टिलाइजर सप्लाय की अर्गेंट हैं। कौन है वे लोग जो फर्टिलाइजर पर निर्भर करते हैं? कृषि के लिए ही फर्टिलाइजर की जरूरत होती है। पता नहीं हमारे फाइनेंस

मिनिस्टर को क्या हो गया है। यहां काफी डिस्कशन हो गया है इस हाउस में लेकिन इस पर नहीं।

लेकिन जो छोटे-छोटे धंधे करते हैं, उद्योग करते हैं, कृषि का उद्योग करते हैं, मीडम, अगर हम इस देश की उन्नति कर सकते हैं तो सिर्फ कृषि के जरिए ही कर सकते हैं क्योंकि एग्रीकल्चर इज़ ऑवर बैकबोन। इसको हम भूल नहीं सकते। इसको छोड़ कर हम आयल में, गैस में सबसिडी देने जाते हैं लेकिन हम एग्रीकल्चर, पर्टिलिज़र, फूड में सबसिडी देने में पीछे हट जाते हैं। यह क्या है? क्या कोई सरकार ऐसे टिक सकती है? आप ही की भाषा to ensure that they too derive benefit in the short run, we have given the highest priority to the strengthening of the programme of rural development.

आप क्या प्रायिटी दिए हैं? मैं आंकड़े देना नहीं चाहती हूँ क्योंकि उसका कोई फायदा नहीं है। कोई बोलता है कि 30 परसेंट एम्प्लायमेंट है, कोई बोलता 37 परसेंट है, मैं तो कहती हूँ कि ज्यादा है 50 परसेंट, क्योंकि मैं देखती हूँ मेरे गांव में कितने लोग हैं और कितनों को रोजगार मिला है। कितने काम के लिए बाहर आ रहे हैं। क्यों आज एड्स के लिए हम इतना बोल रहे हैं, क्यों आज प्लेग के लिए इतना सोच रहे हैं? प्लेग हो गया, प्लेग हो गया। इतने हम लोग मारे गए हैं। यह क्या हो रहा है, यह क्यों हो रहा है? शहर में लोग गांव से भागे आ रहे हैं। दूर-दूर भागे जा रहे हैं। वह देखिए शहर में कैसे आप और हम सोचते हैं कि बस्ती हो गई, स्लैम हो गया। स्लैम का सफाई करना चाहिए। पहले हमारी जब जनता सरकार थी, पहले इन लोगों के लिए जगह देते थे। पहले इनको अलग से जगह देते थे। फिर स्लैम का सफाई हो रहा था। अभी क्या हो रहा है? अब निकालते जा रहे हैं। कहां जायेंगे, कहां भाग कर जायेंगे? गांव से भाग आए। इनके लिए काम नहीं है। अभी-अभी मेरे घर में गांव से एक लड़का आया था। वह हैदराबाद गया, काम नहीं मिला। हैदराबाद से राजस्थान गया। काम नहीं मिला, यहां आकर बैठा है क्योंकि हम एम्प्लायमेंट के लिए देखते हैं। पूअरस्ट से पूअरर को हम देख रहे हैं, आप जहां भी हास्पीटल जाइये, प्राइमरी हेल्थ सेंटर जाइये। वहां देखिए कि दवाई नहीं है। कुछ भी नहीं है। पूछेंगे तो पैसा नहीं है, फंडिंग नहीं है, अल्टीमेट नहीं है। आप हेल्थ भी देखते हैं। और एम्प्लायमेंट कमेटी के बारे में हम बता दें। आप मानते हैं कि एग्रीकल्चर सेक्टर में पब्लिक इन्वेस्टमेंट की इनफ़्लेक्सी है। लेकिन अगर आप किसी को एम्प्लायमेंट दे सकते हैं तो एक है एग्रीकल्चर, अगर आप किसी चीज़ को बाहर भेज सकते हैं तो यह है एग्रीकल्चर प्रोडक्ट। अगर आप किसी में दावे के साथ

कह सकते हैं कि हम देश में एम्प्लायमेंट जेनरेशन कर रहे हैं तो एग्रीकल्चर बेस्ट इंडस्ट्री है और कोई नहीं, क्योंकि जो फिनिश प्रोडक्ट हैं इंडस्ट्री में हम जो बड़े-बड़े देश हैं इनके साथ कंपीट नहीं कर सकते और करेंगे भी नहीं। क्यों करेंगे, क्यों इतना इन्वेस्टमेंट करेंगे? अगर हम किसी चीज़ को बाहर भेज सकते हैं और एक्सपोर्ट कर सकते हैं तो यह सिर्फ एग्रीकल्चर है। सरकार का इसी के ऊपर कमिटमेंट रहना चाहिए। कहीं एक सरकार आती है, कोई आदमी काम करता है, इसके लिए कमिटमेंट रहता है, प्रायिटी रहती है। आपकी क्या प्रायिटी है? आप किसके ऊपर प्रायिटी देना चाहते हैं? एग्रीकल्चर के ऊपर या इंडस्ट्री के ऊपर? इंडस्ट्री के ऊपर देना चाहते हैं, मैं किसी को कहना नहीं चाहती पहले जो लोग आए हैं इस देश को चलाने के लिए इनको कोई देश के बारे में कुछ पता नहीं था, मालूम नहीं था। ये जानते नहीं कि देश के लोग कैसे रहते हैं और कैसे इनका काम चलता है। क्योंकि कुछ मालूम नहीं था आज भी मैं तो आपको नहीं कह सकती ऐसे भी सरकार में लोग आ गए हैं जिनको देश के बारे में कुछ मालूम नहीं है। मेरे को तो मालूम था हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर इनका काफी एक्सपीरिंस रहा है।

लेकिन इन्होंने जिस तरीके से जवाब दिया, उसमें कहा कि हम पूछ सब्सिडी ज्यादा दिनों तक नहीं रख सकते। तो ऐसा किसी प्राइम मिनिस्टर को बोलना नहीं चाहिए क्योंकि इनका काम लोगों को खाना देना, कपड़ा देना और मकान देना है। इस के लिए इन का लोगों के साथ कमिटमेंट रहना है और उस कमिटमेंट का पूरा करना इनका काम है, किसी दूसरे का नहीं है। फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर और प्राइम मिनिस्टर दोनों का वह काम होता है और दोनों देश के प्रति जिम्मेदार होते हैं, लोगों के प्रति जिम्मेदार होते हैं। इसलिए अगर आप बोलते हैं कि हम नहीं देना चाहते तो मैं पूछती हूँ कि क्यों नहीं है? आप कहां खर्चा करना चाहते हैं आपके यहां इतने रुपयों का घोटाळा हो गया, उसमें क्या किया आपने? आप कुछ नहीं कर पाए वहां तो आप नहीं बोल सकते। इसलिए आप को सच्चाई बोलना चाहिए देश के सामने। असत्य बोलने काफ़ी दिन हो गए हैं, पचास साल होने जा रहे हैं। आप को अब अगर देश को बनाना है और आनेवाली पीढ़ी को फायदा पहुंचाना है तो सच्चाई बोलिए। आप पढ़े-लिखे हैं, सब जानते हैं और आप हाइली इंटेलिजेंट लोग हैं, आपको पता है कि जो लोग पेड़ लगाते हैं, उनका क्या भकसट रहता है, मैं उसका फल खाऊंगा? नहीं, जो आनेवाली पीढ़ी है, वह खाएगी। तो आप जैसा करेंगे, वैसा भी फल पाएंगे। हमारे जो लीडर्स थे, जोकि देश को चलाते थे, वह जो कर गए हैं, उसे हम अभी देख रहे हैं।

मैडम, कितनी पापुलेशन है इस देश की? क्या आपने सोचा है, पापुलेशन के बारे में? क्या आप के मन में कोई भी चिंता है? अगर आप गांवों में जाएं तो देखेंगे कि कितने बच्चे आकर सामने खड़े हो जाते हैं। उनमें नंगे बच्चे होते हैं, हम क्या देने जा रहे हैं उनको क्या बोलने जा रहे हैं उनको? यह कहेंगे कि हमारा फॉरेन एक्सचेंज ज्यादा है। उनका फॉरेन एक्सचेंज से क्या होगा? फॉरेन एक्सचेंज से तो जो बिजनेस करते हैं, उनको फायदा मिल सकता है। जो एक्सपोर्ट करते हैं, इम्पोर्ट करते हैं, उनको फायदा मिल सकता है। गांव में जो लड़का रहता है, उस को क्या फायदा मिलेगा? उनके लिए तो वह कुछ नहीं है और अगर फॉरेन एक्सचेंज आप बढ़ाएंगे तो उनको कुछ नहीं मिलने वाला है।

I do not know whether you will continue in politics or not.

लेकिन मेरी प्रियतमी जानकारी है और जहां तक मैं सोच सकती हूँ, आप कंटीन्यू करने वाले नहीं हैं। मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि आप तो काम कर रहे हैं, उसमें कुछ छिपाइए नहीं, देश को साफ-साफ बताइए। अभी लग 40 साल से ऐसे ही रह रहे हैं और भी रह लेंगे, पानी पीकर रह लेंगे, लेकिन उससे देश में एक जमाना आएगा, देश में एक नई सोच पैदा होगी और देश में एक नया आलोक आएगा। इस तरह हम जो अभी तक अंधेरे में रह रहे हैं, वह अंधेरा साफ हो सकता है।

मैडम, मैं सिर्फ एक-दो बातें कहूंगी। मैं आंकड़े नहीं देना चाहती। मैं यह तो जानती हूँ कि आप अपने मन में सोच रहे होंगे कि मैं जो कर रहा हूँ, वह अपनी पार्टी के लिए कर रहा हूँ, लेकिन आपकी पार्टी रहने वाली नहीं है, आप जो भी यत्न करें। इस को तो आप देख ही रहे हैं।

If winter comes now, will the spring be far behind?

इसलिए जब एक स्टेट में ऐसा हो गया है, तो क्या सोच रहे हैं कि आप यहां भी टिक सकेंगे? आप टिक नहीं रहे हैं और कोई भी नहीं टिक रहा है। इसलिए कुछ कर के दिखाइए। आप नेक्स्ट बजट को पापुलिस्ट बजट कर लेंगे, तो आप आ सकते हैं जीतकर, लेकिन वह पापुलिस्ट बजट ज्यादा दिन तक नहीं टिकेगा। तो आप यही सोचते होंगे कि जैसे भी हो हम सरकार में रहेंगे। मैं कहूंगी, जैसा मैंने कहा, कि ज्यादा दिन धुएं में रहने का क्या फायदा, देश के लिए कुछ कमिटमेंट चाहिए, कुछ काम चाहिए, इसलिए आप इस धुएं से बाहर आइए। इतना कहकर मैं अपनी बात खतम करती हूँ। धन्यवाद, मैडम।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Shri Gopalrao Vithalrao Patil. He is absent.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, as far as our erudite Finance Minister is concerned, history begins in June 1991 because everything that went before was absolutely wrong and he has rescued the country and the economy from a severe disaster. Now, while he says all these things, what he probably does not realise is this that from the time of the independence of the country and up till now, it was his party, maybe he is a new Member of the party, which was in power. So, by making such statements he is actually, in a sense, severely criticising his own party for calling the people of India, for defrauding the people of India, for all these years. He does not have any feeling of moral guilt about it. But I feel, the Prime Minister who was also in the Ministry earlier, in several Ministries earlier, the External Affairs Minister who was also in several Ministries earlier, I hope, they will somehow come out with a statement on how we can reconcile this particular position of the Finance Minister with the position of their own party, the way it has run the Govt, for so many years in the past. Now, although he can put the blame on others for everything that went wrong before 1991 June, he cannot put the blame on others for what has happened since 1991 June. The way it has been portrayed in the Economic Survey and other documents as if a miracle has taken place since 1991 June. Now what is the balance sheet? We have had these discussions before in this House, during Question Hour and on other occasions, but if you go through the balance sheet, the four years under this economic miracle have done worse compared to the ten years in the 1980s which, according to me, led to a crisis. For instance, take the GDP growth. The rate of growth of GDP was very low in the first two years, it reached the highest in the third year to 5.3 per cent. But even the highest in these four years is less than the average for the entire decade of the 1980s. The same is true of the industrial growth, the same is true of agricultural growth.

If you take into account the growth figures, you come out with the same conclusion that the

rate of growth of the Indian economy, overall in terms of various important sectors, is less than the rate of growth of Indian economy since the 1980s. Then, one of the things determines growth is, of course, the level of investment. As we have discussed in this House several times, since 1991 June, the rate of investment, the ratio of investment to GDP has gone down by 4 per cent from around 24 per cent or so when he took over to something like 20 per cent now. This 20 per cent figure, I need not inform our knowledgeable Finance Minister, is at least 10 to 15 per cent short of the level of investment required to achieve the rate of growth which has been achieved by even the countries of South-East Asia. For instance, when the level of investment is anything between 30 per cent and 35 per cent, it is much lower than the average for most of the countries which have achieved a high rate of growth. The saving ratio is also equally low and as we discussed in this House before, this is largely because of the promotion of consumerism in this country, the promotion of this culture which feeds the foreign goods, the craze for foreign goods that has led to a very low saving ratio. Along with the promotional work done by the television, import liberalisation for luxury goods and all that. We have also seen that export rate has gone up over the last two years. This is one of the successes which has been trumpeted by the Government that the export rate has gone up to something like 21 per cent last year. May be, it is 17 per cent this year. Now, these figures have to be compared with the export growth rates in the first two years of the regime of Dr. Manmohan Singh. Even if we accept these two figures of 21 per cent and 17 per cent to be high—perhaps, these are high figures—they are not high when we see the rate of growth in imports. The import growth rates are even higher. Whenever Dr. Manmohan Singh talks about it, he talks about the export growth rate, but he does not talk about the import growth rate. As I said, the import growth rates are higher. Our imports have gone up. Therefore, there is a negative balance. The Government has failed to check this. Our exports do not pay for what we are importing.

Worse than this is the position in regard to our foreign debt. The fact remains that we have

a huge debt throttling us. We have a huge debt of 92 billion dollars. India is now the third largest indebted country in the world, after Brazil and Mexico. I do not know whether, after the recent settlement in Mexico, we have defeated Mexico in this! We may never be able to defeat Mexico in football. But perhaps, we have defeated Mexico in this! I do not have the latest figures. Maybe, we have now become the second largest indebted country, next only to Brazil.

Madam, in spite of this huge foreign debt, I still see no blueprint, no plan, as to how this debt of 92 billion dollars is going to be repaid. Such a plan is important because this involves our future generation. We are making our future generation indebted. It is the future generation which has to pay this debt. This means, we are incurring expenditure at the cost of our future generation. However, I do not see any plan of action which says: 'This is how we are going to repay our debt'. In fact, every year, the debt is going up—three billion dollars, four billion dollars, six billion dollars. The Finance Minister was happy that this year, the increase in debt has not been as much as it was in the previous years. But the fact remains that this huge debt of 92 billion dollars is throttling us. There is no plan, no plan whatsoever, on the part of the Government to liquidate this debt. I hope the Minister of Finance would explain this to us.

As a result of this, what is India's position today? As a result of this, India is one among the twenty poorest countries in the world. This is as per the World Development Report. Even if you go by the development indicators like industrial growth and all that, even in terms of the quality of life, India is one of the poorest countries in the world. Only some countries in 'Africa and some in Asia—mainly, Bangladesh—are below us. Almost all the other countries are above us, in terms of development indicators.

There was another interesting thing which I came across recently. Our ranking in terms of G.D.P. *per capita* is 105th in the world. Our ranking in terms of our performance in football is also 105th in the world. There is some matching between our performance in football and our economic performance. I do not know

whether the Finance Minister derives any satisfaction out of it. The Finance Minister has not done worse than what our footballers have done! I do not know whether this is any satisfaction to him. There is a matching between our rating in football and our rating in terms of our economic performance.

SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM: Does our Finance Minister play football?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I do not know.

Madam, I have noticed another thing. We have seen two Manmohan Singhs in the last four years. We had Manmohan Singh-Mark I earlier and now we have Manmohan Singh-Mark II. Manmohan Singh-Mark I was the Finance Minister till last year. Since then, we have Manmohan Singh-Mark II. What was Manmohan Singh-Mark I? He was a very good economist. He was pure. He was a professional economist. He was an amateur politician, which went to his credit. He was a good economist. I knew that he had a very sharp brain. He had very clear-cut policies. Of course, they were wrong. Though the policies were wrong, though the policies were anti-people, the policies were internally consistent, logically consistent. There was a certain focus, some transparency. One could identify, one could predict, that this was the philosophy of the I.M.F. and the World Bank, as transmitted to us by Dr. Manmohan Singh. There was a certain theoretical purity about it. We might not have agreed with what. That was a different question. But certainly, it was pure.

Since the 1994 Budget I find that he is very fast learning politics and very fast unlearning economics. Since his political ideology is over, he now talks like a seasoned politician. In this year's Budget I find that he has shed all his inhibitions and has given concessions to everybody left and right, the poor, the women, the children, the crippled, everybody. Of course, if you work out the concessions, nothing much comes out of them. But he has learnt the political language.

Only the other day he was talking about the vices of competitive populism. Now he is a great champion of populism. Since the election bell is ringing, we can hear a different kind of

language coming out of Dr. Manmohan Singh, but the entire Government has also rediscovered the poor. If you look at the vocabulary of the Government over the past four years, their whole position was that there was no need for the poverty alleviation programme. They looked at the poverty alleviation programme as being inefficient, which really derailed the economy. What was necessary was to have a high rate of growth, an economy which was market-based. And if the market decided everything, then, the allocation would be fine. There will be no problem of allocation and no problem of distribution. The main thing was that the economy should be run efficiently and then something will be there as left-over at the bottom for the poor. The poor's position would also improve. There was no reason to have any special package or policy for the poor. This position was reflected in various reports, including the Narasimham Committee and many other Committees that all the concessions given to the poor should be obtained because they are inefficient. In the long run they reduced the rate of growth of the economy and also of the backward poor. This is the way their own arguments ran.

Now, it is very heartening to see that the Government has rediscovered the poor. Our Prime Minister while speaking on the President's Address devoted half of the time on how much he loved the poor. Now, the question is whether this love for the poor has something to do with the very poor election performance of the Government. Their poor election performance and their poor attitude towards the poverty alleviation programme might have been correlated. That is why I find all clichés, all rhetorics, whether they make much sense or not, seem to be coming back again. After this there is the emergence of our Finance Minister in his new garb as a politician. Now, he has lost his sharpness. Earlier it was a pleasure to fight with him, because he was very sharp. Now he has learnt how to fudge the issues. He speaks with words which have a double-meaning and there is no conviction in what he says. I would like to ask the Finance Minister not to put on this garb but be honest to himself. This U-turn he has taken since last year's Budget. It is pronounced in this year's

budget. I would suggest to him not to go in for this U-turn. If he feels his policies are right, fight for those policies, put them on the agenda, go through the election and then take the risk.

The Finance Minister is considered to be an economic wizard, but I find that he has failed to solve two major problems at the same time.

THE FINANCE MINISTER (SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH): Wizards are on your side. I have never claimed to be a wizard.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: The whole world says you are an economic wizard. You have changed the face of the economy or something like that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Dr. Dasgupta, your party's allocated time is 14 minutes. You have already taken 15 minutes.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, I did not realise this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): You have been in dialogue with the Finance Minister. Kindly conclude.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I have a lot of points to mention. I have not yet come to the nit of the points. I will now forget the Finance Minister and concentrate only on the points.

I think the reason why this Government has failed is that it cannot do two things at the same time. If it goes in for increase in production, increase in exports, inevitably the fiscal deficit goes up and inflation goes up. If on the other hand it wants to control the fiscal deficit and inflation, production goes down, exports go down and employment goes down. As a consequence I find that the Government is playing a kind of a ping-pong game. Sometimes it is under the pressure of the World Bank or the IMF,...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Are you giving the example of China?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: China did not play this ping-pong.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: There, in spite of high production, inflation has gone up. Here it is not like that.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Sometimes he is constraining the demand so much that the fiscal deficit is actually going down and inflation is also going down. But, as he constrains the demand so much, income is falling, unemployment is growing, export is not growing sufficiently. Then again comes a period, when he starts boosting up the demand, ultimately again finding that the inflation is going up and fiscal deficit is going up. I do not know whether the Finance Minister can come up with some solution where he can on the one hand keep his masters in the IMF and the World Bank satisfied with low fiscal deficit and inflation and at the same time keep the electorate and business in the country happy. This is what this economic wizard has not been able to perform yet.

Now, I would like to make two specific points. One is regarding the history, the global experience. My feeling is that our Government has failed to learn from the world experience. Now, we are talking about globalisation, integrating India into the world economy. That means that the global experience looms very large in our horizon, but our country has failed to learn from the international experience despite the fact that our Finance Minister has not been involved in many international bodies. I would give two specific examples. The first period does not involve the Finance Minister. It is the period before he came here as the Finance Minister. The second one is directly related to the period which we are going through at the moment.

In 1985, when Shri Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister, one of his decisions was to go in for commercial borrowings. If you take the figure for 1985, the commercial borrowing was of the order of Rs. 1,000 crores. By the time Rajiv Gandhi left, it became Rs. 34,000 crores. That was largely to finance luxury goods industries, like washing machines, television, VCRs and other things. This increase in the commercial borrowing has been one of the reasons which led to the crisis which Dr. Manmohan talks about repeatedly. For instance, this borrowing was one mainly with the support of the Reserve Bank which

guaranteed that borrowing. And by the time of 1989-90, because there were so many borrowings of smaller magnitude and the foreign loans maturing at different times, it became unmanageable and the time came when the credibility of the country, which was very high in the past, came down very sharply. Foreign lenders were frightened about India's capability of repaying the loan and they decided not to give loans to India and the crisis came about. This crisis was largely due to this irrational borrowing from commercial banks by the Indian Government, from 1985 to 1989 and later on also. But that was not necessary. This crisis, which came up, was also partly because of the 1991 IMF loan repayment, which peaked during the period. That was another reason why we had this crisis, which Dr. Manmohan Singh talks about. But this crisis was unnecessary because we have the global experience. In 1973, there was the oil crisis in the world. After the world oil crisis, all the western banks were flush with petrodollars because all the oil producing countries put their money in the form of petrodollars in the banks of the Western, European countries and the US. They were looking for borrowers. They induced countries in Africa, countries in Latin America to borrow loans in a big way. During this period—from 1973 to 1974 and 1979 to 1980—all the countries in Africa and Latin America were given a lot of money by these commercial banks.

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: Not in Africa.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: Africa too. I will show you the figures, if you like. But what was the result? By 1979-80, all these borrowings collapsed, collapsed with their own external expenditures and badly managed. The result was by 1980, the commercial borrowings by the rest of the world were stopped. In 1982, Mexico—not the recent crisis of Mexico—came out with a statement, "We are bankrupt. We cannot repay our loans. You please forgive us. No more loans. We will not be repaying." So, they declared their bankruptcy. Since then the commercial banks did not lend money to anybody else. Earlier, India did not take such loans. But by 1984-85, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund started goading India through various sources to take

loans, I can show the document, if he is interested. They wanted India to take the loan. So, India repeated the same experience as the African countries have done. African countries took this loan. They were flushed with money. They have wasted the money. Latin American countries also did the same thing. Eventually, they were in a debt crisis. In 1985, India had no debt crisis. India's service ratio was very good. India's amount of debt was manageable. But India went into it without looking into the world's experience and eventually India became the third largest indebted country in the world. This is one example I am giving that there was this experience before us. This experience was completely ignored as a result of which we had a severe problem of debt which eventually resulted to forcing us to take more loans from the International Monetary Fund when Shri Manmohan Singh came. This single instance in history which I had mentioned relates to Shri Manmohan Singh's period. Now, he has gone in for structural adjustments imposed by the World Bank, stabilisation programme... (*Time bell rings*)... Yes, I am finishing. This is the last example. This stabilisation programme has been imposed by the IMF. Since 1980 all the African countries have been through this structural adjustment programme and the stabilisation programme. Most of the Latin American countries have been through this programme. So, we had this ten years of experience in front of us. We could consult the experience and see what has happened to them. The experience was this, all the African countries and all the Latin American countries had the worst possible economic results. They now talk about the last decade of the eighties because they went through this structural adjustment programme and this stabilisation programme. They conformed to the dictates of the agencies faithfully for this period. So, Africa is now at the very bottom. The eighties had been the worst period for them. This experience was in front of us. But unfortunately the government was not interested in taking advantage through that experience. If you look at the 70 odd countries which have taken loan in a substantial way from the IMF or the World Bank—I am not talking about all the countries—I could find only two countries which were successful. Other countries were not successful. Which are those countries? Chile and Ghana.

These are the only two countries where this so-called miracle has worked. Out of these 70 odd countries, these two countries have succeeded. Even in the case of Chile, after the overthrow of Allende Government, the Socialist Government in 1973, they brought in the Chicago school boys. Shri Manmohan Singh has many dreams about the Chicago School boys. But they have really destroyed the economy. But from 1980 onwards, there was a success in Chile compared to the period in 1970's. But if you compare with the Allende period even now, the investment ratio is lower in Chile than it was in 1973.

The other example of success was in Ghana. In Ghana also, compared to the immediately preceding period, they have shown success. Ghana was successful. But compared to the period under Kwame Nkrumah, whether in terms of the GDP or per capita or in terms of investment ratio, they are doing very badly. So, there were only two cases of success, success in relation to the immediately preceding period. In both the cases, success was not to be found when compared to some of the earlier periods. This is the experience with the so-called structural adjustment in the world as a whole. Moreover, from time to time, they come out with other miracle stories.

But certain miracle were short-lived. Turkey was a miracle for some time; Pakistan was a miracle for some time. But they were shortlived. Such miracles continue for three or four or five years. Then they go. Another thing I find is that these programmes come to an end after a period of four years on an average. I talked about this to Dr. Manmohan Singh. I describe it as a 'four-year itch'. That is the name I have given it. After four years, these programmes come to an end one way or the other. Either the Government itself faced a food riot or unemployment, some severe discontent or the IMF and the World Bank become angry because their conditionalities have not been conformed to. So they withdraw the programme. This is the experience of the countries in Africa and Latin America which have taken these loans. After this four-year period, there is a breakdown. For another two or three years nothing happens. Then, again there is an agreement again

breakdown, again agreement and, again breakdown. I was mentioning it to Dr. Manmohan Singh the other day. You are almost nearing the end of that four-year period. The four-year itch has already shown in last year's Budget. This policy cannot be sustained. Nowhere in the world has this kind of a programme been sustained. It will go either because of popular discontent or because of their failure to conform to IMF conditionalities, which is happening in our country now, because they have not been able to conform to their conditionalities with regard to fiscal deficits and all that one way or the other, this programme is coming to an end. I told Dr. Manmohan Singh the other day, "Now your four-year period is coming to a close. You will not be able to continue with the programme any more." He said, "I am happy at least I have gone on for such a long time." "This is what he told me.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Was it a secret talk?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: No secret talk. You cannot avoid this. (*Interruptions*). We have our own group, our own club, which cuts across political angles.

In the East-Asian countries. (*Time-bell*). I am concluding now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): You have already taken double your time, Mr. Dasgupta.

DR. BIPLAB CASGUPTA: I will take, literally, one minute.

Please go through the experience of these East-Asian countries. Is that not a socialist experience? They wanted to build a domestic capitalist economy, a strong economy. They shunned all the proposals of the World Bank. They had gone for a high level of State intervention. They had gone for a high level of subsidies. They had gone for the nationalisation of banks and other things. They had kept the foreign investors, foreign companies, away. They did not allow the multinationals to dominate. They did not specialise in small industries. They went for big industries, including public sector industries. You see the

result. Having achieved this result, now, they are relaxing. Globalisation and all these things, they are also talking about now. Not earlier. Earlier, they followed a policy which was basically based on State intervention. And that is the experience of countries the world over. Not a single country has ever succeeded following the sort of policy which the World Bank and the IMF want to impose on us and what Dr. Manmohan Singh is following now. This is a disastrous policy, a dangerous policy, destroying the future of the country. I hope that our Finance Minister will, still, have the time to reflect on this and, being an honest man, he will self-criticise and say, "I have done a great disservice to the people of India and I am withdrawing all the policies' maybe, I am leaving the Cabinet too." Thank you very much.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THANKUR (Bihar): Madam, I rise to support the Budget proposals for the year 1995-96. I congratulate the hon. Finance Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh, and the hon. Prime Minister on their fifth Budget containing the present Government's continued progressive and bold policies, pragmatic approach, positive direction and enhanced outlay for development and appropriate priorities.

Madam, the Budget proposals have to be looked at objectively and not in terms of a general bias as some hon. Members from the other side did. We are, basically, part of a planned economy, a mixed economy and it is reflected in terms of our expectations in the Eighth Five-Year Plan namely, growth, modernisation, self-reliance and social justice.

We have to see whether the Budget proposals are in keeping with the guidelines of economic reforms policy followed during the last four years, as also the commitment made by the party in its election manifesto to the people of the country. If we see it objectively, as I mentioned, then we find that the Budget for 1994-95 reflects a sound fiscal policy, conducive investment for accelerated growth, larger employment opportunities, positive incentives for savings and investment, substantial development of infrastructure, agriculture industry, science and technology, social services like education and

health, particularly with special emphasis on the anti-poverty programmes and all-round rural development programmes relating to the poor and the persons in the lower income group and established in the tax structure. These are the aspects which have been covered in the Budget proposals for 1995-96, which are in consonance with the policy followed during the last four years. Some hon. Members have said that the Government is not following the economic policy which was started by Pandit Nehru and we have deviated from the cherished goals. The well-laid down policy of the nation and the new economic reforms policy will create problems. Even some Members have gone to say that they are anti-poor. These are all misleading statements, I would say, and it is not fair to say like this. If we really see the genesis of our economic policy which germinates from our planning from the very beginning and planning in our country, as we see, is very deep-rooted. A thinking is there in the country. For the first time, planning came in a book written by Dr. M. Visveswaraiya in 1933. And thereafter, during the congress Presidentship of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, in 1938 the National Planning Committee was appointed with Pandit Jawaharlal Negru as the Chairman. If you see the 18 volumes of the report of the national Planning Committee, you will see that they had foreseen the future of India, how the various sectors improved and developed. Subsequent thoughts have gone into planning in India. In 1943-44, there was a Plan known as "Bombay Plan" prepared by the industrialists of Bombay. Then we had the "Peoples' Plan" prepared by Shir M.N. Ray in 1945. Thereafter, based on the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948, the five year plans were actually started. That is the basis which gave us the "Planned economy" and "mixed economy" and on the basis of which the first five year plan was started into existence with a modest investment of Rs. 4,900 crores. But, nevertheless, if we see, gradually with the experience of the First Five Year Plan, we talked of the changes. The change was there. The Industrial policy Resolution of 1956 was brought about during the period of Pandit Jawahar Lai Nehru itself. That was in substitution of the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948, and thereafter, from time to time, there

have been changes in our policy-frame. Even during the regime of other Governments run by Opposition Parties there have been changes in our policy but I do not like to take the time of the House in giving so many details. These changes are very clear. The changes envisaged in 1956 were new classification of industry schedules (A) (B) and (C) and fair and non discriminatory treatment to the private sector. They were inserted in the Resolution of 1956. Environment, village and small scale industries, removal of regional disparities, need to have a provision for amenities for labourers, foreign investment and capital, etc., all these have mentioned there. Even the basis of the policy which the Janata Dal made in 1977 remained the same as of the 1956 Resolution, but certain changes in according priorities were made, and particularly the rural industries, small scale industries and khadi and village industries were given priority and district centres were to be started and so on. If you see the decisions taken in 1980 by Mrs. Gandhi who reiterated the real policy, we carried on the basic policy of 1956 in our values, in our approach and in our direction, but new changes were also brought about by Mrs. Gandhi in the year 1980. The 1956 Policy reflects all these changes. In 1980 it was said, "The 1956 policy reflects the value system of our country and has also shown conclusively the merit of constructive flexibility. This flexibility aspect was provided in the 1956 Resolution itself and it had been carried on in 1977, it had been carried on in 1980 and thereafter again changes were brought about in 1985 by Rajiv Gandhi Ji when he introduced new aspects of modernisation, investment, infrastructural development, science and technology and so on. Then again in 1989, when the Janata Dal Government came into power, they also brought in a new policy but the basic structure of the policy remained the same. In fact, in 1986 there was also a change being made. In the year 1990 when the new policy was presented by the Janata Dal Government, projected by Shri Ajit Singh, the investment ceiling in plant and machinery for small scale industry was raised. These changes had been brought about. The ceiling was raised from Rs. 35 lakhs to Rs. 60 lakhs. Again, delicensing

of all new units up to Rs. 25 crores was dispensed with and for non-backward areas it was Rs. 95 cores. It was fixed in the year 1990. In 1991 under the guidance of our hon. Prime Minister the new policy was before us. The hon. Finance Minister has explained more than once in the Parliament and elsewhere that the basic goal of the economic policy remains the same but we have certainly, brought about the new aspects of the conomy according to the needs of the time, according to the dynamism it requires, and if we want to make it actually competitive within the country and within the world economy, we have to bring about changes. That is why we have brought about changes in the industrial licensing policy, the foreign investment policy, foreign technology, public sector, the MRTP Act and others. Now all these things are before us. We are aware of them. I do not take the time of the House in repeating them and I have closely seen all these aspects.

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Are all these changes brought in the same structure?

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: Yes, the basic structure of the planned economy and the mixed economy is the same. We have been making changes in priorities from time to time. You have been changing it in your own State. You kindly appreciate the fact that the policy which was there in your State several years back, is not there today. Far-reaching changes have been taking place in science and technology. We cannot keep our industry, whether in the private sector or in the public sector obsolete. They have to be updated. They have to get the best of technologies.

SHRI JIBON ROY: We have an independent and self-reliant line. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: I will say it is a wrong notion. It was not so. It is not so today. We decide our policy. Our Government decides the policy. We decide our plans. We decide our investment pattern. This is not the correct way. When you see something, you see it in a particular way. If you see with a red glass, everything will be red. If you see with a green glass, everthing will be green. This should not be the approach. We must be very objective. We

must be very clear. We must be very honest in our assessment. There may be deficiencies. There may be deficiencies in the delivery system. There may be deficiencies in many respects. Our population is growing. The expectations of the people are growing much more. There are areas where we have to do much more. But we cannot, for that reason, say that we have not done well. During the period when the new Economic Policy was started, I was a part of the Government. I had seen how the hon. Finance Minister had to work up to 2.00 A.M. in the night to prepare the Budget of 1991. In the Budget he had given clearly the projections which had been implemented, and they were further modified in 1992, 1993, 1994 and in the Budget of 1995 which we are now discussing here. We know what the position was in the last three years. The position was so critical. At that particular time, it was not a question of having more foreign exchange.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Thakur, how long will you take.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: I will speak as long as you can give me time. Madam. I want to speak at great length.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): No. You will have three minutes.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: I have enough time. My party has enough time. There is no difficulty. My friends want to hear me. Let me say something on the Budget. But if you want to tell me not to speak, I will stop here.

The question is this: Why is there confusion? We must say what we have done during the last three years.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Thakur, we are going to take up a Short Duration Discussion at 5 o'clock. So, it will be good if you conclude before that.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: I cannot conclude. Madam. Then I will continue after that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Well, then you will be on your legs.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: Yes, Madam. I have just started. I was saying what the position was when the present Govt. took office in June, 91. The position was very critical in regard to foreign exchange, agriculture, exports, growth rate etc. The growth rate of our economy at that time was less than one per cent. It has now gone up to 5.3%. The industrial growth, which was half per cent has virtually gone up to 8.7% in the last year. Similarly, in the case of exports we had, in dollar terms, about 4.5 million dollars. It has now gone up to 20 million dollars in 1993-94. Last year we have done fairly well. We expect to do much better in the current year. The foreign exchange reserve was about one billion dollars. That was why 67 tonnes of gold had been mortgaged by the previous Govt. As per the mortgage provisions, they were to be exported to Bank of England and Japan. Of course, we were able to get them back after making the necessary payments in 6 months. This was the situation. Today we have a foreign exchange reserve of 20 billion dollars. Some Members were criticising us for having it. When you don't have it you know the difficulty. When we have more you go on criticising us irrationally that it was not correct to hold such a large reserve. As regards foodgrains production, it has gone up from 168 million tonnes to 185 million tonnes. Is this not an achievement? The foodgrains stock, which was 14.7 million tonnes, is about 30 million tonnes on 1st January, 1995. Now these are some of the areas where we have got achievements. As regards the rural development programmes, people talk about humane face. As regards the rural development programmes, we have achieved, I would say, commendable success. There is no doubt, a lot remains to be done.

5.00 P.M.

For the first time a provision of Rs. 30,000 crores was made in the Eighth Plan for rural development. From Rs. 3,100 crores in 1992-93 it rose to Rs. 5,010 crores in 1993-94. In 1994-95 it was Rs. 7,010 crores and this year we have got a provision of Rs. 7,700 crores. I would like to give the details of this amount. I would like to tell the House how many million man-days we have achieved in these years. This amount has given impetus to the creation of

infrastructure in the rural areas. We are having durable assets for the benefit of the people. We are having services which are necessary for the people. In the fields of health and education substantial amounts have been provided. Some new schemes have been provided for the first time. There is a scheme *Sunischii Rozgaar Yojana*, Assured Employment Scheme in 2,300 blocks in the country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Thakur, now it is 5 o'clock. You can resume your speech tomorrow. Now, we will take up the short Duration Discussion.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I would like to suggest one thing. Before you take up the Short Duration Discussion, let us pass the Appropriation Bill without discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): We are not taking up the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI MODISH PRASAD MATHUR: That is why I am suggesting that we first pass the Appropriation Bill without discussion and then we can start the Short Duration Discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Mathur, the Short Duration Discussion is slated at 5 o'clock.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: Madam that is my suggestion. We can postpone the Short Duration Discussion for a few minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): If the House agrees, I have no problem. What is the sense of the House? (*Interruptions*).

श्री विमलभाई मेहता (गुजरात): बजट दिस्कासन तो कलू रहेगी न?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती कमल सिन्हा): हां, बजट दिस्कासन तो कलू रहेगी।

श्री विमलभाई मेहता: वह तो बिजनेस एडमिटरजी कमेटी ने टाइम तय किया था।

SHRI ASHOK MITRA (West Bengal): We cannot pass the Appropriation Bill like that. We are not served with any notice. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Madam, the Appropriation Bill can be passed tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Let us finish the Short Duration Discussion first.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Madam, is it the last item of the day?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): We will decide it later on. Please take your seat.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: I will take my seat. I have to attend a meeting. Therefore, I want to *know....{Interruptions}*.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: It was decided in the Business Advisory Committee. That is why I am submitting it. It was decided that the Appropriation Bill will be passed without discussion (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: We cannot do like that. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: That is your view. I have only said whatever was decided in the Business Advisory Committee. That is all.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Madam, is this the last item of the day? Now it is 5 o'clock. Usually we sit up to 6 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Unless the House decides something else, it is the last item as per the List of Business. So, kindly take your seat.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

On the Situation arising out of the Irregular Payment of the Salaries to the Employees of M/s Jessop & Co. Ltd.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Madam, the reason for raising this discussion is one public sector undertaking employing 5,440 persons...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Mukherjee, before you start I have to say one thing. While giving permission for the Short Duration Discussion the Chairman said that it should be finished as early as possible.