

DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 2009-10

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, further discussion on General Budget, 2009-10. Due to paucity of time, I would like to request every hon. Member, who takes part in this discussion, to be precise. Please do not take more time. I will stick to the time allotted to the respective party. Now, Shri Brij Bhushan Tiwari is to continue his speech. Mr. Tiwari, your Party has a balance of twenty-one minutes, and, you have fielded four speakers. ...*(Interruptions)*... If you want to give time to your colleagues, then, you will have to conclude early, otherwise, we will be helpless.

श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सबसे चिंता की बात इस बजट में राजकोषीय घाटा है, जो जी.डी.पी. का 6.2 प्रतिशत है। अगर राज्यों का भी मिला दिया जाए, तो यह 10 प्रतिशत से भी ऊपर चला जाता है। इसके साथ ही साथ यह राजस्व घाटा भी चार गुना बढ़ गया है। यह बहुत ही चिंता की बात है और मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी कैसे इन घाटों की भरपाई करेंगे, क्योंकि उसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि योजना व्यय में कमी आ रही है और गैर-योजना व्यय भी बहुत तेजी से बढ़ रहा है। मैं इस संबंध में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इतने सबके बावजूद भी जो बड़े मध्यम वर्ग के लोग हैं या जो कॉरपोरेट सेक्टर के लोग हैं, उनको जो रियायतें दी गई हैं, वह 418 लाख करोड़ रुपये की हैं और अगर कुल रियायतों को माना जाए तो वह करीब 7000 करोड़ रुपये पड़ता है। मैं इस संबंध में यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि रियायतों के साथ ही साथ जो कर वसूली है, वह भी बहुत ही चिंताजनक है। अभी महालेखापरीक्षक की एक रिपोर्ट सदन के पटल पर रखी गई है, उसमें यह कहा गया है कि during 2007-08, against Rs. 3,6057 crore certified by the recovery officers, only Rs. 8,612 crore were recovered; मतलब 24 परसेंट पैसा ही रिकवर हो पाया है।

There was an improvement in recovery from 14 per cent in 2005-06 to 24 per cent in 2006-07. यह हमारा जो deficit है, उस deficit का करीब 17 परसेंट बैठता है। इस प्रकार एक तरफ तो हम घाटे में हैं और दूसरी तरफ जो करों की वसूली है, वह ठीक तरीके से नहीं हो पा रही। मैं इस संबंध में यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कारपोरेट सेक्टर को जो 7000 करोड़ रुपये की छूट मिली है, वह पूरे fiscal deficit का 17 परसेंट है। इतना ही नहीं, इसके बाद भी आप देखिए कि तमाम प्रकार के आयकर अधिनियमों में छूट हुई। आयकर अधिनियमों में संशोधन करके एक औद्योगिक परिवार के औद्योगिक समूह को करीब पचास हजार करोड़ रुपये का मुनाफा कमाने का मौका दे दिया गया। इसके बावजूद भी जो corporate sector है, कानूनन ढाई लाख करोड़ रुपये से ज्यादा कर रियायतों का फायदा उठाने के बावजूद भी इन्होंने इस बजट के प्रति सेंसेक्स को गिराकर अपनी नाराज़गी जाहिर की। इस प्रकार यह मामला है। हम इनके खिलाफ नहीं हैं। यह सही है कि राष्ट्र की प्रगति में, राष्ट्र के योगदान में इनका भी महत्व है, परन्तु मैं सदन में इतना जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि इनको भी नियंत्रण और मर्यादा में रखने की आवश्यकता है। अगर ये अनियंत्रित हो जाएंगे तो जैसे सांड अगर अनियंत्रित हो जाए तो वह बहुत ही havoc पैदा कर देता है। उसी प्रकार से आर्थिक क्षेत्र में या देश के निर्माण के क्षेत्र में इनका अनियंत्रित होना देश की प्रगति के लिए ठीक नहीं है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इनमें ट्रांसपेरेंसी नहीं है। इसके साथ ही साथ लाभ कमाने की इनकी जो भावना है, इस भावना के जरिए, मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि ये समावेशी विकास का केन्द्र बन सकते हैं या समावेशी विकास का नेतृत्व कर सकते हैं। पूरे बजट को देखते हुए मेरी समझ में केवल एक ही बात आती है कि सरकार की जो मानसिकता है, वह यही है कि समग्र विकास संभव नहीं है, सबका विकास नहीं हो सकता है इसलिए कुछ लोगों का विकास हो और वह भी, जो जितना ज्यादा सम्पन्न है, जो जितनी ज्यादा आय कमाता है, अगर उसका विकास किया जाए तो उसके विकास के जरिए पूरे देश का

3.00 P.M.

विकास हो जाएगा। जो trickle down theory पहले कही जाती थी, यह उस trickle down theory की मानसिकता और उसके दर्शन को दर्शाता है। इसी के साथ ही साथ जिस प्रकार से पूंजी का, दौलत का केन्द्रीयकरण हो रहा है, देश में गैर बराबरी बढ़ रही है, उसके संबंध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो गैर बराबरी और भ्रष्टाचार है, यह समाज को अंदर से तोड़ता है। जैसे explosion बाहर से विस्फोट होता है और implosion आंतरिक विस्फोट है। अगर इस गैर बराबरी को रोकने का उपाय नहीं किया गया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह व्यवस्था नियंत्रित नहीं हो सकती। इसके लिए आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हमें अपने भोग पर अंकुश लगाना होगा। हमें अपनी फिज़ूलखर्ची पर रोक लगानी होगी, हमारे सरकारी ठाठ-बाट पर रोक लगानी होगी। मैं यहां पर चाणक्य का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में उनका जिक्र किया था। चाणक्य को एक बार एक चीनी यात्री पाटिलीपुत्र में मिलने गया। वे एक साम्राज्य के महामात्य थे जो गंगा किनारे एक झोंपड़ी रहते थे। चीनी यात्री को आश्चर्य हुआ कि इतने बड़े साम्राज्य का महामात्य, महामात्य यानी प्रधान मंत्री, एक झोंपड़ी में रहता है। जब वह यात्री वहां उनसे बात करने गया तो उस समय उनके पास दो टेबल लैम्प थे। जब वह यात्री वहां गया तो जिस टेबल लैम्प को जलाकर वे काम कर रहे थे, उसको उन्होंने बुझा दिया और दूसरा टेबल लैम्प जलाकर वे काम करने लगे। जब यात्री ने पूछा कि आखिर यह क्या है तो उन्होंने कहा कि चूंकि मैं सरकारी काम कर रहा था इसलिए सरकारी लैम्प का इस्तेमाल कर रहा हूँ और अब आपसे निजी वार्ता हो रही है इसलिए यह मेरा व्यक्तिगत लैम्प है। इस प्रकार ये सब बातें हैं। अगर हम आत्म संयम, आत्मनियंत्रण और मर्यादाओं का ध्यान नहीं रखेंगे तो देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था को सुधारा नहीं जा सकता है। इन्हीं बातों के साथ मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करता हूँ। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, with a sense of sentiment and gratitude, I hasten to thank the Chair for having called me on behalf of the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazagham as one of the speakers to speak on a very important subject. Sir, it is a matter of great pride and privilege to speak on a subject, which is the most important subject, of the Session, namely, the Union Budget.

Sir, as a student of economics, I had been taught as to what is a 'budget'. 'Budget' is a tool of financial administration. It contains the estimated revenue and expenditure for a particular period. Not only that, Sir, it also envisages the policy, social and economic, of either the national Government or the State Government. So, as it is, it is a very important piece of instrument which reflects the in and out of the activities of the whole Government.

Sir, the UPA Government has come to power after a big mandate and they can afford to be strong, stable and steady. Equally so, the Finance Minister also can afford to be assertive and aggressive. He can even afford to be a little bit tough on matters so warranted. Sir, I read the Budget speech of the hon. Finance Minister. I have seen the other documents also. I have been listening to the previous speakers and I could see that there are several highlights in the Budget. Just as a coin will have two sides, this Budget has got highlights or hits on the one side and low-lights or pits on the other side. I could see the hailing of the Budget on that side and waiting of the Budget on the other in the House. So, the Opposition has got their own reservations

and reasons for them. Sir, these are my impressions. As far as I am concerned, I would like to be very objective and go by merit. In this connection, I have been guided by....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Come to the Budget. Your time will be exhausted. Come to the Budget.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Our leader, Madam Jayalalitha who has been very careful in appreciating certain aspects of the Budget and criticising the other side of it also. Sir, she has very carefully said that and she thanked the UPA Government for having borrowed some ideas from our election Budget and election manifesto. In AIADMK's election manifesto, we had said that fringe benefit tax should be abolished which they have accepted. They have increased the allocation for police modernisation. They have increased the allocation for defence. They have increased the allocation for border fencing. So, these are the areas of the AIADMK's election manifesto which are found in this Budget. So, in that case, she is very appropriate in appreciating it. Sir, at the same time, she also wanted the exemption limit of the income-tax of the salaried class to be increased to Rs. 5 lakh. That has not been done. But, they have done a marginal or symbolic increase which does not have any effect at all. Sir, ultimately, our Madam has said that they lack the long-term vision. Instead of going on for populist measures, they should have taken long-term measures. These are the impressions given by my political leader which I hasten to endorse.

Sir, I have made 3-4 parts to make my observations. Sir, before preparing anything, one is subject to certain pressures and background. Before preparing the Budget, they should have been taken into account the macro level situations and the micro level situations, the policies of the Government,..... the expectations of the ruling party and the people, and other considerations will be borne in mind. So, taking all these things into account, a Budget is to be prepared. They should have taken these things into account.

Sir, coming to global economic crisis, or global meltdown, and global recession, the Chair and the entire House know that it has got a tremendous effect world over; not on some countries alone, but on India as well. The Prime Minister, the Finance Minister and the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission have all conceded that there is some effect on account of the said factor. Unfortunately, they have not been pretty serious till the growth rate fell down a little and the inflation increased. And there was an unprecedented breakdown of the stockmarket. Till then, they have been thinking that the effect was only marginal. But after having seen all this, they are a little bit serious, pretty serious. But they have not done much, with the result that only some minor things have been taken into account. But it has no effect at all. Sir, the result is that the industry has gone down; jobs have been thrown out; several serious situations have taken place and the export also has been affected. It has got an impact on our economy. My simple question on this point is whether the hon. Finance Minister or the Minister of State for Finance, who is sitting here,

has taken into account the implication of the whole thing. I mean, whether they have taken it in the right spirit; whether or not they have done it. I have got my own doubts about whether the implications have really been taken into account in the proper perspective.

Coming to the next point of internal security, Sir, I need not say much about it because of the fact that with Naxalism, Maoism, terrorism or extremism, or whatever ism they are, prevailing throughout the length and breadth of the country, the people are becoming restless and ultimately, are finding it extremely difficult to live in peace. Absolute peace and public order are very essential than any other aspect. Top priority needs to be given to this aspect. But as far as this aspect is concerned, somehow or the other, the Government is trying to say, yes, yes, we are seized of the matter. What is it that you are seized of? The problem still persists. What I am trying to ask is, as far as your Budget is concerned, whether you have taken this serious aspect into account for doing something concrete. This is my second point, Sir.

Coming to the third point of corruption, from womb to tomb, and criminalisation of politics, politicisation of administration. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, as you know, in a democracy, there are three sides, namely, the people-elected representatives, the organisation of elected representatives elect the political executives. They operate through the bureaucracy and reach the people. This is the situation. What happens is, whatever be the scheme that you are trying to implement, its benefit does not reach the people at all. It is said, out of one rupee, only 15 paise reach the beneficiary. The result is there is only a 15 per cent benefit. What does it mean? With the erosion of ethics, and of vanishment of values, what happens is that corruption erupts to the core. On the other day, it was discussed in the House, during the Question Hour, to what extent corruption is prevailing in bureaucracy, and on the next day, what extent, corruption in judiciary! Everywhere it is spreading. What I am trying to ask here is, since it is a major problem, what you are going to provide in the Budget for correcting it. You have not done that. So, my third point is about the evil effect of black money. Sir, it has been assessed about 15 years back. ...*(Interruptions)*... Rs.30,000 crores of black money was in circulation; 21 per cent of that is mingling with GNP. But, according to the CVC, it is about 40 per cent. What I am trying to ask is: since black money is in circulation to a greater extent, what is going to be the effect of it on our economy; whether the Finance Minister has taken into account while formulating the Budget.

Coming to the next point of human development and poverty alleviation, I am sorry to say that even after six decades of achieving independence, the poverty has not been abolished. On the other hand, it is spreading everywhere. I mean, the farmers are committing suicide; people are suffering a lot, and a great number of people are badly suffering out of hunger. They are not able to

get even a single meal in a day. Whatever be the schemes that you are trying to implement, nothing reaches the public. That is how I look at it. In such a situation, what are you going to do? In this connection, I would like to mention one thing. If I say that, my friends may try to interfere. People need food. What do we do? When Madam Jayalalitha was the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, she had introduced a nice programme “Annadanam”. A number of my colleagues understand what is meant by “Annadanam”. I mean feeding the poor in temples. Whoever wants to eat food, they can go to the temple and eat food. This is known as “Annadanam”. This was going on very successfully. Unfortunately, that Annadanam scheme was stopped by our colleagues Government, the DMK, when they came to power. I am not attacking the DMK. Their policy is different and our policy is different. What I am trying to say is that the Government is not able to handle the problem of hunger, poverty, etc. When there is a way to do, it has not been accepted and followed. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA (Tamil Nadu): When we are giving one kilogram rice at Re.1, there is no need for Annadanam. We give one kilogram rice at Re.1. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, please. Don't interrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*... Don't interrupt.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Again, our Madam Jayalalitha very much appreciated your scheme of 25 kilograms of rice or wheat per month at Rs.3 per kilogram. While welcoming the move what she has mentioned is that specific allocation has not been made for this purpose. What is the use of mentioning it when no specific, exclusive allocation is made for that purpose? That is the point what our Madam is raising. Let us see what you are going to do on that. The Government has announced it. Let us see whether it will come through in practice.

Since you are showing signals every minute, I am running through the points like with haste. It has been announced in the Budget “a slum-free India” in five years. It sounds well. What I am trying to say is that in the urban areas they are trying to use all the land. They are trying to construct *pucca* houses and avoid slums. It sounds well. But where do you find the place? I want to impress upon the entire House that every year about 15 lakhs of vehicles are coming out. They are on the road. In major metre cities there is no mobility; there is no parking place; there is no road; there is no fly-over; there is no bridge; and with the result, in another five or six years, you can't find a single inch to move in your vehicle. This is the situation. This is a very gigantic problem. Whatever land is available in the urban areas, you are going to use it. I am not against slum dwellers at all. What is your aim in future? These are the problems that are coming up like anything. You are not taking into account those things. On the other hand, you are just announcing this and that. I will run through the points. Just one or two points.

This is a Budget in which everyone has expected that something will happen with regard to MPLADS. As far as the MPs are concerned, they are arguing for others. They speak for the public. The MPLADS is a very popular scheme and we are trying to create durable assets. When the Central Government Schemes or the State Government Schemes could not fulfil, they are fulfilled through the MPLADS. What I am trying to say is that the MPs have been given Rs.2 crores every year to be spent. As far as the Rajya Sabha Members are concerned, it is for the entire State and as far as the Lok Sabha Members are concerned, it is for their constituencies. This amount of Rs.2 crores should be enhanced like anything. So, proposal gone to the Ministry and the Ministry has recommended enhancement upto Rs.5 crores. Where is it now held up? It is held up either in the Finance Ministry or in the Cabinet. I don't know. I thought and many of us thought that some announcement will be made in this Budget. But they have not done it. They feel that this kind of an announcement should not be made at all. This is a Scheme in which everyone is interested. But, unfortunately, nothing has been done.

Another important point is this. Now you are talking about agriculture, irrigation, etc. Only four per cent of the agricultural sector is attempted to be developed. I am in favour of irrigation. What do you want to do? A lot of things can be done by interlinking all rivers. Interlinking of rivers is a major problem. It could be done very easily and it should be done. But, unfortunately, that is not taken into account. As regards interlinking of rivers, I thought there will be something in the Budget. Each State is trying in its own way and a few States do that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Malaisamy, you have left only eight minutes for your colleague.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: They say that it is a growth-oriented budget. They have not said anything uninstrumental for growth orientation. They have not done anything for savings. The budget has preferred only the rich class. Transaction tax has been abolished, income tax surcharge has been abolished; whereas, nothing has been done for the *Aam Admi*. What I am saying is, they are talking big about the *Aam Admi*; whereas, they have preferred only the rich people. They have neglected agriculture and the rural people. Good economics is good politics. There are a number of other things, which I want to mention. Since you are feeling uneasy, Sir, I conclude my speech. If permitted, I will speak later. Thank you.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मेरा नंबर था, मैं दो मिनट के लिए अखिलेश दास जी से बात करने के लिए चला गया था। मैं आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन) : आप कहाँ गए थे?

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक : अखिलेश दास जी ने बुला लिया था, उनसे बात करने गया था।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन) : आप उधर थे?

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक : जी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे.कुरियन) : ठीक है। ज्यादा टाइम मत लेना।

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक : जितना समय है, उतना ही बोलूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे.कुरियन) : ठीक है, बोलिए।

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: धन्यवाद उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बजट पर हो रही चर्चा में भाग लेने का अवसर दिया, इसके लिए आपके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करता हूं। आज देश को आजाद हुए लगभग साठ वर्ष से अधिक बीतने जा रहे हैं। इन साठ वर्षों के दौरान देश में अमीर आदमी अमीर हुआ है और गरीब आदमी गरीब होता चला गया है। इन साठ वर्षों में ज्यादातर समय कांग्रेस पार्टी और उनकी सहयोगी पार्टियों की सरकार रही है। कांग्रेस पार्टी ने ऐसा कोई मुकम्मल इंतजाम नहीं किया कि देश का गरीब आदमी भी अच्छे ढंग से जीवन-यापन कर पाता। महोदय, मैं वित्त मंत्री जी के बजट भाषण से ही प्रारंभ करूंगा। इन्होंने शुरुआत में ही कहा कि 1947 में जब हमारा देश आजाद हुआ, तो हमारा बजट खर्च 193 करोड़ रुपए दर्शाया गया था। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को बधाई देना चाहूंगा कि आज अपने देश का बजटीय खर्च लगभग 10 लाख करोड़ रुपए हो गया है। माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, पिछले कई वर्षों से केंद्र की सरकारें अपने बजट का व्यय बढ़ाने के उद्देश्य से राज्य सरकारों के साथ नाइंसाफी करती रही हैं। केंद्र सरकार का बजट व्यय बढ़ाने का एक मुख्य कारण है कि केंद्र सरकारें राज्य सरकारों को दिए जाने वाले धन, संवैधानिक संस्थाओं जैसे वित्त आयोग अथवा योजना आयोग के माध्यम से न देकर केंद्र द्वारा प्रायोजित योजनाओं के माध्यम से दे रही हैं। प्रत्येक बजट में इन केंद्र प्रायोजित योजनाओं की संख्या व धनराशियां कम होने की बजाय बढ़ रही हैं। मान्यवर, यह संवैधानिक व्यवस्था के विरुद्ध नहीं है तो क्या है? केंद्र सरकार ऐसे विषय, जो कि राज्य अथवा संयुक्त सूची के बारे में राज्यों को सीधे धन न देकर वाहवाही लूटने के लिए अपनी योजनाओं से, अपने नेताओं के नाम पर रखकर राज्य सरकारों को दी जाने वाली धनराशियों को कम करके, उसे इन योजनाओं के माध्यम से दे रही है। इस बजट में ऐसी नई केंद्र सहायतीय योजनाएं राज्य सरकारों की स्वायत्तता तथा स्थानीय स्तर, इनके द्वारा बेहतर नियोजन की प्रक्रिया के अनुसार कुठाराघात है, जिसका मैं और मेरी पार्टी निन्दा करती है। केंद्र सरकार की इस नीति का पालन करते हुए वर्तमान बजट में केंद्र सरकार द्वारा केंद्रीय करों व टैक्स की आय से सरकार को मिलने वाले अंश में अंतरिम बजट में दर्शाई गई धनराशि से 1300 करोड़ रुपए कम कर दिए गए हैं। राज्य सरकारों पर छठे वेतन आयोग की सिफारिशों को लागू करने के बोझ से जहां व्यय बढ़े हैं, वहीं भारत सरकार के बजट में इतनी बड़ी धनराशि से राज्य सरकार को मिलने वाली धनराशि कम करना उचित नहीं है तथा उत्तर प्रदेश की जनता के साथ धोखा है। यह बजट एक छलावा है। माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने गरीबों की संख्या कम करने का जो लक्ष्य रखा है, उसे वास्तविक रूप से वह उन्हें अमीर बनाकर नहीं, बल्कि उनकी संख्या कागजों पर कम करके कर रहे हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश में भारत सरकार द्वारा गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले परिवारों की संख्या, पिचयानवें लाख परिवारों की संख्या कई वर्ष से स्थिर रखी गई है, जबकि पूर्व में ही, जब गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे की परिकल्पना की गई थी, तब भी संख्या से अधिक गरीब परिवार राज्य में थे। राज्य सरकार के बार-बार अनुरोध के बावजूद केंद्र सरकार द्वारा प्रदेश में गरीबों की वास्तविक संख्या को दर्शाया नहीं जा रहा है। इससे अभी भी प्रदेश में कई लाख गरीब परिवार केंद्र सरकार व प्रदेश सरकार की गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे रहने वाले परिवारों के लिए चलाई जा रही योजनाओं का लाभ नहीं उठा पा रहे हैं। इस बजट में गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले परिवारों की संख्या को वास्तविक न करके उसमें कमी करने की बात कही गई है, जोकि केंद्र सरकार के इस कथन से एक सहभागी विकास बजट है। यह बजट की धज्जियां उड़ा रही है। माननीय मंत्री जी, आपकी जानकारी के लिए ग्रामीण

विकास मंत्रालय द्वारा बनाई गई एन.सी. सक्सेना कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में बताया है कि देश में पचास प्रतिशत लोग गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहते हैं। ऐसे में माननीय मंत्री जी द्वारा बजट भाषण में गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे के परिवारों की संख्या के आँकड़ों में कमी करके उन्हें सरकारी योजनाओं से वंचित रखने के साथ-साथ 10 लाख रुपए की वार्षिक आय से अधिक की आय के करदाताओं को सरचार्ज से छूट देना इस सरकार की गरीबों के प्रति भेदभाव तथा अमीरों के प्रति हमदर्दी को दर्शाता है। हमारी मांग है कि जहाँ आय कर में सरचार्ज को समाप्त किया जाए, वहीं गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले परिवारों की संख्या को आँकड़ेबाजी में सीमित न करके वास्तविक रूप से इनकी संख्या बढ़ाई जानी चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Brajesh Pathak, as per the rules, you cannot read out a written speech. ...**(व्यवधान)**... सुनिए, रूल के अनुसार ऐसे prepared text को पढ़ने की अनुमति नहीं है।

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक : मैं वैसे बोल सकता था, लेकिन कुछ points छूट जाते।

डा. अखिलेश दास गुप्ता (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, बाकी सभी लोग कुछ points लेकर आते हैं। He is quoting. Only points are there. It is not a written speech. He is only referring to points.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): He can refer to the written text for points. But he cannot read continuously.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक : सर, ठीक है। कोई दिक्कत नहीं है।

सर, ऊर्जा के क्षेत्र में भी बजट में कुछ विशेष प्रावधान नहीं किया गया है। उत्तरी ग्रीड से उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार को बिजली मिलती रही है। अब सरकार ने तय किया है कि उत्तरी ग्रीड से जो बिजली मिलेगी, उस बिजली को खुले बाजार में नीलाम किया जाएगा यानी अब कोई भी स्टेट उत्तरी ग्रीड से बिजली ले सकती है। आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से हमारा अनुरोध है कि उत्तरी ग्रीड से उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार को जो बिजली मिलती थी, उत्तर प्रदेश की जनता को जो बिजली मिलती थी, उसका हक न मारा जाए। यह उत्तर प्रदेश के निवासियों के साथ अत्याचार और अन्याय होगा।

मान्यवर, बजट में उत्तर प्रदेश में नोएडा के पास जेवर में बन रहे हवाई अड्डे के बारे में भी कोई उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है। पूर्व में सरकार ने तय किया था और उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने प्रस्ताव भी दिया था कि नोएडा में एक हवाई अड्डा बनाया जाए। अभी दिन में Calling Attention Motion पर चर्चा चल रही थी, माननीय उड्डयन मंत्री जी बड़ी बुरी हालत में फँसे हुए थे। देश भर के सांसद और पूरी जनता कह रही थी कि उड्डयन विभाग घाटे में चल रहा है, एयर इंडिया घाटे में चल रही है। हम देखते हैं कि हवाई अड्डे के ऊपर घंटों, 45 मिनट, एक घंटे तक हवाई जहाज ऊपर चक्कर काटते रहते हैं। इससे पेट्रोल भी जलता है और यात्रियों को भी परेशानी होती है। इन सब देश के नागरिकों को, दिल्ली के नागरिकों को, आसपास के लोगों को परेशानी से छुटकारा दिलाने के लिए नोएडा में हवाई अड्डा प्रस्तावित किया गया था। आपके माध्यम से हमारा सरकार से अनुरोध है कि नोएडा में जो हवाई अड्डा प्रस्तावित है, तत्काल उस पर कार्रवाई करते हुए हवाई अड्डा बनाने के लिए कार्य शुरू कराएँ, जिससे आसपास के आगरा, मथुरा, वृंदावन जैसे धार्मिक महत्व के क्षेत्र हैं, पर्यटन के महत्व के क्षेत्र हैं, जहाँ देश-विदेश से हजारों नागरिक पर्यटन के लिए उत्तर प्रदेश आते हैं, साथ ही जो देश की राजधानी आना चाहते हैं, उन लोगों को जाम से निजात मिल सकेगी। उन लोगों को दिल्ली के ऊपर घंटों चक्कर नहीं लगाना पड़ेगा। इससे पेट्रोल भी बचेगा और एयर इंडिया भी इससे कुछ राहत महसूस कर सकेगी।

सर, बजट में माननीय मंत्री जी ने तमिल नागरिकों के पुनर्वास के लिए 5 सौ करोड़ रुपए का बजटीय प्रावधान किया है। हम धन्यवाद ज्ञापित करते हैं कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने तमिलों के लिए इतनी बड़ी धनराशि आवंटित की है। लेकिन मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूँगा और उनसे अनुरोध भी करना चाहूँगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में बुंदेलखंड और पूर्वांचल, दो ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं, जहाँ पर सूखा...**(व्यवधान)**...

डा. वी. मैत्रेयन (तमिलनाडु) : वह तमिलनाडु के तमिलों के लिए नहीं है, श्रीलंका के तमिलों के लिए है।

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक : जी हाँ, वह श्रीलंका के तमिलों के लिए दिया है। हमारा उनके प्रति समर्थन है। श्रीलंका के हमारे जो तमिल भाई हैं, उनके लिए केन्द्र सरकार ने जो पैसा दिया, उसके लिए हम आपत्ति नहीं करते हैं। हम इसका समर्थन करते हैं कि उनको मदद देना अच्छी बात है। लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश में बुंदेलखंड और पूर्वांचल, जो अक्सर सूखे की चपेट और दैवी आपदाओं से घिरे रहते हैं, उनके बारे में हमारी नेता बहन कुमारी मायावती जी ने कई बार केन्द्र सरकार को चिट्ठी लिखी, वे प्रधान मंत्री जी से खुद मिलीं कि 80 हजार करोड़ रुपए का विशेष पैकेज दिया जाए, जिससे बुंदेलखंड और पूर्वांचल के लोगों को भी जीने लायक व्यवस्था उपलब्ध करा सकें। हमें तो ऐसा महसूस होता है कि उधर तो उनको वोटों की संख्या दिखाई पड़ रही है, लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश में भी आम जनता रहती है, वहाँ भी आपके लोग रहते हैं, चूँकि आप केन्द्र सरकार में हैं, तो वहाँ बुंदेलखंड और पूर्वांचल के लिए अलग से आपको बजटीय प्रावधान करके विशेष पैकेज देना चाहिए था। आपने पिछले दिनों सामरा कमेटी बनाकर और उसे वहाँ भेजकर अध्ययन भी करवाया था कि वहाँ के नागरिकों की क्या समस्याएँ हैं। लेकिन उस कमेटी का क्या निर्णय आया, आज तक उससे न तो सदन को अवगत कराया गया और न ही लोगों को बताया गया है कि कमेटी ने क्या निर्णय लिया। बुंदेलखंड और पूर्वांचल में आज तक कोई राहत राशि नहीं भेजी गई है।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं कुछ विशेष बिन्दुओं पर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूँगा। बजट में जिन प्रावधानों को शामिल किया गया है, कहा तो यह गया है कि यह आम आदमी का बजट है, गरीबों का बजट है, लेकिन आम आदमी और गरीबों की बात तो दूर रही, यह केवल खास आदमियों और अमीरों का बजट बन कर रह गया है। Fringe Benefit Tax का लाभ, जिसे कंपनियाँ अपने कर्मचारियों को देती थीं, उसे समाप्त करके यह दर्शाया गया है कि यह बजट केवल बड़े लोगों और बड़ी कंपनियों का हिमायती है, पूँजीपतियों और धन्या सेठों का हिमायती है। Commodity Trade Tax को समाप्त कर दिया गया है। गेहूँ और चावल, जो हमारी आम जनता के उपयोग की चीजें हैं, इसमें दलालों को बढ़ावा देने के लिए, उन्हें फायदा पहुंचाने के लिए यह किया गया है।

10 लाख रुपये सालाना और उससे अधिक की आय वाले समाज के उच्च वर्ग के लोगों पर इन्कम टैक्स सर-चार्ज समाप्त कर दिया गया है। इसका मतलब यह है कि जिसकी आय 10 लाख रुपये से अधिक होगी, उसको तो राहत देने का काम किया गया है, लेकिन जिसकी आय दो लाख रुपये होगी, उसे हमारे बजट से मात्र एक हजार रुपये का फायदा होगा। जिसकी आय 11 लाख रुपये होगी, उसे 20 हजार रुपये का फायदा होगा, जिसकी आय 20 लाख रुपये होगी, उसे 50 हजार रुपये के लगभग फायदा पहुंचेगा। यह बात स्वयं इस चीज को दर्शाती है कि यह गरीब, आम आदमी का बजट है अथवा अमीरों का बजट है।

राजनीतिक पार्टियों में चंदा लेने की परम्परा रही है, उसमें एक कदम और आगे बढ़ाते हुए, चन्दे को 100% कर मुक्त किया गया है। इससे यह साफ हो जाता है कि राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ ज्यादा से ज्यादा चंदा बटोर सकें और कौन सी राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ इससे चंदा बटोरेंगी, यह पूरा देश जानता है।

पेट्रोल-डीज़ल के दाम बढ़ा करके सरकार ने यह साबित कर दिया है कि आम आदमी से उसका कोई लेना-देना नहीं है। मैं आपके सामने पेट्रोल और डीज़ल के कुछ आंकड़े रखना चाहता हूँ। 7 जून 2008 को डीज़ल का दाम 37.25 रुपये प्रति लीटर था और पेट्रोल का दाम 50.82 रुपये प्रति लीटर था। जब चुनाव होने वाला था, तो सरकार ने 29 जनवरी, 2009 को बताया कि डीज़ल 32.41 रुपये और पेट्रोल 43.47 रुपये हो गया है। किन्तु सत्ता पाते ही इन्होंने बजट सत्र का इंतजार भी नहीं किया कि सदन में यह घोषणा करते, यह लगातार पेट्रोल और डीज़ल के दामों में बेतहाशा वृद्धि करते गए। इससे यह साबित होता है कि इस सरकार का गरीबों से, आम

आदमी से कोई लेना-देना नहीं है। महंगाई के कारण गरीब आदमी की कमर टूट गई है, उनके पेट पर लात पड़ी है।

इस बजट से बड़े ट्रांसपोर्टरों को भी फायदा पहुंचाया गया है। पहले ट्रक पर 20% टैक्स हुआ करता था, अब उसे घटाकर 8% कर दिया गया है। रेलवे से ढोए जाने वाले जो खाद्यान्न पदार्थ हैं अथवा अन्य सामग्रियां हैं, उन पर सर्विस टैक्स बढ़ा कर गरीबों की कमर तोड़ने का दोबारा प्रयास किया गया है। इसमें हथकरघा बनुकरों की बात भी की गई है, क्लस्टर कई जगह बनाया जाएगा, लेकिन हजूर, जो हमारे हथकरघा बुनकर सूती धागा बनाएंगे, उस पर सरकार ने 8% की दर से टैक्स लगाने का काम किया है, जिससे गरीब आदमी की हालत और पतली हो गई है और उसकी कमर टूटने लगी है।

बजट से पूर्व तेल की खोज पर टैक्स लाभ दिए जाने की व्यवस्था थी कि केन्द्र सरकार ने इस बजट पर तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस के उत्पादन पर टैक्स हॉलिडे सुविधा, चुनिन्दा उत्पादकों को लाभ देने की नीयत से दी है। ये चहेते कौन हैं, यह सारा देश जानता है। सरकार ने हमारी नेता बहन कुमारी मायावती जी की देखादेखी उत्तर प्रदेश की ही तर्ज पर पूरे देश में अम्बेडकर ग्राम योजना की तरह प्रधानमंत्री आदर्श ग्राम योजना की शुरुआत की है...(व्यवधान)।

श्री नन्द किशोर यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): क्या आपकी योजना...(व्यवधान)

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: क्या आप चुप रहेंगे? आपको कोई कष्ट है क्या? ...(व्यवधान) अच्छा, आप अपनी लगा लो...(व्यवधान)

हमारा आपसे अनुरोध है कि बहन कुमारी मायावती जी ने जो व्यवस्था अम्बेडकर ग्राम योजना के माध्यम से की, उसमें प्रत्येक गांव के लिए लगभग 80 लाख रुपये खर्च करने की व्यवस्था थी, उन 80 लाख रुपयों में उन्होंने सड़क, पानी, बिजली, स्कूल, अस्पताल और ढेर सारी नागरिक सुविधाओं को उपलब्ध कराया, लेकिन केन्द्र सरकार ने एक गांव के लिए मात्र 10 लाख रुपये की व्यवस्था की है। उसमें भी स्पष्ट केवल 1000 गांवों के बारे में ऐसी योजना लागू किए जाने का बजटीय प्रावधान किया गया है। यह गरीबों के साथ धोखा है।

श्री नन्द किशोर यादव: आपने 50 करोड़ रुपये की मूर्ति ...(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. Please.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: आपके तो नहीं लग रहे हैं, इसलिए आप चुप बैठिए ...(व्यवधान) आप चुप बैठेंगे कि नहीं ...(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Pathak, look here. ...(Interruptions)... Mr. Pathak. ...(Interruptions).

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: आप चुप बैठेंगे कि नहीं, आपको क्या दिक्कत हो रही है ...(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Pathak, please sit down. (Interruptions)

श्री राम नारायण साहू (उत्तर प्रदेश): सच्चाई सुनने की हिम्मत नहीं है ...(व्यवधान)

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: आप नोटिस दो और बोलो ..(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Pathak. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: पहले नोटिस दो, फिर बोलो ..(व्यवधान) गरीबों का खून चूस कर ...(व्यवधान) तुम क्या बात करोगे ..(व्यवधान) बैठो आप, फालतू मत बोला करो ..(व्यवधान)

श्री राम नारायण साहू (उत्तर प्रदेश): आप गलत बोलोगे तो सुनोगे ...(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Pathak, you sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: सर, यह बीच में कैसे बोल सकते हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Sahu, sit down....*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Sahu, take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Sahu, take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Pathak, look here.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: सर, अगर कोई पीछे से मुझे डिस्टर्ब कर रहा है...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Sahu, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Pathak, yes, I know, there were some disturbances. ...*(Interruptions)*... But, you have no business to look back and talk. You remember it. You have to address the Chair only. You should know that.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: सर, अगर कोई पीछे से मुझे डिस्टर्ब कर रहा है तो हम क्या करेंगे...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Interruptions from others, I don't approve of. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: सर, अगर मुझ पर सीधा कोई व्यक्तिगत आक्षेप करेगा, तो ...*(व्यवधान)*... उसका विरोध करने का ...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You have no business to interrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*... सुनिए, सुनिए ...*(व्यवधान)*... आप बैठिए...*(व्यवधान)*... You have no business to stand up when I am standing. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sit down, sit down...*(Interruptions)*... You have no business to stand up when I am standing. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे कानून का अच्छी तरह से ज्ञान है...*(व्यवधान)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप पहले मेरी बात सुनिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: मुझे कानून का अच्छी तरह से ज्ञान है...*(व्यवधान)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप पहले मेरी बात सुनिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: लेकिन अगर पीछे से टोका-टोकी होगी ...*(व्यवधान)*...तो मैं भी बोलूँगा। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप पहले मेरी बात सुनिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

पाठक जी, आप एक नये मैम्बर हैं, यह मुझे मालूम है। लेकिन, आपको इतना मालूम होना चाहिए कि आपको चेयर को एड्रेस करना है। अगर कोई आपको डिस्टर्ब करे तो यह आपका काम नहीं है कि पीछे मुड़ कर झगड़ा करें। यह follow करना मेरा काम है...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: सर, मैं झगड़ा नहीं कर रहा हूँ ...*(व्यवधान)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): सुनिए, सुनिए। So, if you want to continue your speech, you can continue. But, remember, don't look back. You address only the Chair. Then, with regard to other Members, Sahu Saheb and other Members, please don't try to disturb. Why do you want to try to disturb? When your chance comes, you can speak. Why do you want to trouble ...*(Interruptions)*... Please don't do that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री राम नारायण साहू: सर, उत्तर प्रदेश में बिजली नहीं है...(व्यवधान)... गोमती नगर में जाकर आप देखिए...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no; Sahuji. ...*(Interruptions)*... आप बैठिए, बैठिए...(व्यवधान)...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: महोदय, अब बर्दाश्त करने वाले नहीं हैं ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Pathak, don't look back. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Pathak, you address the Chair. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: इसे हम कतई बर्दाश्त करने वाले नहीं हैं ...(व्यवधान)... आप इनको समझा दीजिए कि यह अपना काम करें ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You don't look back. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: जब इनकी बारी आए, तब यह खूब बोलें। ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Pathak, don't look back. ...*(Interruptions)*... You address the Chair. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: नहीं, इनसे कहिए कि यह मुँह में ...(व्यवधान)... टेप चिपका लें ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Don't look back. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Pathak, if you look back and speak, I will expunge everything from the record. I will ask you to stop your speech. I am telling you.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: महोदय, आपसे हमारा सीधा-सा अनुरोध है कि अगर कोई व्यक्तिगत बात करेगा तो हम उस पर जरूर बोलेंगे। ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no; you address the Chair.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: हम आपके सामने बोलेंगे। लेकिन, इनसे कहिए कि यह पीछे से डिस्टर्ब न करें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): ठीक है। आप बोलिए।

DR. AKHILESH DAS GUPTA: But, Sir, he is making a personal comment. That is the problem.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Don't worry. I will take care.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: सर, अगर हमारी नेता के बारे में कोई व्यक्तिगत आक्षेप करेगा, तब हम आगे-पीछे थोड़े ही देखेंगे! ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no; you need not tolerate it. I am here tolerating it. I will tolerate it. You continue your speech. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is not your job. Your job is only to address the Chair. You understand it. This is my job.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: सर, इस बजट में शहरी गरीबों को आवास देने का बहुत अच्छा निर्णय लिया गया है, slum-free India की बात की गई है, लेकिन ग्रामीण भारत के बारे में, गरीबों के बारे में कोई भी चर्चा नहीं की गई है और न ही इंदिरा आवास योजना, जो केन्द्र सरकार के माध्यम से राज्य सरकारों को मिलती है, उसमें धनराशि बढ़ाने के बारे में ही विचार किया गया। केवल 25 हजार रुपए इंदिरा आवास योजना के माध्यम से BPL परिवारों

को मिलते रहे हैं। हम आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहते हैं कि 25 हजार रुपए में कौन-सा घर बन जाएगा, क्या हो जाएगा? ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में रहने वाले गरीबों के बारे में भी सरकार को विचार करना चाहिए।

सरकार ने अपने बजट में विद्युतीकरण को बढ़ाने के बारे में भी बात की है। उत्तर प्रदेश के अन्दर राजस्व गाँव, जो बड़े गाँव हैं, उनमें तो विद्युतीकरण लगभग पूर्ण होने को है, लेकिन जो मजरे छूट गए हैं या जो छोटे गाँव हैं, जहाँ हमारे शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के भाई रहते हैं, जहाँ अनुसूचित जाति तथा अनुसूचित जनजाति के लोग रहते हैं, उनके गाँवों के विद्युतीकरण के बारे में इस बजट में कोई प्रावधान नहीं किया गया है। FRBM कानून के तहत केन्द्र सरकार का राजकोषीय घाटा 6.8 प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं हो सकता है, लेकिन राज्य सरकारों से कहा गया है कि यह घाटा 4 प्रतिशत से अधिक न हो, जो कि राज्यों के साथ अन्याय प्रतीत होता है।

सर, महाराष्ट्र में चुनाव है। मुम्बई को उसकी दशा सुधारने के लिए 500 करोड़ रुपए दिए गए हैं, लेकिन माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार ने महाराष्ट्र के उन किसानों के बारे में बजट में कोई प्रावधान नहीं किया, जो बेचारे सूदखोरों के चक्कर में आत्महत्या करने को विवश हैं। उनके बारे में सरकार ने इसमें कोई प्रावधान नहीं किया है। ऐसा महसूस होता है कि सिर्फ चुनावी बजट दे कर मुम्बई को खुश करने का प्रयास किया गया है। लेकिन महाराष्ट्र के उन किसानों के बारे में कोई बात नहीं कही गयी है।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हालात बहुत खराब हैं। चुनाव जीत लेना, सरकार बना लेना कोई बड़ी बात नहीं है, लेकिन सरकार में बैठे लोगों की यह जिम्मेदारी है कि वे देश के सभी वर्गों का ख्याल रखें, सभी को साथ लेकर चलें और एक ऐसा प्रदृश्य देश में प्रस्तुत करें, जिससे देश की आम जनता को, सभी वर्गों को महसूस हो कि सरकार उनका ख्याल रखती है। यह सरकार सभी की है। महोदय, कहा गया कि यह आम आदमी का बजट है, लेकिन इसे पढ़ने के बाद यही महसूस होता है कि केवल यह खास आदमियों का, अमीरों का बजट है।

महोदय, इस सरकार के पहले परमाणु करार के मुद्दे पर बड़ी बहस चली और लोक सभा के अंदर यह बार-बार कहा गया कि हम परमाणु करार इसलिए करने जा रहे हैं ताकि देश में गरीब की कुटिया में, उसकी झोंपड़ी में बिजली जले, लेकिन बड़े दुख की बात है कि इस बजट में परमाणु करार और परमाणु बिजली के बारे में कहीं कोई चर्चा नहीं है। उस गांव की बुढ़िया के बारे में, जिस का नाम पालियामेंट में अक्सर लिया जाता रहा है, उसकी भी चर्चा नहीं है कि उस की कुटिया में बिजली कब जलेगी? इस बात की भी चर्चा नहीं है कि इस साल में गरीब के घर में एक बल्ब भी जल जाएगा या नहीं। महोदय, यह कहा गया कि सोलर इनर्जी से काम चलेगा, लेकिन मैं आप के माध्यम से वित्त मंत्री जी से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सोलर इनर्जी बारहों मास चलेगी? महोदय, बरसात होती है, प्राकृतिक आपदाएं आती हैं, आंधी-तूफान आते हैं, उनमें सोलर इनर्जी कहां से आएगी? लेकिन इस सरकार के द्वारा गरीबों का मजाक उड़ाने का प्रयास लगातार जारी है क्योंकि सरकार बन गयी है, अब देश की जनता पूरे साल क्या कर सकती है? उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से यहां एक सच्ची घटना बयान करना चाहता हूँ। एक अमीर घराने की लड़की को स्कूल में “एक गरीब परिवार” पर निबंध लिखने को कहा गया। उस लड़की ने लिखा, एक गरीब परिवार था। उसमें पिता गरीब, मां गरीब, परिवार में चार नौकर, वे भी गरीब। उनकी टूटी प्राडो कार और उनका ड्राइवर भी गरीब। उस परिवार के बच्चे-बच्चियों को स्कूल छोड़ने बेचारा गरीब ड्राइवर टूटी प्राडो कार में जाया करता था। उनके बच्चे “ताजा” जैसे होटल में हफ्ते में तीन दिन खाना खा पाते थे। ऐसे गरीब परिवार के बारे में उस अमीर घर की बच्ची ने essay लिखा था। ऐसा महसूस होता है कि सरकार में बैठे लोग भी उसी essay की परिकल्पना को मजबूती से आगे बढ़ाने में लगे हैं। महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि कुदरत ने आपको देश के लोगों की सेवा करने का मौका दिया है। देश के लोगों ने आप को अपनी अंतःआत्मा की आवाज पर, हृदय की आवाज पर देश

सेवा करने का मौका दिया है। पिछले 60 सालों में से 50 साल आप को ही देश की सेवा करने का मौका मिला है, अब आप वही काम कीजिए जो देश को आगे बढ़ाने वाले हों। तभी हम देश के उन महान सपूतों का सपना पूरा कर पाएंगे जोकि हंसते-हंसते फ्रांसी के फंदे पर झूल गए थे, तभी हम उनके सपनों को मूर्त रूप दे पाएंगे।

महोदय, मैं एक और अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ। इस बजट में ढेर सारे प्रावधानों की व्यवस्था की गयी है, लेकिन देश के अंदर व्याप्त नक्सलपंथी की समस्या पर केवल बजटीय प्रावधान किया गया है। महोदय, हमारे पूर्व गृह मंत्री जी बैठे हैं। हम गोली से नक्सलपंथ की समस्या को नहीं निपटा सकते। हमें इसके लिए देखना पड़ेगा कि हमारे सामाजिक, आर्थिक व भौगोलिक आधार क्या हैं? आखिर वे भी हमारे देश के लोग हैं। हमें देखना पड़ेगा कि कैसे उन के रास्ते बदल गए? वे कैसे हमारे देश के ही निरीह लोगों की जान लेने लगे? अभी हमारे एक कप्तान व कई लोगों को बारूदी सुरंग से उड़ा दिया गया। आए दिन हमें नक्सली हमले की सूचनाएं मिलती रहती हैं। मैं सरकार से आग्रह करूंगा कि उनके साथ बातचीत कर के मुख्य धारा में लाने का प्रयास करें। वे कोई विदेशी आतंकवादी नहीं हैं, हमारे देश के लोग हैं। उनसे बातचीत कर के उनको पटरी पर ला सकते हैं और इस तरह देश को नक्सली समस्या से छुटकारा दिला सकते हैं।

महोदय, मैं एक और महत्वपूर्ण बात की ओर आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। सरकार बजट लायी है, जैसा भी लायी, ठीक है। अब सरकार चलाना इन का काम है और जनता के सामने सही बातें रखना हमारी duty है, लेकिन देश में जिस तरीके से जाली करेंसी पड़ोसी देशों से आ रही है, इस बारे में गृह मंत्री व वित्त मंत्री, दोनों को गंभीरता से विचार करना पड़ेगा। माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी पिछले दिनों, लगभग एक सप्ताह पूर्व खर्च के लिए मैंने कुछ पैसे पार्लियामेंट के ATM से निकाले थे। उस पैसे को जब मैंने दुकान पर भेजा तो मुझे पता चला यह पांच सौ रुपये का जाली नोट पार्लियामेंट के ATM से निकला है। इस पर “Fake” लिख कर मुझे वापिस किया गया है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no, you are not supposed to exhibit like this. Don't do that.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: अगर आप अनुमति दें तो मैं इसको सदन में रखना चाहता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You are not permitted.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: It is a document. He is authenticating it.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: मैं इसको सदन में रखना चाहता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): For that you should have taken permission.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: यह मुझे पार्लियामेंट के ATM से मिला है और यह ऐसा नोट है ..(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Exhibiting is against the rule. Don't do that.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: He is authenticating it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): You cannot exhibit any pamphlet or anything.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): He is taking your permission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): I have not permitted. Then, why do you say like that. I have not permitted to present it on the Table. For tabling, you should have taken the permission. I have not permitted.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: कोई बात नहीं। आप मेरी पूरी बात सुन लीजिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): If you want to bring that issue, you can bring it in a different way.

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: हमारा आपसे कहना है कि हम चाहे कितना भी अच्छा बजट बना लें, लेकिन यदि हम जाली currency को भारत में आने से नहीं रोक पाएंगे तो हमारा बजट कुछ नहीं कर सकता। हमारी पूरी अर्थव्यवस्था चौपट हो जाएगी। ..(व्यवधान)

श्री के.बी. शणप्पा (कर्णाटक): कहाँ से आया जाली नोट?

श्री ब्रजेश पाठक: ATM से। Parliament Annexe के ATM से मैंने यह निकाला और जब इसे दुकान पर भेजा तो दुकानदार ने इसके पीछे “Fake” लिख कर मुझे वापिस किया। मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि ऐसे गंभीर विषयों पर सरकार को ध्यान देना पड़ेगा कि जाली currency को हिन्दुस्तान में आने से कैसे रोका जाए और भारतीय अर्थव्यवस्था को चौपट होने से कैसे रोका जाए। मैं ज्यादा वक्त न लेते हुए, आपको धन्यवाद ज्ञापित करते हुए अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। जय हिन्द। जय भीम।

SHRI N.K. SINGH (Bihar): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir. Let me get back into fashion. The fashionable thing these days is Kautilya and let me begin by, therefore, quoting one little stuff from Kautilya which the Finance Minister perhaps should have known. Kautilya said, ‘That a king with a depleted treasury will eat into the vitals of its citizens and the common people’. Obviously, Kautilya was not a mere economist, but perhaps, an astrologer to have known the configurations of Indian finances of 14th June, 2010. It is not as if that the Finance Minister who is no novice to the world of finance has’nt done a credible job in balancing several asymmetries in perhaps seeking relaxation from fiscal rectitude to fostering growth, forgetting inflation, reviving consumption, putting money into infrastructure, rural development with a view to try and get back the country to a higher growth trajectory. In this balancing act, which is quite credible, there are several important factors which I thought he has overlooked. First and foremost is the issue of sustainability. I don’t want to go more into this but the raw fact remains that a 6.8 per cent fiscal deficit of the Central Government when added to a four per cent deficit of a State and add it to under-recoveries of 30,000 crores on current prices of petroleum with a likelihood of prices going up and with a lot of under provisioning on account of other things which will happen, the fiscal deficit will turn out to be close to 12-13 per cent of the GDP. This alone entails at least a Rs. 4,00,000 crores of borrowing. The explanation that Rs. 2,00,000 crore may come out from open market borrowed operations of the Reserve Bank is, perhaps, a fiction because, we know that an open market operation of this nature is neither possible nor feasible, and that the only ultimate outcome would be a substantial monetisation of the fiscal deficit and, that, Sir, this embeds the system with deep inflationary pressures. So, there are inherent serious concerns on the macro fundamentals of the economy.

In fact, the hon. Finance Minister goes on, perhaps, to recognise this a little later, but not before he has gone to another fiction. That intermediate fiction is a document which he has placed along with the Budget entitled ‘Medium Term Fiscal Policy Statement.’ What does that Policy

Statement say, Sir? It says that next year and the year after, the fiscal deficit, including the revenue deficit, would undergo a correction of 3 percentage points. There are no expenditure plans. Or, what expenditure plans would be rolled back? There are no additional revenue realisations. The expectation of corporate revenues going up by 15 per cent, with income tax revenues going down by 6 per cent, is something which totally lacks credibility. In fact, the only truthful part of the Medium Term Fiscal Policy Statement is the concluding part of that statement. What does that conclusion says? With your permission, Sir, I read it. The last sentence of the Fiscal Policy Statement says and I quote, "Without putting at risk the revival process, the Government will look at exit strategies as soon as there is an improvement in the economic condition." This is a more realistic statement, because here the return to the path of fiscal rectitude is an open-ended one. Therefore, this is in sharp contrast to what he has said earlier, namely put definite numbers on what he intends to do next year and what he intends to thereafter.

My second important issue and quarrel with the Budget is this. Does the Budget address the fundamental issue that this is the right strategy to reverse in the decline in the growth rate? Independent international studies have shown that the Indian economy had peaked in 2006-07. If you look at really the third quarter statement of the year 2006-07, the GDP growth has climbed up to 9.6 per cent. The manufacturing sector has climbed up to 12.2 per cent. For every successive quarter, after the third quarter of 2006-07, there comes a decline till you come to the last quarter of 2008-09 when the GDP growths have collapsed and the manufacturing sector is down in the negative. The point I am trying to make is that the decline of the Indian economy, the GDP growth and the manufacturing sector began much before the global crisis had hit us. Therefore, to really put the Indian economic situation contingent on the exogenous variable of a looming global crisis is misleading us. We, therefore, need to ask ourselves a question that, perhaps, the economy had run out of steam. Perhaps, we need endemic solutions. Perhaps, there were institutional bottlenecks. Perhaps, there were infrastructural bottlenecks. And, till, therefore, these begin to get addressed, this kind of an artificial fiscal stimulus package will only bring a temporary reprieve, because it will not address the more fundamental endemic causes which led to the decline of the Indian economy one year before the beginning of the global economic crisis.

My third point is about the quality of stimulus. Sir, out of 120,000 crores extra which has been put into the system, Rs. 44,000 crores go to the Pay Commission, Rs. 33,000 crores goes to the interest payments, Rs. 10,000 crores goes to contribution to the International Monetary Fund. In fact, the real increase in areas on which Government claims a lot of credit for is a miniscule about. If you combine, for instance, the NAREGA increase with the Grameen Rozgar Yojna, the increase is 0.7 per cent. The SSA programme, the primary flagship programme on education, there is a decline. In rural development, the increase is only 0.38 per cent. On child welfare the increase is

awfully 0.8 per cent. In fact, the most of the increases have gone on into boosting consumption, not gone into capital creating assets and not gone into those investments which will have long-term multiplier effects to the Indian economy. Therefore, first and foremost, the increases are nominal and they have gone into directions which may not leave a permanent impact on the economy.

My forth point is that a lot of credit has been taken by the hon. Finance Minister for the introduction of GST from 1st April, 2010. I recognise this is an important step. But, perhaps, the Constitutional legal changes which are necessary and the kind of harmonisation of many differences between different States and the consensus building in the political process we are really running behind time and we only hope and wish that he is able to do so. Let me say this that nothing would be more terrible than to hastily introduce an ill-conceived GST, because that will only enhances the distortory tax structure. It is better to plan and introduce more carefully. My fifth point is this. Nothing has been done to improve the overall climate for private investment. In fact, the one, on Integrated Energy Policy, again, is flawed because we have tinkered with the policy. We have not tried to own our past contractual liability on oil and gas. We have suddenly changed regimes without giving a proper notice. We have detracted from credibility and from investors' confidence. So, Sir, the short point is, India is in a debt-trap. At today's debt numbers of roughly 87 per cent of the GDP, the Government owes every Indian Rs. 45,050/- . In 2011 and 2012, the Government would owe every Indian Rs. 67,375/- . Look at the kind of miniscule tax breaks. Look at the kind of woeful debtrap, which the Government has created. In fact, one can only end up by saying that all that the Finance Minister wishes to say, in his fiscal policy statement, is, "Oh Lord! Make me prudent. But wait for it, not now." And, in fact, hopefully he does not end up by saying, "Blessed thee be to the newer generation because thou shall inherit my debt".

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

So, what is really the path forward? I would like to say, for the submission of the Government, ten very quick suggestions. First and foremost, make greater fiscal room to allow States half-a-percentage point more and reduce the fiscal deficit of the Central Government by half percentage point to keep the equilibrium going. Second, stop cherry picking and have a more equal treatment. I have no problems with giving cherry-picking to West Bengal, to Maharashtra and to other parts of the country. But do so equally, in an even-handed way to the other parts of the country, following the cardinal principle of fiscal federalism in which we play a political neutrality in devolution of funds and in being able to start and initiate development projects. Third, come up with a more credible detailed White Paper on returning to the path of fiscal rectitude, with a better outlined path of fiscal consolidation, not by mere rhetoric, but with stiffening of political

spine, which comes up with a credible action plan. Fourth, the Finance Minister, on page 40 of his Fiscal Responsibility Programme, has come up with an excellent suggestion to set up an Independent Evaluation Office to go into public outlays. Set up this office as soon as possible since so much faith has been placed in public outlays.

Fifth, create an office of public debt to begin to obviate the conflict of interests, which the Reserve Bank has, since the Government has an enormous portfolio in the management of public debt. Sixth, restructure the Reserve Bank of India by creating a separate banking supervisory authority to again obviate the conflict of interests in the Reserve Bank, managing two kinds of areas where there is an inherent conflict. Seventh, based on the President's Joint Address, urge the Ministries to come up with individual papers on what their action programme is and how they intend to take forward the many ideas embedded in the Finance Minister's speech. Eighth, Mahalanobis, I am sure Brinda//will agree, was no reactionary. Writing fifty years ago, he talked about the need that in the constitutional scheme of things, fiscal federalism, in a new polity, needed to be revisited to give India a comparative advantage of a large labour force to be able to create employment outside agriculture and seek livelihood in labour-intensive manufacturing activity. Ninth, come up with a medium-term programme in the legislative domain, not merely in the area of what people describe as neo-liberal economics, but in other areas, like, in health, in education, in Judiciary to be able to have a kind of growth, which is sustainable, which is truly creative, and which is inclusive. Finally, Sir, let me say that this Government has come back to power with a huge mandate and has come back to power by making huge promises. People remember these promises. Therefore, begin to perform in a credible way because, surely, you will remember that the memory of creditors is far more than the memory of debtors.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me begin by quoting Thiruvalluvar, one of the greatest poet philosophers that the country has ever produced. "Hon. Member spoke in Tamil". "A State, a Government is one which is capable of evolving policies, which is capable of creating wealth, which is capable of safeguarding wealth, which is capable of distributing wealth equitably." I doubt the Congress-led UPA Government can live up to this definition of Thiruvalluvar. The Government claims it has got the renewed mandate and the mandate is for inclusive growth and equitable distribution. I question this; I substantiate it with certain observations. Coming to the fiscal stimulus, the Government talks about fiscal deficit which has increased from 2.7 per cent to 6.2 per cent of the GDP in 2008-09 amounting to Rs.1,86,000 crores and that the difference of 3.5 per cent is the total fiscal stimulus. I do not agree with my good friend, Shri N.K. Singh, because we all know that the impact of global economic crisis is not restricted to the larger organised segments of industry; it is serious among

4.00 P.M.

those engaged in informal economy. The Government's policies of liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation have made the poor people in the informal economy gain little when the economy grew rapidly. According to the National Commission for Enterprises, in the unorganized sector, during the period of growth — 1993-94 to 2004-05 — the benefits of growth bypassed the 77 per cent of the population who remained poor or vulnerable with average per capita daily consumption levels of below Rs.20/- . It is clear that, now, during the current slow down, it is exactly these poor and vulnerables who will be affected the most adversely. Does the Government have any answer to show how much of Rs.1,86,000 crores went for the poor and how much went for the corporate sector? This is my first issue.

Secondly, Sir, the Budget ignores the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes, the OBCs and other minorities. When we talk of inclusive growth, unless the Budget addresses the concerns of these weaker sections, we cannot have an inclusive growth. The Special Central Assistance to the Scheduled Castes sub-plan is the single most important scheme for dalits and the lion's share of the Budget of the Ministry of Social Justice is, generally, set aside, which is used exclusively for the economic upliftment of dalits. What is inexplicable is that the SCA Budget fell from Rs.577.71 crores in 2008-09 (Revised Estimates) to Rs.469 crores in 2009-10 Budget. There is a demand for more allocations of Plan funds, according to the population of dalits in the country under the Special Component Plan. These funds would amount to roughly Rs.50,000 crores but the Finance Minister submitted a Budget which reduced the SCP allocations for dalits by 18 per cent. The imbalance between the concern for dalits by the Congress Party seems to be farcical, looking at the allocations in the 2009 Budget. Sir, I can go on quoting the figures. The Rajiv Gandhi National Fellowship supports dalits to pursue M. Phil., Ph. D. The fellowship allocation fell by 10 per cent contrary to the increased demand for the Scheme from Rs. 87.94 crores in 2008-09 (Revised Estimate) to Rs. 79 crores. The same scholarship has been increased by Rs. 13 crores on the tribal side. Sir, interestingly, the allocation for Ministry of Minority Affairs has increased by Rs. 1076 crores. I welcome it. It is a positive thing which has been done after so many years. ...*(Interruptions)*... And, the allocation for Ministry of Tribal Affairs has increased by Rs. 1235 crores. But the allocations of Dalit has been increased only by a mere Rs. 77 crores. Then, what is the meaning of 'inclusive growth'? This Government will have to think over it.

Then, Sir, coming to agriculture, the Government claims that efforts will be made to ensure that the Indian agriculture continues to grow at an annual rate of 4 per cent. But actually the agrarian sector has witnessed a sharp decline in growth rate and there is a fall in the production of foodgrains. Except for rice which has registered a marginal increase of 2.4 per cent, you will find a decline in all other varieties. There is decline in the production of wheat, decline in the production

of coarse cereals, decline in the production of pulses and there is an overall decline of 1.4 per cent in foodgrains over the target. Now, how can we protect our agriculture? Sir, agriculture is in deep crisis. The farmers' distress is unprecedented, but the Government has not accepted the recommendations made by Swaminathan Commission even to bring down the interest rate to 4 per cent, simple interest. That is what they are asking. Even the Budget talks about 7 per cent. If they repay, they can have a concession of 1 per cent, and this is also a mockery of our agricultural sector. This shows how the agrarian sector is treated by this Government.

Sir, due to constraint of time, I am rushing the question of disinvestment. Here, I do not agree with the Government the way it wants to sell off the public sector undertakings. We had enough discussions in this House. I do not agree with BJP also. Mr. Venkaiah Naidu has said, 'The Government has no business to be in business.' But he tried to over simplify the entire issue by saying, 'why Government should sell Chicken Biryani or Mutton Biryani.' It is not so. Sir, the reserves and surplus of Central Public Sector Enterprises was Rs. 2.59 lakh crores in 2003-04 when the UPA came to power. The same has gone up by another Rs. 2.26 lakh crores and stood at Rs. 4.85 lakh crores in 2007-08. This is the strength of the Indian economy. Why should this Government think of demolishing these public sector undertakings? It is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who called the public sector undertakings as 'modern temples of modern India.' Why should the Government demolish these modern temples which give strength to our economy? Mr. Arun Shourie is sitting here. He was the Disinvestment Minister when the NDA was in power. When there was a debate in the very same House on this subject, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, the present Finance Minister, who was in Opposition then, told the BJP-led NDA Government, 'For God's sake, don't try to befool everybody that only disposal of capital assets is the core of economic reforms.' I think, Mr. Arun Shourie must remember this. 'For God's sake, do not try to befool everybody that only disposal of capital assets is the core of economic reforms.' It was Mr. Pranab Mukherjee when he was in Opposition. Now, when he is the Finance Minister of the Congress-led UPA Government, I would like to remind him his own words. Why do you want to destroy the capital assets that the country has built over the years? That is why, we do not agree with the Budget which speaks of disinvestment, Sir.

Coming to other issues, the Economic Survey which was presented in Parliament, quoting the United Nations Development Programme, ranks India 132 out of 179 countries. India is ranked 132! Many Asian countries including China and Sri Lanka are ranked above India. What is the problem? Currently, India spends close to three per cent of its GDP on education and less than one per cent of its GDP on health. There is an increase of about Rs. 2000 crores in the Budget's Plan expenditure for higher education. I welcome this. We need more investment in higher

education. But, primary education, which should be the real strength of our education system, is totally neglected. Allocation for Sarva Siksha Abhiyan and Mid-day Meal Scheme remain the same. There is no mention about the Right to Education Bill. There is no increase in the allocation of funds for the National Child Labour Project. Then what is the inclusive growth that we are talking about when we do not have the needed approach to fight economic exclusion of the weaker sections in our society? It talks about the NREGA. We had enough discussions in this very House about it. The NREGA must be implemented with a view to building assets in the rural parts of our country. The poor people, the agricultural workers, can be the targeted groups. They can be given land and this scheme can be used for bringing uncultivable or uncultivated land under cultivation. Thus, they can help the economy and the country. There is no mention about the Urban Employment Guarantee Act, which is being demanded by several sections of the people. Even when the Employment Guarantee Bill was being discussed, we always wanted that it should be a universal, countrywide scheme. Why is there no mention about this?

Coming to the power sector, there is mention about power where the Budget really reduces the basic customs duty on permanent magnets, a critical component for wind operated electricity generators, from 7.5 per cent to 5 per cent. My point is, Government should give more priority and pay more attention to the renewable energy. Even in the case of solar energy, Government can take up the issue of building solar energy plants in the country. We have been gifted with a lot of sunlight and heat throughout the year. We can think about this, because I don't think nuclear energy is going to be feasible in the coming years. After seeing the G-8 statement, I really doubt whether India will have access to nuclear fuel in the near future. So, this is one issue that Government will have to consider. Then, about the funding of political parties, I agree with my Left colleague who spoke on this subject. This Parliament will have to consider the observations of the Indrajit Committee on State funding. In fact, the committee was constituted when NDA was in power. And if corporate houses want to join the democratic process by monetary contributions, they can contribute and there can be a separate corpus which becomes part of State funding and there can be a level-playing field for all political parties. Then, Sir, the Budget gives Rs. 500 crores to Sri Lankan Tamils. We have been demanding it and it has been the demand in Tamil Nadu also. At the same time, my point is, what is the mechanism to see to it that that money will be spent on the resettlement and rehabilitation of Sri Lankan Tamils? I agree with Mr. Venkaiah Naidu who spoke on that subject. The situation in Sri Lanka is horrible and the Tamil people are undergoing unimaginable sufferings and hardships. When our Government contributes to the tune of Rs.500 crores, I think there must be a mechanism to see that money is spent on Sri Lankan Tamils. Then, Sir, I would like to speak on agriculture. The Government talk about indebtedness of farmers and suicides of farmers. But a thing is missing, that is, remunerative price for farmers. Wheat-growing

farmers get Rs.1000 per quintal. But what about paddy-growing farmers? They are demanding Rs.1000 per quintal. What about sugarcane growers? They are demanding Rs.2000 per tonne. This Government has no respect for the recommendations given by Agricultural Price Commission. They have accepted a certain amount of Rs.1550 for one tonne sugarcane. How can you overcome the crisis in agriculture?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI D. RAJA: This is an important thing. Finally, I must conclude by saying that this Government is increasingly coming under pressure from various big business corporate houses. It is CII which claimed this mandate for fast track reforms. Again it is FICCI which said, "Pull out all stocks and unleash a slew of reforms in the areas of pension, insurance, banking, disinvestments, labour, private participation in Defence, retail, etc." Mr. Venkaiah Naidu also said, "Go ahead with all reforms. Why are you not showing your guts?" This is the point which the country has to understand. If the poor people will have to be protected and the development will have to be inclusive one, I think the Government will have to amend its policy which is a neo-liberal, which is a neo-liberal economy and which is a neo-liberal approach in every aspect of our economic management. With these words, I conclude my observations on the Budget.

DR. C. RANGARAJAN (Nominated): Thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to speak. All of us know that the Finance Minister had a difficult balancing act to perform. On the one hand, he had to step up the Government expenditure in order to stimulate aggregate demand, on the other hand, he had to keep the fiscal deficit at the reasonable level. On the whole, he has done well. But I am afraid that he has kept the fiscal deficit at an uncomfortably high level. This issue needs to be addressed. This is not fiscal fundamentalism or anything like that. There are adverse consequences of high fiscal deficits and we should not underestimate the consequences. The fiscal deficit for the last year for the Central Government was 6.2 per cent and it is 6.8 per cent for this year. Add to it, the State deficit of 4 per cent. This alone adds to 10.8 per cent, not including the other off-budget liabilities. Therefore, we are caught in a very difficult situation. The level of fiscal deficit is far beyond what is sustainable over a period of time. Maybe in times of emergency and in times of difficulty, we might be able to tolerate the higher level of fiscal deficit. That may be so. But I think we need to have a clear understanding of where we are going. The consequences of the high level of fiscal deficit is this that the outstanding liabilities as a proportion of GDP goes up.

As far as the Central Government is concerned, according to the Budget papers, the outstanding liabilities of the Centre to the GDP will go up from 59.6 per cent to 61.4 per cent in one year. So, this is the extent of the impact of the high fiscal deficit. Let me explain a little bit more. There are three consequences of fiscal deficit which we must note. First, interest payments, as a

proportion of the revenue receipts, go up. And, as interest payments pre-empt a larger proportion of the revenue receipts, less is available for productive investment expenditures. Now, this is one consequence of what is really happening. The interest payments, as a proportion of the Central Government's revenue receipts, were 47 per cent in 2003-04. Because of the decline in the fiscal deficit and other measures taken, it came down to 31.6 per cent in 2007-08. In 2008-09, it has gone up to 35.0 per cent, and in 2009-10, it is budgeted to increase to 36.7 per cent. Now, this large pre-emption of the revenue receipts for interest payments means that in order to provide for productive investment expenditures at the same level, more deficits will have to be incurred and, therefore, a vicious cycle is set in motion. The second aspect of the high fiscal deficit is a crowding out effect. At any particular point in time, there is a finite amount of resources available. As the public sector makes more demands on it, less will be available for the private sector. Now, in some situations, the pre-emption of the public sector, out of these resources, may not do any harm. If the private sector demand is weak, or if the private investment is weak, it may not cause a serious problem.

But, once the private investment picks up, as the stated objective of the fiscal stimulus package is, then you get into a situation which will pose a serious allocation problem between the public and the private sectors. And, the third consequence of this is the high level of borrowing and the pressure that it puts on the interest rates. The extent of borrowing by the Central Government in 2009-10 will be four times of what it was budgeted to borrow according to the Budget of 2008-09. Therefore, in a short period of time, there is going to be a very substantial increase in the amount of borrowing that the Government of India will make and to this, we will also have to add the borrowing that the State Governments will make. All of this would put pressure on the interest rates. And, therefore, if you want to avoid the pressure on interest rates and seek to provide some kind of support from the Reserve Bank of India, this will only result in an explosion in money supply stocking inflation. The Reserve Bank of India could provide some support; it is not as if the Reserve Bank of India should not provide any support, but any excessive support from the Reserve Bank of India will add to the high power money and will result in the stocking of inflation. Therefore, in a sense, there are consequences of high level of fiscal deficit of which the Government must be aware. What we really need is a roadmap, so to say, for moving towards a more reasonable level of fiscal deficit.

Probably, it will not be possible in this year. But, the Government must set its sight clear as to what it should be doing in the coming years. The main cause of the increase in the fiscal deficit is the increase in the Government expenditures. According to the Budget itself, the Government expenditures of the Central Government during the year 2009-10 will be 37 per cent higher than the expenditures in 2008-09. This is a substantial increase. In fact, the Revised Estimates for 2008-09

was 20 per cent higher than the Budget Estimates. And, now, we have another 17 per cent increase over the Revised Estimates of last year, and, therefore, there is a considerable expansion in the expenditures of the order of 37 per cent. Now, some of these expenditures may be very difficult to bring down also. And, therefore, the Government must draw up a roadmap as to how quickly and how efficiently they can reach towards the FRBM target. There is a logic behind the FRBM targets.

The FRBM target is three per cent of the GDP as the fiscal deficit for the Central Government, and, subsequently, other developments have happened to give another three per cent of the GDP to the State Governments. Thus, six per cent of the GDP by the Centre and the States together, is consistent with eleven per cent investment in financial assets by the household sector.

The only modification that we need to make with respect to the FRBM targets is that these targets should not be fixed as some targets to be reached every year. It must be treated as cyclical average so that they may rise during periods of recession or depression, and, fall down during the times of boom. Therefore, the FRBM targets have to be treated as a cyclical average over the cycle rather than as a target to be achieved every year.

Sir, the Budget can be analyzed from three angles, the macroeconomic implications of the Budget, the tax reforms and the reforms' direction. As far as the macro-economic implications are concerned, I have already talked. I have mentioned about the implications for the Government expenditure. I have also talked about the implications for the fiscal deficit. There is one area of fiscal expenditure over which the Government must really move strongly and that is the area of subsidies.

Subsidies are inevitable in a developing economy like ours. Nobody denies the role of subsidies in the system but the subsidies must be directed towards the vulnerable groups, must be designed in a manner in which only those who deserve the subsidy receive the subsidy. Take, for example, the fertilizer subsidy. The fertilizer subsidy goes to every farmer, and, it is not very clear whether this subsidy should go to every farmer, or only to the small and marginal farmers. It is very difficult to design a policy only aimed at it but some suggestions have been made by the Expenditure Commission and also by the Economic Advisory Council. The suggestion is to provide 120 kilograms of fertilizers of a particular mix to all farmers, and, any requirement beyond 120 kilograms must be paid at the market price. Now, this level of 120 kilograms has been estimated and it would meet the full requirements of all the small and marginal farmers. Therefore, every farmer should be provided this quantity at the subsidised and anything beyond that should go at the market price. I think, this is one way of dealing with the problem. Similarly, we have to address the subsidies which are being given with respect to kerosene and LPG and see that only vulnerable sections receive it.

The second dimension of the Budget is on tax reforms. I think, this Budget does not talk a great deal about tax reforms. Apart from the tax code for the indirect and direct taxes, the only other reference is to the GST. As has been pointed out by the earlier speaker, Mr. N.K. Singh, I think, the introduction of GST is important but the introduction of GST without adequate preparation would have serious consequences, therefore, if it is not possible, to introduce it by April, 2010, that does not matter. You may introduce it by April, 2011. There are constitutional pre-requisites which have to be modified, and, therefore, we may have to wait.

But, I think, in the case of GST, proposal is for a dual system. One of the most important and complicating the problem is the inter-State transactions and unless we have built up adequate information and database to decide on this, it would be premature to introduce the GST.

Sir, the third is the reforms' direction. I think, the Budget is somewhat weak on this. The Budget does not clearly indicate the directions in which the reforms will be carried out. Let me say this at this particular point that there is no need to be apologetic about the introduction of reforms. The reforms introduced since 1992-93 have had an important impact on the economy. The primary objective of the new economic policy is to improve the productivity and efficiency of the system by injecting a greater element of competition. Some of the sectors reserved for public sector have also to be thrown open to the private sector. In some of these sectors, the public sector has still the dominant role but it has to compete with the private sector. But there is nothing in the new economic policy which takes away the role of the State or the public sector. As has been somewhat cryptically remarked or paradoxically remarked, 'more market does not mean less Government but only different Government.' Therefore, I think as far as reforms are concerned, we have to read between the lines in the Budget in order to glean which reforms will be introduced.

Once again, even with respect to disinvestment, the Budget is not very explicit. But I would like to say, in contradiction to what my predecessor said, that there is a case for disinvestment. There is nothing wrong with disinvestment as a means of raising resources.

The timing of disinvestment must be chosen correctly. The Government should not lose on that score. But I must say that even at the time when the stock market was booming and when the Government could have reaped a large amount of money by disinvestment, those who were opposed to disinvestment, opposed it at that time also.

Therefore, depending upon the nature of product, depending upon the nature of commodity, which is being produced, the extent of disinvestment can be decided. But I do not think that disinvestment by itself is bad or is incorrect. I, therefore, feel that the Budget has been somewhat silent on reforms.

While concluding, let me say that this Budget is primarily an expenditure Budget. It has focussed on increasing the expenditure of the Government in a substantial manner. This is valid in the situation in which the economy is placed. But we need to look not only at the level of Government expenditure, but also at the composition of the Government expenditure. Unless the composition of the Government expenditure is such as to stimulate the economy, the level by itself is not adequate.

Keynes did not make any distinction as far as consumption expenditure or capital expenditure within the Government expenditure is concerned, he talked of the total impact of the Government expenditure. I think there is a need to make a distinction even within Government expenditure, between investment and consumption. A larger amount of expenditure devoted to investment will increase the productive capacity of the economy and support the growth process at a later time.

But, as I said before, one of my great concerns is the high level of fiscal deficit. Probably the growth process itself will help, but, I think, the Government needs a road map for bringing down the fiscal deficit.

Let us also understand that Budget-making is an interesting and difficult exercise only because there is a constraint of fiscal deficit. Excessive fiscal deficit can blunt the impact of the stimulus package itself. Thank you very much.

SHRI RAJEEV CHANDRASEKHAR (Karnataka): Sir, I thank you for having given me an opportunity to speak on the Budget.

Sir, if you recall the Presidential Address made just a few weeks ago had a number of very promising, forward-looking statements including the one that I like the most which is, 'the dreary desert sand of dead habit must be left behind.' Therefore, the expectations from this Government were high as they should be, especially since in terms of reforms, the last five years have been eminently forgettable and so there was a hope that the next five years would be in some ways memorable.

Sir, it was obvious to most of us that fiscally there was very little room for the Finance Minister to do more than what was already done in the Interim Budget. This Budget is clearly a wait-and-watch Budget with some additional fiscal support thrown in to try and reinforce the ambiguous signs of a recovery. So, I call it a sensible Budget, because it has avoided the temptation to create a flourish at a higher fiscal cost and risk.

But let us be clear, we are in a sticky situation as far as the economy is concerned. The signs of growth at best can be described as tentative. There are some attempts in some quarters to spin the precarious fiscal situation as not serious since "even the US is operating a trillion dollar fiscal deficit." But with great respect to the spin masters, the US and Western economies have very different capacities to rebound and are architected very, very differently from us. This argument is as credible as saying that just because a few companies can borrow large amounts of money, all

companies can borrow the same. Sir, it is important to understand that our growth over the last few years has been on the back of sustained investment flows, both equity and credit. And, a surging services/export sector resulted in a downstream consumption economy that created a further spiking in growth. Over the last several months and looking forward from the last several months, it is safe to make some specific assumptions. Given the global credit crisis, foreign investment flows have moderated. We know that FII flows have come down from 33 billion net positive to minus 11 billion and will show little signs of reversing, excepting for some short-term phenomenon of funds, playing the arbitrage game between markets, leaving the domestic sources of capital as the prime driver of investments. Even assuming that liquidity in Indian credit and equity markets remain high, the problem is that, with the increasing fiscal deficit and increased borrowing needs of the Government and the Government-linked entities, the odds of the private sector being crowded out of Rs.5 lakh crore market by the Government's own borrowing of Rs.4,60,000 crores, is very high. Simply put, the capacity of the domestic markets to finance the ambitious investment requirements of our economy are limited and if foreign investment flows don't materialize in significant numbers, the investment side of the equation of our economy is bound to falter.

Sir, pressing this point further, if investment flows falter, as they have in the last 8 months, then, the economy will be truly vulnerable — given that the second leg of our economy, that is, the exports and services like IT, BPO, etc. are already weak because of their linkages to the global economy slowdown.

It follows from this, that the derived consumption economy is also showing signs of sputtering, as is obvious from the results of the retail companies and retail sector in general. This sputtering so far has been gradual and not been sharp which could either mean that things are not as bad or things are going to get worse.

Sir, given this background, I can understand the challenges for economic strategy and policy-making for the Finance Minister and the partly self-made predicament that the Government finds itself in.

It has a significant social spending programme which it has to finance and the economy has a significant investment programme that it needs to kick-start and pump-prime. Both these objectives are competing for capital, increasingly limited to domestic banking and capital markets.

Sir, knowing as we all do that the social programmes cannot be cut, the policy measures in the Government actions post-Budget that the Government will have to lay out are bold, decisive and clear administrative measures for these two objectives. Firstly, accelerate external capital flow and other sources of capital into the investment programmes of the private and public sector in addition to what already exists, including deepening the domestic debt markets. Sir, the second one is, reform the Government's own finances primarily by focusing on efficiency of spending to

ensure that the Government spending requirements don't increase from where we are already and cause more financing pressure.

Sir, this Budget should have been more explicit about this. This time around, the larger financial and economic strategies are more important than ever before.

So, to come back to the Budget, this is a high risk year for all of us. We are poised on a razor edge fiscally. There are question marks on the monsoon. The so-called green shoots are proving to be patchy and imaginary and need to be more even and credible. This is the year that will take the green shoots either into a path of full economic revival or not. It is precisely for this that a directional signal for the next five years was critical in the Budget. The Budget doesn't do that, but to be fair, the Finance Minister has promised that the Government and the various Ministries will roll this out over time. I hope this is done as pieces of a coherent picture because the current efforts of 100-day agenda of different Ministries is anything but coherent.

Sir, there has been much talk for the past three years about the so-called inclusive growth architecture to drive our growth. The thing about using phrases like this is that they need description and articulation. Every time I hear someone in the Government say that phrase, I look for some idea of what that means. Apart from profligate spending in a notoriously leaky pipeline, there is not one thing that I can see which can be called architectural.

Sir, in my mind, inclusive architecture is not a phrase to be used for speeches. It should provide answers to specific questions as to how does the subsidy get delivered without leakages; what will be the targeted outcome of these subsidies every year over the next 5 years; what is the definition of poverty; who qualifies to be poor, and therefore, the recipient of poverty alleviation programmes; how can we ensure that the Government is more responsive and accountable; how can we ensure that public and Government policy is for the good of all people and not for one lobby or the other. How can we ensure that PPPs don't give disproportionate returns to only the private sector and public assets like spectrum, oil/gas blocks, iron ore mines, are not given to private parties on less than market terms? What is the realistic roadmap to fiscal consolidation? What is the broad roadmap of growth? (*Time Bell rings*) I will just end, Sir. Can we use better economic forecasting and monitoring techniques and indices so that we are not caught napping again like last year?

Sir, I can suggest various kinds of reforms and public policy measures, but there is no need because the Economic Survey is a good document for the Government to implement. And I will be very satisfied if the Government is implementing the Economic Survey, Sir.

Let me end, Sir, by raising one very important point in the Budget, which none of my colleagues in Rajya Sabha has mentioned, which is that I take serious exception to the way the

Government has handled the issue of 'One Rank, One Pension' demand of the veterans and retirees of the Armed Forces. By not giving the officers the benefits and giving them only to persons below the officer ranks, you are creating divisions in the structure of the Armed Forces and creating haves and have-nots. This is a classic bureaucratic short-sighted approach to handling of institutions, which we will all come to regret many years later if we do not fix it. Sir, I strongly urge, through you, the Government to reconsider this; let us not allow bureaucratic meddling with institutions such as the Armed Forces. These men and their families have served the nation at a time when things were much more difficult and challenging than today, in terms of environment and resources. These officers were responsible in allowing our Armed Forces to develop into an apolitical and professional institution that we can all be proud of — a fact that should not be underplayed— given the extent of politicisation of the Armed Forces in the nations and in our neighbourhood. Let those people who have served this nation, get their proud due! Please do not let a few bureaucrats and a few Rs.100 crores come in the way of this. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Rahul Bajaj. You have got seven minutes.

SHRI RAHUL BAJAJ (MAHARASHTRA): Thank you very much, Sir. And I will keep to seven minutes!

Let me start by saying that the Finance Minister had, as we all know, a very difficult task. He had to balance the need for growth, to further the Government's commitment to 'inclusive growth', be physically prudent as well as to pursue reforms. Perhaps, he could have presented his Budget in a slightly better form so that we would not have had the reaction that we had on July 6, from the stock market and also from some people in the corporate sector on the first day. Sir, we have had some very learned speeches, especially from Dr. N.K. Singh and Dr. Rangarajan. So, mine will be only an aam admi speech, Sir!

We have to see, in the Budget, the positives than the negatives. I will not refer to the positives because my friend Abhishek Manu Singhvi and others have spoken enough about it. In any way, there is no point in praising the Government in power, Sir! It doesn't help at all. I would only mention one thing, and that is with regard to the fringe benefit tax, Sir. You have removed it. We welcomed it. You have transferred it to the employees. That is understandable to some extent. Those perks on which the employees were already paying tax, tax them. But don't tax them now; whether it is a car or something else, which was not taxable in their hand at all, don't tax it now, and specially a small point, but the employees are shouting away. I give you an example. I am not even talking of ESOPs at the moment, but of the superannuation funds; he gets them at the time of his retirement, Sir. He would be taxed at that time, Sir; that is perfectly understandable. But each year, the employer contributes to the superannuation fund. Employee does not get in his

hand, and he will now be taxed, I am told! To so, we create a major cash flow problem for him, and I am sure that the Government would like to look at that, Sir.

On the negative side, I will mention two small things and two major things because others have been said. The two minor things relatively are MAT, 10-15 per cent politically, fine, equity. How can you have a zero-tax company? There are reasons why it should be. You have made it a zero-tax company by giving it depreciation etcetera, etcetera. He is not cheating. If the guy would be cheating, he would be in jail. He is not cheating, but politically a zero-tax company, I know which company was in lime light hurried in the beginning, which caused all this to come. Fine. But, Sir, there is a small company, a non-listed company, which only holds shares, equity shares. Its only income is dividend income—it has no other income—which is not taxable in its hands. The dividend distribution tax has been paid by the paying company, for paying the dividend. This company which holds equity has no liability, but if it sells the shares, again the long-term held shares, there is no capital gain tax because he held it for over a year, Sir. Previously, this was exempt. Now, you are taxing it. That is why there is a book profit and that is why you take MAT. I think it is very unreasonable and it may be looked into. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't disrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAHUL BAJAJ: This lady Member from Jharkhand is disrupting me, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I need your protection. ...*(Interruptions)*... She always disrupts me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't disrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*... We are short of time. ...*(Interruptions)*... When your turn comes, you speak. Please don't disrupt. We are already short of time. ...*(Interruptions)*... There is the problem of time.

SHRI RAHUL BAJAJ: The second small point is VRS. I think either I misunderstand it or the Finance Minister has not understood it properly. The VRS is mostly paid to the people who take VRS. They are all not crorepatists; they are not industrialists or owners of companies. They are employees. Now VRS is given in lieu of future income. You can't tax it. You should not tax it in one year. So, section 89 which used to give him relief — he is taxed on the average of the last three years — which you have removed, should continue. I would like to inform Ms. Mabel Rebello, through you, Sir, that this is for the middle class and not for the rich.

Now, I come to the two major items. Ms. Mabel Rebello would like to refer to them. But I want to refer to them. Mr. Abhishek Singhvi is not sitting here. He tried to justify the Consumer Price Index and food price which are even 30 per cent higher. All that I would like to say is that for the consumers and citizens of the country a negative Whole Price Index is no consolation, when the Consumer Price Index is eight per cent or nine per cent. In the case of many edible items it is much higher. So, there is a problem. That has to be looked into. Nobody has explained to us why

this dichotomy is there. The Wholesale Price Index for a company like mine is all right. I will get inputs like steel, cement, at a cheaper rate. Fine. It is okay. But again, through you, Sir, I may refer to Ms. Mabel Rebello, that for the citizens...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't react. Just listen.

SHRI RAHUL BAJAJ: I support those citizens who are shouting at high retail prices, Mr. Minister of State for Finance.

Now coming to the two important major points, one is disinvestment. I wish Mr. Sitaram Yechury was here. ...*(Interruptions)*... You convey to him. I completely disagree with him. This is required at the rate of Rs.25,000 crores per year which has been mentioned in the Economic Survey, not because we need the money alone. It may help or may not help the fiscal deficit. That depend on how they use this money for public sector and social work. I have no time to go into that. Otherwise, you would ring the bell. It means more efficiency. You retain your 51 per cent. But you list it. It will bring some shareholders. Don't sell it to large corporate houses, that is, strategic sale. For the time being, I am saying, to help everybody, forget about it, but go through the capital market route. That will help the company. If it is making loss or if it is making a small profit, it would do better. So, the taxpayers' money would not keep being pumped into such a company. But two things are very important, transparency and right timing. Dr. Rangarajan has said that. Even Mr. Sitaram Yechury said that. I agree with Mr. Sitaram Yechury on that. You can't sell it today. Choose your timing — you can't delay it indefinitely — so that you get the best possible price and do it in a transparent manner. We can't have Government favouring anybody. That is why I am saying capital market route is better to start with than the strategic route.

My last point is on deficit financing. It is, in the current circumstances, a necessary evil. I repeat it. I agree with Mr. Sitaram Yechury here. He is not here. It is necessary. That is what John Maynard Keynes said. But it is an evil. By 2011-2012, if you want the deficit to come down to four per cent — I would like it to come to three per cent — where is the road map? As the former RBI Governor asked: Where is the road map? If you don't come to that level, then it can have various implications, including inflationary implications, effect on the interest rates, the rating agencies downgrading us, effect on foreign exchange inflow, etc. So, we have to get rid of this fiscal deficit. We have no plan. I believe that it is not proper to reduce expenditure on infrastructure and social sector. You have to make it more efficient. I have always said that. You have to make it more efficient and less corrupt. But you should not reduce it. The Finance Minister will not be allowed by the Houses, by Cabinet and by the Government to reduce that expenditure. It should go up. If tax rate increases, it will not increase your revenue and it is also not desirable. The only solution, ultimately, is growth, growth and growth. Growth cannot come without reform, reform and reform, whether it is disinvestment, whether it is fiscal deficit. There are many other things, but I

don't have time to go into that. But I would like to emphasise that you must, in the long run and in the medium term, contain fiscal deficit and it must be contained. It is an evil. Today, it is necessary. I support the expenditure, today. Otherwise, you would not have employment, you would not have purchasing power, and you would not have demand for industrial products and other products. But in the long run, it is an evil, it is a cancer. Once it gives vent to all inflationary conditions, then to control it, will become a big problem. So, Sir, reform is a must. That is the message I would like to convey through you, Sir, to the hon. Finance Minister who is a very learned person. We are going through a very difficult period. Sir, 2009-10 will continue to be a difficult period for us. Many things can go wrong. If the GDP growth does not increase from the current year's expectation of around six per cent to 9 per cent....(*Interruptions*)... If it does not increase to 9 per cent, Sir, we are going to have a major issue. So, we need reforms. We need to go back to as near a double-digit growth for GDP as possible, within a year or two. Thank you.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have had very authoritative interventions by Dr. Rangarajan, by my dear and long-standing friend Shri N.K. Singh. We have had important and constructive suggestions from the representatives of industry and other interests. I would come back to these points to add to some of them and differ from some of them. But I first want to start with paying, really, a compliment and congratulations from the bottom of my heart to the Finance Minister and I hope that the Minister of State will convey that to him for a matter which is not mentioned in the budget but which falls in his purview. Sir, as you know, when the President's Address was being discussed, I had drawn the attention of the House to many things, to dangers from many quarters. As a symptom of that I had drawn the attention of the House to the fact that China had blocked a loan to India from the Asian Development Bank. Though the loan was almost four billion dollars, but a very small component of three-four million dollars related to Arunachal Pradesh. They said, "This is our territory. No loan to India can go on that". This is a very serious development. It was in continuation of their policy. But the Finance Minister, the team in the External Affairs Ministry and in the Prime Minister's Office, they took a clear and firm stand in this regard. China persisted with this. For the first time, in the history of the Asian Development Bank, they insisted that there will be a vote in the Board of the Asian Development Bank. India stood firm. It mobilised support from different quarters, including the United States. And the result was, the Board, with one dissent that of China, voted that the loan would be given to India. This is a single achievement. It is the first time that China has suffered a set back. I can say from personal knowledge, having travelled to that region, that it has been noticed all over East Asia and South-East Asia. So, irrespective of any differences that anyone of us may have, I compliment the Finance Minister and his other colleagues in this regard. I hope the same clear and firm stand will be taken in regard to the pressures which are being put, which he

knows, in regard to Kashmir, in regard to assumption of dialogue with Pakistan without precondition, in regard to WTO that Arunji had mentioned in his intervention, the first time, in regard to the various treaties like NPT and others. And, much will depend upon the Finance Minister personally because I know the role that he played in regard to Siachen. That is one point.

The second point is, as Dr. Rangarajan was mentioning, and Shri N.K. Singh was mentioning, we all recognise that the Budget has had to be prepared in difficult circumstances and has had to be a balancing act. All of us recognise that. But, as Shri N.K. Singh also emphasised, much of this difficulty has been created. It is a self-created one that because of the stoppage of reforms, a complete paralysis of reforms for five years, the momentum slowed down. As people, like me, had pointed out, which Shri N.K. Singh has very well documented today, that when the index of industrial production was at its peak, it shows that a year before this crisis, jobs had already started getting lost in the textiles sector. By April, 2008, twenty five lakh jobs had already been lost, according to official statements of the Government. And that was the real reason for the difficulties that came. On top of that, there was the global slowdown; therefore, the exports were slowing down. And revenues suddenly plummeted. We used to have a growth of almost 40 per cent in direct tax collections. That started plummeting. That would have led to the deficit. But the real contribution to the deficit, I should say, as has been mentioned by Dr. Rangarajan just now, has been that current expenditure has really not grown; it has gone out of control. This is a fact, and all these in the name of inclusive growth! I shall come to this point whether there is substance in that, or, whether we are just throwing money and saying that we are doing this for inclusive growth. In spite of these circumstances, I am very happy that, at least, a few steps have been taken towards tax reforms. As Dr. Rangarajan just now mentioned, it is primarily an Expenditure Budget, and, even on tax reforms, there is no great architecture or vision that has become evident. But, at least, a few irritants, which were continued out of some sort of obstinate determination in regard to fringe benefit tax and others, have been removed. It is good that the Commodity Transactions Tax, which has actually never been made operational, has also been withdrawn. Both had smelt of the Inspector Raj being re-introduced. There is a new Direct Tax Code to come within 45 days, service tax being extended to lawyers, the ten per cent surcharge being reduced and the Goods and Services Tax on schedule. Sir, there is a point in which I would like to second the appeal that Dr. Abhishek Singhvi made, and that is an appeal from all of us to all political parties. Everybody is in office in some State or the other, and he is right that it would not be correct for any one of us to delay things. It is true that the GST should not be half-baked or ill prepared. But a year is a long time for a country to think, for even to come to a consensus on these matters! I am sure, two weeks of concentrated work on this by distinguished people will leave almost no questions unanswered. It may leave out questions where negotiated

solutions are not possible. But, at least, a clarity on the options should be there, and we should all co-operate in this regard so that everything that people want would come out, and we would continue to move on tax reforms. So, I second that particular appeal.

Sir, there are many other special measures that I found commendable, and I do not want to take your time on this. This threshold of non-promoter holding is a very good thing. The Assistance, that is being announced for the Infrastructure Finance Corporation, is also a very good thing. But the problem really is not in the specific measures because, after all, this Budget is a continuation of the Government which has been there for five years. So much work has gone on as regards the other steps that could be taken for an overall architecture for new tax regimes. But we do not find any trace of that at all. And, the Budget has been, as unfortunately, our Budgets and Addresses from the Red Fort and the Address of the President have become, another dhobhi list. So many shirts, so many shorts, so many kurta-pyjamas! That is all. And it is this architecture, this vision, that is required, specially at a time like this when the country was seeing that it was in difficulties and, therefore, it needed what Dr. Rangarajan just now called, a 'roadmap', not just on taxation, not just on deficit, but on the general economic policy and reforms in this regard. I cannot imagine now what the difficulty and the constraint was because the difficulty and the constraint have been, for the time being, sort of waived by the people. मगर इसमें एक गफलत है, आप तो आलिम हैं, आपको याद है कि difficulty अब इनके अंदर है। गफलत यह है कि — “जब तूफां में हो कश्ती, तब सब कोई सहाय” — everybody can help you and save you, when your boat is in the storm — “जब कश्ती में हो तूफां, तो कौन सहाय”... So, the paralysis within the ruling party in this regard to reforms is what the problem is now. That is why...

श्री जेसुदासु सीलम (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) : तूफान उधर है।

श्री अरुण शौरी : सीलम साहब, आपकी बात ठीक है, जब economic policy इस साल में evolve होगी, तब पता लगेगा, it will all be clear क्योंकि constraint तो है नहीं। आप भी कहते हो कि mandate भी है, that will be very good. But on matters like labour, on matters like execution of infrastructure projects, on energy, on reforms in the coal sector, on open access to power, on distributed generation, all these things have been listed by Government reports themselves. But we find no indication that they are being brought forward in that respect.

Sir, there are only two reforms which are mentioned. Because this has not come up in other speeches, I will take you through the paralysis which characterizes this Budget and the functioning of the Government which I sincerely hope we will get out of. One is in paragraph 35. This is on POL pricing and subsidy. I will just read it out now. Sir, you know what happened last year; because administrative price mechanism had been sort of brought back and Ministries had started fixing prices again, the Chairman of the largest oil company in India, a Government officer, had to say in

5.00 P.M.

public that if within thirty days, the Government did not change the prices, he would not have one rupee to import more oil. That was what the situation had come to. And a loss of about Rs.40,000 crores had been inflicted on those governmental companies. What is the solution? "It is important to recognize that almost three-quarters of our oil consumption is made through imports. Domestic prices of petrol and diesel have to be broadly in sync with global prices of these items". So, what is the remedy? "Government will set up an expert group to advise on a viable and sustainable system". Now, this expert group will be the fifth group, the fifth committee, commission and expert group, in the last five years, for the same thing; there was the Lahiri Committee in 2004; then, the entire working group on integrated energy policy, set up by the Planning Commission in 2005; the Rangarajan Committee in 2006; and the B.K. Chaturvedi Committee in June, 2008. Just see the Budget of 2005-06 of Chidambaram. He says, "As far as petroleum products are concerned, the Government has received the recommendations of the Lahiri Committee and appropriate decisions have been taken" — 'have been taken' — "to which I shall refer to in Part B". You will not find them in Part B. Then, in the next year, in 2006-07, he says, "My Ministry has held extensive discussions with stakeholders on three major subsidies, mainly, food, fertilizer and petroleum. "We have also sought the views of the general public." When you can't do something, seek views. "...Working Groups, Committees have gone into the question of fertilizer and petroleum subsidies, the latest being Dr. C. Rangarajan Committee. I would urge Members to help the Government to evolve a consensus on the issue of subsidy." Then, in the Eleventh Plan the same thing was said. Now, why does this not happen? I don't want to cast any aspersion, and I am all, as you know, an advocate of vigorous private sector, vigorous and efficient Government, vigorous Government sector so that you can all have competition and prices come down and efficiency comes up. Why does this not happen on POL? Sir, there is a very good passage by the Commission headed by the Prime Minister, i.e., the Planning Commission. This is the Mid-Term Appraisal of the Tenth Five Year Plan put out by the Planning Commission in 2005. They say, 'Why does this not happen?' You find the same paralysis continuing now because you have to have another expert group. He says further, "The current pricing mechanism uses the import parity pricing..." You don't have to go into that. "...even for products in which India is the net exporter." I don't want to say who is exporting. "This provides higher margins to the refiners. Economic rationality suggests that the trade parity should be the norm for pricing instead of import parity. Moreover, Customs Duty on crude oil is five per cent, while the average duty on petroleum products is ten per cent. This further increases the refinery margin." Then, the normative transportation is fixed, and he says, "For this reason, so as to help the public sector companies, but private sector refineries are following the same methodology for building up prices for their

products.” Then, he gives another feature of this pricing and then says, “This ensures even larger benefits for more efficient private refineries.” So, you really have not just a paralysis within political parties or outsiders, but you have other interests coming into rational policies being introduced. And, therefore, what do we do? We set up expert groups, as we have done again, and we remain exactly where we have remained for the last ten years on this matter.

Sir, the second reform, the only other reform that is mentioned here is fertiliser subsidy. Sir, you just see again in paragraph 34 as to what it says. There are two lessons in this which you will see, I hope the Minister of State will notice, as to how one part of the Finance Ministry does not seem to know what the other part of the Ministry has done or is doing. It says, in paragraph 34, “In the context of the nation’s food security, the declining response of agricultural fertiliser usage in the country is a matter of concern.” Why? It is because we subsidise only nitrogenous fertiliser and this leads to imbalanced use of fertilisers in phosphates and potashic fertilisers, and that is leading to deteriorating in our soil. “To ensure balanced application of fertilisers, the Government intends to move forward to a nutrient based subsidy regime instead of the current product pricing regime. In due course, it is also intended to move to a system of direct transfer of subsidy to farmer.” Now, Sir, if you see this is what we are being told today and this has been hailed as a great advanced scheme that, at last, we are going to a nutrient based subsidy regime. Now, if you see the Mid-Term Appraisal of the Tenth Plan put out four years ago, they say the same sentences that “productivity is going down, and we are unable to do this because we are giving fertilisers in an imbalanced way. Continuation of the subsidy on urea while de-controlling PNK fertilisers further adds to the inadvertent promotion of imbalance in fertiliser use. One of the proven and well-documented reasons for stagnation in the productivity and production growth rates since the early 1990s is the unbalanced use of fertilisers.” Then he says, “In the Eleventh Plan approved under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister....” again, they say, “...soil degradation through the use of agrochemicals is a serious issue that needs to be addressed. Imbalanced use of chemicals and fertilizers is doing this.” The reason they give is that the present system of fertilizer subsidy is irrational and has become counterproductive. All these members, including the present Finance Minister, all of them, are endorsing this. There are long passages and I don’t want to take your time to say that this is the problem and it needs to be addressed in an urgent manner. Mr. Chidambaram first in his Budget of 2007-08 says, “It is a serious problem. While fertilizers should indeed be subsidised, we must find an alternative method of delivering the subsidy to the farmers....” This is exactly what the present Finance Minister has said, “...We are going to do in due course. The fertilizer industry has agreed to work with the Department of Fertilizers to conduct a study and find a solution. Based on the report, the Government intends to implement a pilot programme in at least one district in each State in 2007-08. In regard to the implementation of the Budget announcement...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL (Gujarat): Are you discussing the 2008-09 Budget or 2009-10?...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री अरुण शौरी : इनको क्या रोके?

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL: With highest respect to your knowledge and information, you are comparing three-four years Budgets. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The problem is that you are continuing to make the same promises, which you have not been implementing at all. Again, they are saying that this is the reform...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL: You come to 2009-10 Budget. Sir, one question only. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु (कर्नाटक): इनको प्रॉब्लम क्या है?...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री अरुण शौरी : यह हमेशा करते हैं। इनकी ज्यूटी लगायी हुई है।...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL: I want to ask only one question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding. ...*(Interruptions)*... I cannot allow you unless he yields. ...*(Interruptions)*... That will not go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL:*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: This irritation of such Members itself shows...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The fact that the same promises are continuing to be made and are not implemented is a reflection of the fact that we are not proceeding as we should be doing. And that is one of the problems as identified by the Government report itself that the economic progress has been brought down to a slowdown, as Mr. N.K. Singh was just saying. This is the reason. So, you see the same thing happening in the 2008-09 implementation of Budget announcements and he said that the modalities are being worked. Now, once again we are told that this will be done in due course. Dr. Swaminathan has recommended these things, everybody has recommended. And for 15 to 20 years and certainly in the last five years there has just been a repetition of all this. That is one point. But there is a second point by which I will come to your Budget of 2009-10 and on which you are very keen. ...*(Interruptions)*... अब ज़रा सुनिए। फिर से गौर से सुनिए। वे कहते हैं “to ensure the balance application of fertilizers..”, — Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is a very interesting thing, the second aspect of this matter from the Budget of this year — “...the Government intends to move towards a nutrient based subsidy regime.” What does your Economic Survey laid in the same House by the same Finance Minister say this year? It says that it

*Not recorded.

has already been done. It says, in addition, due to the implementation of the nutrient based subsidy pricing, prices of various complex fertilisers were reduced by 18 per cent on an average. कुछ पता भी है, एक तरफ आप कह रहे हो इंटेंड्स, अब बोलिए साहब, आप ही का बजट है इसी साल का। इसी साल की इकॉनॉमिक सर्वे है, तीन दिन पहले दी गई।

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL: I will reply to that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When you speak you can definitely reply. Note down all the points and reply. Tomorrow you reply. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, but hope never dies. Hope is eternal. सर, नेक्स्ट पैराग्राफ देखिए, The Government has taken various policy initiatives for the fertilizer sector. These cover pricing policy for indigenous urea, new investments in the urea sector, nutrient based pricing and production and availability of fortified and quoted fertilizers. Sir, the point that I was making was, that, on the only two reforms that are mentioned on POL, there is no progress. This is another fifth committee in five years. On fertilizer subsidy intentions for the future and we get nowhere at all. One part of the Ministry is not knowing what the other part is doing. Now, Sir, this characterises other aspects also and I will take up two examples from the current Budget. One is power. Everybody has said on the shortage of energy and on various matters. Now, Sir, in case there is some impatience you should please look at paragraph 24, I am referring to that. Sir, in power the problem is that, we have set up a target of 78,000 megawatts for the Eleventh Plan. We are now going to be near the middle of the Eleventh Plan. How much have we achieved of 78,000? It is 13,000. Now, the reason for that is, you require almost 10-12 lakh crores in this sector against this because of profligate expenditure on so-called inclusive growth. We will not have half of this amount with the power sector and the result of that is, we will not get even 40,000 additional megawatts this year and the typical point and the point that illustrates it is in paragraph 24. It is called the Accelerated Power Development and Reform Programme. Sir, the Eleventh Plan said that this is one of the main challenges facing us. This programme is not about generation. This programme is about sub-transmission and distribution, i.e. transmission within States and further distribution. Here, just see what the paragraph says. This is crucial because you have to reduce T&D losses from 35 per cent to 15 per cent as the Expenditure Budget presented now this year says in volume 2, page 182 of this Budget. 'To do this you require massive investments and this is an important programme.' Mr. Pranab Mukherjee said the Accelerated Power, Development and Reform Programme is important for reducing the gap between power, demand and supply. I propose to increase the allocation for this scheme to Rs. 2080 crores, a steep increase of 160 per cent. It seems very impressive till you realise that what is actually required is 16,000 to 20,000 crores per year and that is why the things will continue exactly the same way. ...(*Interruptions*)... Even at the cost of irritating some Members I would remind you that in the previous Budget three years ago, we were told that the details of this scheme had been worked out. A national fund for

Transmission and Distribution Reform is now to be contemplated. The details of the scheme will be worked out and announced very soon. Then, you see what was said about this promise in the Implementation of the Budget Announcements of the Interim Budget that Mr. Pranab Mukherjee just presented in February, 2009. It says that sanction has been given. A Steering Committee has been set up. A nodal agency has been set up. The nodal agency has set up a process consultant. A process consultant is working on the empanelment of IT consultants. A quadripartite implementation agreement has been drafted. What about that fund which was to come very soon?

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु : मानसून ।

श्री अरुण शौरी : सर, यह अकबर इलाहाबादी का couplet है। प्लेटों की आवाज़ आती रहती है। प्लेटों के आने की आवाज़ आती रहती है, कांटे-छुरियों की आवाज़ आती रहती है, मगर खाना नहीं आता। सर, यही हालत है। अच्छा अब आप देखिए, इन्होंने कहा कि फंड होगा, जल्दी बनेगा, अनाउंस जल्दी किया जाएगा। If you see the February document, what did it say about the National Electricity Fund? It says that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Member (Power) i.e., from the Planning Commission, has been constituted by the Planning Commission to consider various aspects of establishing a National Electricity Fund. A Committee has been set up. So, what did the Committee do? The Committee has decided to form a Sub-Committee under the Chairmanship of the Secretary, Power, to make recommendations on issues relating to operationalisation of the National Electricity Fund. The matter is currently under examination and it continues — I had checked it — till last evening. This is the real problem. This is the reason for keeping tabs on what is promised from time to time. The House should not lose sight of that. I tell you that where the matter concerns about doing something, it does not get done. But, where the matter relates only to sending money to somebody else, that is done. That is shown as achievement. The hon. Prime Minister has said it many times. Shri Chidambaram has said it — not outlays but outcomes — innumerable times. Actually, that culture is continuing exactly as it is in regard to employment schemes and in regard to everything else. A single example has mentioned here as an achievement. It is with regard to the Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyudikaran Yojna. The target was to provide electricity to 2,35,000 villages. Of which, actually speaking, only 54,000 villages have been electrified, as reported by Shri Pranab Mukherjee's document of February, 2009. And, out of 7.8 crore households, which were to be provided electricity, only 43 lakh households have been given electricity! This is the problem. Once we had told in this House that Ministries have been instructed to prepare Outcome Budgets. I don't know what has happened to that. That was there in the Budget Speech. Sherlock Homes used to say, 'there is a dog that did not bark.' We should look at that. For that reason, all of us who have got this Budget papers, the first paper is this. This is the List of Documents of Budget for 2009-10. It had 13 items. But, one item was missing. It is the Implementation of Budget Announcements. In every Budget, Mr. Chidambaram had a foreword

to that document saying, 'this document has been introduced to ensure transparency and accountability and whatever promises we made we will report next year what we have done on that.' That is the only thing that is missing.

How? Is it that accountability and transparency have been completely ensured; or that, that document was not doing that job; or, that document was proving an embarrassment because some of us were reading it? Sir, it is the same thing in regard to this great promise of the Food Security Act also. Everybody wants it. Everybody wants the hunger to be abolished. But the way to do that has been given by some of the great experts, like, Dr. Swaminathan, who are honoured and listened to all over the world. How to increase production? How to focus on farmers with less than two acres of land? How to give balanced nutrients, not just these three fertilizers? We don't do that. But we just go on passing resolutions, go on having higher and higher targets. Goliath had referred to the Indian planning, saying that it indulges in therapeutic targetry. For therapy purposes, we raise the target. So, therapeutic legislations are also there. But the fact to be remembered is that the real problem is not being addressed to. It has been addressed to in every Budget. Today, already, 316 million people are covered by the Food Distribution System. 316 million! And, as you all know, they are given 35 kg of foodgrains to the BPL families, antayodoya families, and so on. And, yet, despite covering 316 million people under the Public Distribution System, we are number 66 in the global hunger index. And, Sir, it will astonish you to learn who is above us. Albania is above us, Turkmenistan is above us, El Salvador, Gabon, Guyana, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Magnolia, Nicaragua, Lesotho, Namibia, Guatemala, Senegal, Uganda, all failed States, Swaziland, Sudan, Nepal, Djibouti, Guinea, Pakistan, Malawi, Rwanda, Cambodia. The best performing State, in India, on hunger is Punjab. And, that would be 34th in this...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time will you take because your party has left with 30 more minutes, and there are five more speakers?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I will take some more time and, then, finish it. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Minus those six minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which six minutes? ...*(Interruptions)*... Those were not six minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*... There is a record here. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I have just two more points, and I will finish after those two points.

DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA A. HEPTULLA (Rajasthan): It is a very good speech, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But there is time constraint also. You withdraw your other speakers, I won't mind giving him all the time.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, the point that I was making was that instead of going on passing more and more laws we should really be attending to the things like the Public Distribution System because, again, the law may be passed, but we will have to do the same thing. That's why I would be enthused, about these allocations and these Acts, only when some concrete steps are visible in the field on improvement of delivery system, of which this Budget also talks.

Sir, because great authoritative people, like, Dr. Rangarajan, Shri N.K. Singh and others have spoken on the issue of deficit, I won't take much of your time on that. But I would like to make two points on that. One, the claim is a surprising claim in the Budget. That is, if you see, it says, "To counter the negative fallout of the global slowdown in the economy, we have brought about this deficit". The difference between the actuals of 2007-08 and 2008-09 constituted the total fiscal stimulus. Shri Pranab Mukherjee says, "This fiscal stimulus, at 3.5 per cent of the GDP, at current market prices for 2008-09, amounts to Rs. 1,86,000 crores". The fact of the matter, as Mr. Venkaiah Naidu was also reading all those figures, which my good friend, Gurumurthy, has worked out, is that of this figure, two-thirds, that is, Rs. 1,30,000 crores have nothing to do with the stimulus at all.

It is fallen tax collections because of the slow down; it is the Sixth Pay Commission dues; it is the fertilizer subsidy; it is the food subsidy and it is the extra interest on borrowers. The same thing is about the stimulus that is being said for tomorrow. We are now being told that this extra expenditure of Rs.1,20,000 crores is what is for the future. The fact is that of this Rs.1,20,000 crores, Rs.97,000 crores, as Shri Venkaiah Naidu also quoted, is because of the dues on account of the Sixth Pay Commission, extra interest of Rs.33,000 crores, Non-Plans, as you said now, about IMF contributions and so on. It is only Rs.42,000 crores which is an extra expenditure on the Plan. Now, Sir, I mentioned this because this is becoming a habit. In the February Interim Budget, we were told on behalf of the Government that one of the FRBM targets is being pushed ahead because of the global economic slow down. At that time, I had to read Shri P. Chidambaram's previous Budget in which he had said "Much before the global slow down we are pushing back this target because of social expenditure." So, this business of claiming credit for the things that are not getting done, which are not being reflected in the economy, is not a good thing. We may expect it of a lawyer like Shri Chidambaram but not from a seasoned man like Shri Pranab Mukherjee. Sir, when we have Shri Rangarajan saying that we are getting into a vicious cycle in regard to the debt, I don't have to elaborate on that point, Sir. But the main point to remember in this regard, Sir, is that just 140 days ago, just that much time ago, Shri Pranab Mukherjee told us in the House that this deficit is going to be only 5.5 per cent of the GDP and, today, suddenly, it has become 6.8 per cent. No astronomical expenditure took place but it was just that you are

giving bad news in those days. The net borrowing has risen four times higher this time than the Budget that was approved for 2008-09. That is the profligate way in which the finances of the country have been managed. As Shri Rangarajan said, you will not only pre-empt private borrowing, interest rates will just have to rise. We have been told by the Finance Minister that no, no, this will be done in a way in which rates will not rise. But there is no magic. He has held meetings with the Chairmen of the Banks, but if you read the Business Standard of today, you will find that all the Chairmen have said, “Yes, interest rates will have to rise.” As Shri Rangarajan just now said, when capital investment from the private sector comes up in a country in which household savings are 12 per cent of the GDP, when 11 per cent is taken up by the deficits of the Governments, then, how can there be a situation in which anything is left for the rest of the economy to grow? Sir, one point which should not be missed in regard to this deficit is how it is squeezing out any manoeuvrability for the future. I think we don’t quite recognize that. Sir, if you take only debt servicing, it is already 94 per cent of the gross revenue receipts of the Government. About 94 per cent of the gross revenue receipts are eaten up only in paying interest on past debt and on repaying that debt. If you take net revenue receipts of the Centre, then, just that debt servicing is 120 per cent of that net revenue receipts of the Government. If we take unavoidable expenditure only, interest payment, subsidies, pension, salaries, revenue expenditure on Defence, revenue expenditure on Police, repayment of debt, that is 55 per cent more than the gross revenue receipts of the Government. It is twice the net revenue receipts of the Centre. That is the squeeze in which we have got in. And, our only answer to that is, to increase borrowing this time by Rs.3,97,000 crores.

How is this going to be sustained? So, the point that NK was making on sustainability is really to be seen in the context that how we are just completely squeezing out not just the private sector and all, but the manoeuvrability and options of the Government of India itself. And, Sir, these figures are only the Revised Estimates. When the final figures come for the year, you will see it will be much greater.

Sir, on specific programmes, on disinvestment and all, I don’t really want to take your time. I had a good occasion to speak on this in the President’s Address, but, Sir, I would like to touch only one point, i.e., in regard to paragraphs 53 and 54. And, I will request Members to please bear with me because it is a sensitive matter. As I mentioned earlier, like everybody in this House I am for all positive help to every section of society, namely, Schedule Castes, Muslims, Christians, Hindus, anybody irrespective. I had spelt out five secular principles on which such assistance should be given. It should be based on the individual, not a group. Second, in identifying that individual, use secular criteria, as you do in APL/BPL. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बोलिए।

श्री अरुण शौरी : सर, क्या करें! काँटों का भी कुछ हक है, कौन छुड़ाए अपना दामन। ...(*व्यवधान*) ...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बोलिए। (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, there my plea was that when the State organizes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए। (व्यवधान)...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, when the assistance is given, the criteria on which it is given, discourse congeals around it, politics congeals around it, power congeals around it and it has great consequences. On the question of caste itself, it is a curse and it was being eroded by modernisation and electoral politics; and such schemes of Government and reservations based on caste, etc., have fortified it to a dangerous extent. So, the point is, when you give assistance, please don't give it on a criterion which widens the earth fault lines in our society. Sir, I want to read to you just one passage from a book written in 1940s and you will see that this warning will come true again, unfortunately, within our short life times that remain for us because of this politics which is being pursued, a vote bank politics, either on caste or religion or so on, and that is what is reflected in these paragraphs 53, 54 that I mentioned. Sir, it is one of the great scholars on comparative religions, a man called W. Cantwell Smith who wrote in the 1940s about India and what was happening. Unfortunately, his prophecy regarding the partition of India came true. But in this particular chapter, he is recounting evolution of British Policy and he said that the essence of British policy was to offer a boon which a group could claim only if and only to the extent to which it remained different from the rest of the society; and he says, "The Government's method of encouraging communalism has been to approach all political subjects, and as many other subjects as possible, on a communalist basis; and to encourage, even to insist upon, everyone else's doing likewise. The principal technique is separate electorates: making the enfranchised — Muslims in that case — and the enfranchised sections of many other groups, into an increasing number of separate constituencies, so that they vote communally, think communally, listen only to communal election speeches, judge the delegates communally, look for constitutional and other reforms only in terms of more relative communal power and express their grievances communally. Even the British Government has admitted on occasions that the system serves to keep India from gaining independence by political means." And, just see, Sir, he quotes the Secretary of State, Edwin Montague who says, "Division by creeds and classes means the creation of political camps organised against each other, and teaches men to think as partisans and not as citizens."

We regard any system of communal electorate, therefore, as a very serious hindrance to the development of a self-governing principle. Therefore, we are encouraging it. And, as the same statement says, "The principle works so well that once it has been firmly established, it so entrenches communalism that one could then hardly abandon the principle even if one wished to do so". This is what I had in mind when I pleaded with the Prime Minister to think again on these

allocations and instructions which had gone from his own office to the banks to keep ledgers on how many loans had been given by religion.

Sir, I do not wish to end on a combative note. I would, Sir, in seven sentences, give seven suggestions to the Finance Minister in view of what I have said and what very learned people like Shri Rangarajan, Shri N.K. Singh and many other friends have said. First, please, implement your resolve to get back to the discipline of the FRBM; do not listen to the economics of lawyers like Mr. Abhishek Singhvi. As Mr. Rangarajan said, to restore confidence in this, it is not necessary only to give specific steps, it is also necessary to lay out a roadmap. And as every Member who has spoken on this matter in regard to the medium term document that is given here has rightly remarked, it is just not a sufficiently detailed thing to invite any confidence in this regard. Second, in particular, please, reign in current expenditure. In this it requires the cooperation of the whole House because if all of us keep pressing sectional demands, then no Finance Minister will be able to discipline the expenditure. Third, for this purpose, please examine closely what is being done in the name of inclusiveness. This is just becoming a mantra; you paste this label and do anything that you like! Fourth, for this purpose, please, take people into confidence. You are not disclosing either the true economic situation or the measures that are required. Then, please expedite implementation of projects. Ensure effective implementation. This will require more than committees. Two days ago, there was a big headline saying that the Prime Minister is now going to chair a thirteen-member committee to expedite infrastructure projects. But the Prime Minister already chairs a committee to expedite infrastructure projects! There is a committee already! It is the same committee; now two new members have been named. We are now being told, and it is a big headline. So, it will require more than this purpose. The second last is: resume reforms; finally, a new architecture in all this. For all these purposes and all the important issues that I have mentioned in the beginning in regard to standing up to pressure, I wish the MoS will convey to the Minister of Finance my great hope in him and we wish him strength within Government and luck outside the Government. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia, for your information, there are 15 minutes left and six Members to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is my duty to bring it to your notice.

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR (Punjab): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir, for giving me this opportunity to express myself on the Budget proposals as have been presented by the Finance Minister. Sir, it has been the greatest glory of parliamentary democracy that in a debate such as the one we have heard since morning, the freest and fullest expression of opinion is relevant in a discourse that enriches democracy, in a dialogue that, if I may use the words of John Stuart Mill, is a 'conversation of democracy'. I have benefited immensely, Sir, from the

very lucid expression of views by Mr. Arun Shourie. I heard Mr. Rangarajan; I heard Mr. N.K. Singh and other distinguished speakers who preceded me. In the time that is available to me, I would seek to express my own point of view and that of my party. Sir, this is a debate. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members will be sitting up to 7 o'clock.

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR: Sir, this is a debate that will test the assumptions of the Budget; this is a debate that will test the validity and the efficacy of that document that seeks to define India's future, that seeks to lay the foundation of our economy and of the well being of our people. I have identified, Sir, four yardsticks and touchstones on which this Budget must be tested. Is it a Budget that adequately responds to an extraordinary global situation which we face today like of which has never arisen in this country? The second test is: Is this a Budget that unites the two Indias that co-exist? Is this a Budget that unites India that lives in the optimism of our hearts and the other India that lurks in the scepticism of our minds? Is this a Budget that ensures for all our people larger and greater happiness in greater and larger freedom? Finally, is this a Budget that discloses a political philosophy or an internal reasoning which is integral to the underlying premise of this communist philosophy? These, Sir, are essentially the four parameters or the touchstones on which one must test the validity of the assumptions of this Budget. Sir, on the first, is this Budget an adequate response to an extraordinary global situation, I would venture to say that it is an extraordinary response to an extraordinary situation. I say so sanguine in the belief that the facts which owe no apology to either my party or to the opposition will speak for themselves. Sir, we have had in the last fifty years three global economic crises, but not one of the magnitude of the crisis that we face today. The largest economy of the world, the US economy, has registered a decrease of 38 per cent on an annual basis in the investment. It has registered a decline of 13 per cent in its economic growth. Sir, the global output per head has fallen by 2.5 per cent and global trade has shrunk by 12 per cent. It does not require a lot of argument to say that an economy that is integral to a global economy which is driven to a very large extent by economy such as the US will need to respond to this challenge. We are not insulated from the global environment. Therefore, the test of how well or how badly we have done must be, whether as a country we have minimised the negative impact of the global situation. Sir, I have it on high authority to share with this august House that while job losses in China, Japan, Korea, Singapore and Malaysia were much higher, we, in India, did much better in comparison to these countries in South-East Asia.

Sixty per cent of our companies still continue to hire, while 13 per cent of our companies have showed a declining rate of employment. Sir, the gross domestic savings, as a percentage of GDP at current prices, stand at 37.9 per cent compared to 2007-2008. And, despite the negative global

economic growth, only two countries in the world have registered positive economic growth - China and India. And, in India, Sir, I am delighted to say and proud to say that despite the global economic scenario, we have registered a growth of 6.7 per cent, and that is the reason we are sanguine in the belief that in the next year, we might, with some luck, be able to register a growth of about 7 per cent - no mean achievement by any count. How could we do that? Sir, the three stimulus packages - in December and then, February and then, in the Interim Budget - which accounted for an infusion of Rs. 1,86,000 crore into the Indian economy, which went to fuel consumption, demand and, therefore, re-energised our productive processes, definitely helped in that process. To that extent, Sir, the first test of the Budget must stand to scrutiny, namely, that this has given to us an extraordinary opportunity to come out with an ingenious and an extraordinary response. Of course, we have strained the full resources of the Indian nation State. And, that is where I would come to the points that they have made and I have no reason to deny them that view and they have all the reason to expound their economic theory. But, the view, that I would like to share with this House, is that in extraordinary times, you look for extraordinary remedies. It is true that we have strained every single sinew of the Indian nation state. It is true that we are pegging on the margins. There can be no doubt about it. Even the Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, said it in so many words. But, Sir, at the end of the day, all arguments, all submissions of fiscal deficit must have only a limited appeal when it comes to securing the future and the present and immediate well-being of the people of India. Sir, we have not expounded or accepted or advanced ever a philosophy that the people are secondary to the State. The State, as a social compact of its constituents, is a product of the will of the people, and it is eventually the State that must bring succour to the people in extraordinary circumstances. I am aware that the kind of expenditure that we have allocated in the Budget will put a strain on our sources. But, this has been consciously done. This has been advisedly done. This has been done in pursuance of a philosophy of governance that tilts in favour of those who are on the margins. The UPA Government believes that the State must today come up and deliver on the challenges that the nation faces, and that is the reason, Sir, that we always recount what the architect of modern India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, said. He said, "The service of the nation is service of the millions who suffer." Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, reminded us of this talisman and he said, "The State and the Government must endeavour to wipe every tear from every eye." Now, it is in situations like the one that we face today that our own philosophy as a nation is put to test. Can we fair that test at the altar of Keynesian Economic theory that you cannot spend beyond your means. Yes, we all know that. We don't need to cite Keynes or Adam Smith to say that we cannot spend beyond our means. Our Prime Minister said in his various speeches as the Finance Minister that no country and no Government can live beyond its means. We know that. It is a way in the

Indian philosophy. But, what do we do in an extraordinary situation? Do we let millions of people suffer? Do we let millions of young men going to depression for want of any indication of their future? We can't do that. That is where the State, as an instrumentality in the service of the people, must exert itself. The endeavours of the State have to be tested, Sir, on the touchstone of whether while securing economic growth, while ensuring fiscal prudence, we do not compromise the lives, the aspirations, the hopes of those living on the margin. Sir, this is the ultimate validation of the exercise of democratic power. There is no justification for anyone to be in Government, there is no justification for even the State to exist if you cannot, in the extraordinary situation, bring succour to the people of this country.

The second test, therefore, Sir, I think, stands validated in view of my submission. I come to the third test. Is there an internal, integral philosophy of the Budget? Yes, it is there. What is the philosophy? It is the one, which I just elaborated, that when it comes to test the Government as the voice of the people, voice of a billion people of this country, shall not fail; that a duly elected Government is bound irrevocably to the pledges it makes when it goes to seek the mandate of the people. You cannot fault any Government for living up to the pledges that it makes to the people of India. That, Sir, is the third test, and, on this test also, this Budget, irrevocably, advisably asserts the philosophy of governance that tilts in favour of those who need help.

Sir, 'inclusive governance', 'inclusive growth', and, 'growth with equity' are not an empty political rhetoric for the UPA leadership. When our leader, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi announced schemes like NREGA, Bharat Nirman and RTI, she was espousing a view of governance, a view of the State that will always stand for the have-nots, if it came to the crunch, and, Sir, today, we have figures to demonstrate it.

As somebody said, the proof of the pudding is in its eating and the empiricists who have expounded the empiricist theory of history say, "my view is as good as yours, and, therefore, there is no superiority of your views". Only the facts are sacred and nothing else is sacred. In that view of the matter, Sir, I have some facts to share with this House. Sir, I will only take half a minute. Have you really been able to achieve inclusive agenda of governance? My answer is, 'yes'. Sir, Rs. 71,000 crores of debt-waiver to farmers is a record, unprecedented, in the annals of history of this country. On top of that, for the first time in the history of this country since Independence, the availability of agricultural credit has been increased from Rs. 28,700 crores to Rs. 3,25,000 crores. I think, Mr. Raja said, it is a marginal increase over the past. Sir, it is a huge increase in actual terms. Look at the sum total of the figure of Rs. 3,25,000 crores availability of credit to the farmers. It speaks of Rs. 39,100 crores for NREGA enabling over four crore people of this country to take jobs.

Sir, we all know that human dignity is inextricably linked to your economic subsistence levels and it is only jobs that give you that basic security net, the basic net that ensures you not only

livelihood, it ensures you a life of dignity that the Constitution mandates upon all of us to secure for all our people. We have discharged the Constitutional mandate, we have lived up to our political pledges, and, therefore, we have delivered on every single pledge that we made to the people of India.

Sir, the National Food Security Act is a path-breaking legislative exercise. I heard some distinguished Member saying that the work on the Act has not started. We have been in the Government for only two months. The work has already started. A legislation of this kind that must stand scrutiny in courts, and, that must stand the test of time, will take a little bit more time but the fact remains that this is a path-breaking initiative of the UPA Government, unprecedented, once again, not only in India but in any part of the world. Sir, allocations for the *Bharat Nirman* have been raised by 45 per cent, if you want to calculate in percentage terms, in 2009-10. There is an increase of 63 per cent in the outlay for the *Indira Awaas Yojana*. Corpus for the *Rashtriya Mahila Kosh*, which facilitates credit support to poor women, has been increased from Rs.100 crore to Rs.500 crore. Rs.15,027 crore have been made available for the National Rural Health Mission.

Without the health of a country, no country can exist. The foremost duty of any Government is spending in the social infrastructure sector, that is, education and health. In fact, the Eleventh Plan has been described as the Education Plan. Rs.15,027 crore have been provided for health.

An amount of Rs.4,000 crore has been made available to micro, small, and medium enterprises. Sir, I entirely agree that one of the great deficits of our economy so far has been our poor infrastructure. But, for that reason, the funds are made available to the IIFCL. It will enable it to spend over the years Rs. One lakh crore in the PPP mode.

One of our distinguished colleagues said why are we subsidising private sector investments and initiatives in infrastructure. No. It is in the PPP mode. These are the assets of the nation. These eventually become assets of the nation. And if there is private sector participation, that enables us to leverage more public funding. We can get more money and therefore invest more in infrastructure.

Every single section of our society — senior citizens, salaried people, pensioners in the Army, and women — has been given some kind of relief or the other.

Sir, I would like to submit this for your consideration. It is no one's case and the Finance Minister himself said it by way of a caveat that a single Budget Speech cannot be a panacea or answer to all our wants. Nor is the Budget the only instrument to solve all our problems. But it is indicative of a philosophy of governance; it is indicative of a resolve; and it is indicative of a will to marshal the resources of the nation in aid of a philosophy of politics that we have shared with the people of India.

6.00 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time that you asked is over.

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR: Sir, I need five more minutes. Sir, I know for certain that the collective wisdom of the people of India is much larger than the wisdom of their representatives or of any Government. The ultimate test of any Government's promises or programmes is after five years when people cast their votes. We must have done something right, and we are continuing in that direction, for the people of India have returned us to power consecutively the second time.

Sir, Arnold Toynbee once said, "The History of civilisation is nothing more and nothing less than a series of responses to a series of challenges that people face in common." Have we come up to those challenges? Have we answered those challenges? That, Sir, is the touchstone on which this Budget will have to be judged.

Sir, I have one quote to make from the speech of Shri P. Chidambaram, the then Finance Minister, when he was speaking during the debate on the Budget for 2006-07. He said, The young people of India are building castles, it may appear that those castles are in the air, but as Henry David Thoreau said: "If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost; that is where they should be. Now put the foundations under them." That is what, Sir, this Budget seeks to do.

In summation, allow me to say, Sir, the final validation of the Budget; the Budget echoes the silent cry of those who suffer from want, hunger, disease, powerlessness and lack of freedom. It lends itself to the advancement of dignity of the marginalised. It allows everyone to participate in the prosperity of the nation. It protects the vulnerable and helps those in need to escape the trap of need. It envisions an economic system that strengthens the bonds of human solidarity. It recognises that the State must exist for its creators and not *vice versa* and that the economic system is a means and not an end. Finally, Sir, and this is the most important line I would like to draw your attention to, the Budget knows its own limitations. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Message from Lok Sabha.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Appropriation (No.2) Bill, 2009

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Appropriation (No.2) Bill, 2009, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 14th July, 2009.