

170 kilolitres a day, respectively. As a result, those wells ceased to flow. Fourteen, due to the whims of the CMD, the OIL is bearing maximum wastage of money. Without examining the necessity, he ordered to send the BHEL 55 rigs to Bhubaneshwar, and when it was found that it could not be accommodated, it was brought back again to Duliajan. Fifteen, some equipments worth Rs. 3.25 crores, meant for desert drilling in Rajasthan, were procured. When the drilling programme could not be finalised, these materials had been transferred to various operation areas, mainly to Duliajan, to regularise the buying, though these equipments cannot be used there. Before the present C.M.D. joined OIL, it had a surplus of 30 to 40 crores all the time. But since his coming the OIL is facing minus point with an overdraft of 50 crores mainly due to overdrafting.

I have cited a few examples of how the OIL is performing under the guidance of the present C.M.D. The students, the youths and the local public have been witnessing all these happenings at OIL. Now they have raised a voice of protest against such activities of the present C.M.D. OIL is a public sector undertaking and every citizen has the right to voice for its better management. But till today the Government, ignoring the public voice, has been trying to cover up these things lightly. The people's protest the misdeeds of the C.M.D. and thereby doing more harm to the organisation. I caution the Government not to take all these things lightly. The people's protest may take a strong stand to call for a total bandh and then it would be very difficult to handle the situation. Therefore, the Ministry should take immediate action in this regard to put an end to it before the situation goes out of control.

**THE BUDGET (GENERAL) 1987-88—
GENERAL DISCUSSION—(Contd.)**

श्री विठ्ठलभाई मोतीराम पटेल
(गुजरात) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि हमारी सरकार का खर्चा दिन-प्रति-दिन बढ़ता जा रहा है। उस में जहां हो सके वहां कटौती करनी

चाहिए और एक-एक पैसा बचा कर हम को खर्चा कम करने की कोशिश करना चाहिए। मैं एक एग्जम्पल देता हूँ। ओ०एन०जी०सी० का हैडक्वार्टर देहरादून में रखा गया है। देहरादून में कोई तेल तो निकलता नहीं है फिर हैडक्वार्टर देहरादून में क्यों रखा गया है मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। मैंने काफी कोशिश की पता लगाने की कि देहरादून में यह कैसे गया। बहुत साल पहले जब तय किया गया था उस वक्त पेट्रोल मिनिस्ट्री में जो अधिकारी थे उनकी जमीन देहरादून में थी। वह जमीन गवर्नमेंट द्वारा खरीदने के लिए उन्होंने तय किया और हैडक्वार्टर ओ०एन०जी०सी० का वहां रखा है। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से कहता हूँ कि वह तलाश करायें, फाइल निकलवायें और यह पता लगवायें कि यह हैडक्वार्टर वहां क्यों रखा गया। ओ०एन०जी०सी० के अधिकारियों ने एक साल में 5,800 ट्रिप हवाई जहाज से गुजरात जाने का और असम जाने के लगाये। 2,300 ट्रिप्स फ्रस्ट क्लास और एयर कंडीशंड के लगा तो यह सब खर्चा करने की जरूरत क्या है। वह अपना हेलीकाप्टर भी रखते हैं। जहां तेल निकलता है वहां हैडक्वार्टर रखने से इनका यह हवाई जहाज का खर्चा बच सकता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : असम में ले जायें या गुजरात में ?

श्री विठ्ठलभाई मोतीराम पटेल : गुजरात ले जाइये, बम्बई ले जाइये। जहां तेल मिलता है वहां ले जाइये। देहरादून रखने की क्या जरूरत है। उनको डाक ले जाने के लिए भी हवाई जहाज का इस्तेमाल करना पड़ता है। ऐसी हालत में यह खर्चा कम करना चाहिए।

दूसरे, फूड कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया में 10 परसेंट का अनाज में घाटा होता है। जो प्राइवेट व्यापारी होते हैं उनका अनाज में एक परसेंट या डेढ़ परसेंट से ज्यादा घाटा नहीं होता है तो इनका दस परसेंट घाटा क्यों होता है यह समझ में नहीं आता। इसमें भी कुछ कमी कर सकते हैं।

[श्री विठ्ठलभाई मोतीराम पटेल]

एक बात और है कि प्रोजेक्ट सैंक्शन करने में बहुत डिले करते हैं और इतना डिले करते हैं कि खर्चा 10 गुना, 20 गुना हो जाता है। प्लानिंग कमीशन में जो बैठ हुए हैं मैं यह नहीं कहता कि वह अकलमंद नहीं हैं, उनमें अकल है। पर उनको यह देखना चाहिए कि प्रोजेक्ट को सैंक्शन देर से करते हैं तो उससे कितना ही खर्चा हमारा बढ़ जाता है। कमी-कमी 15 साल, 20 साल लग जाते हैं प्रोजेक्ट को सैंक्शन करने में जबकि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं एक एक्जाम्पल देता हूँ। हमारे यहां गुजरात का नर्मदा प्रोजेक्ट है। यह सालों से चला आ रहा है। प्रिंसिपल में एक्सप्ट कर लिया गया है, वर्ल्ड बैंक ने लोन भी सैंक्शन किया है। जब यह सब हो गया तो एन-वायरनमेंट डिपार्टमेंट बीच में आ गया कि इतने जंगल खत्म हो जायेंगे। हमने कह भी दिया कि हम 20 गुना जंगल पैदा कर देंगे लेकिन वह अभी तक नहीं माने। गुजरात गवर्नमेंट इस पर साढ़े तीन सौ करोड़ रुपये खर्च भी कर चुकी है और मध्य प्रदेश ने भी खर्च किया है। गुजरात को हर दिन 4 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा हो रहा है। इस प्रोजेक्ट को जल्दी से जल्दी पूरा होना चाहिए। वहां पर पीने का पानी नहीं मिलता। अहमदाबाद से टैंकर से कच्छ और सौराष्ट्र को पानी दिया जाता है। स्पेशल ट्रेन चलानी पड़ती है। अगर हमारा नर्मदा प्रोजेक्ट पूरा हो जाए तो पूरे गुजरात को पानी मिल सकता है। हमारे यहां की प्रोडक्शन भी बढ़ जायेगी। सौराष्ट्र ग्राउन्ड-नट पैदा करता है। अगर यह प्रोजेक्ट पूरा हो जाता है तो ग्राउन्ड-नट की प्रोडक्शन बढ़ जायेगी और 700-800 करोड़ का जो इम्पोर्ट करना पड़ता है वह बन्द हो जायेगा। और एक्सपोर्ट करने को भी मिलेगा। इसलिए मैं सरकार से और प्रधान मंत्री जी से विनती करता हूँ कि वे जल्दी से जल्दी इस नर्मदा प्रोजेक्ट का मामला तय कर दें, सैंक्शन कर दें। दूसरी बात मैं प्राइस इंडेक्स के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं पार्लियामेंट में दिया गया जवाब पढ़ रहा था कि प्राइस इंडेक्स तय करने के लिए कौन-कौन सी चीजों

को एकान्त में लिया जाता है। ग्रीन कोकोनट को इसमें रखा जाता है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कितने लोग ग्रीन कोकोनट पीते हैं? इसी तरह से चीकोलेट, काफी, जैम जैली, बिस्कुट, सिल्क साड़ी आदि सब चीजों को रखा जाता है। इससे प्राइस इंडेक्स और बढ़ जाता है। इनके अलावा सिगरेट, मेटरेस, टी०वी०, फोटो मेटरियल, लिपिस्टिक शैम्पू, हेयर लोशन, आदि सब चीजों को रखा जाता है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कितने लोग लिपिस्टिक यूज करते हैं? इन चीजों को रखने से आपको तनख्वाहें बढ़ानी पड़ती हैं। जो डेटे-डु-इस्तेमाल की चीजें हैं जैसे अनाज है, तेल है, वेजिटेबल्स हैं और खाने की दूसरी चीजें हैं इनको आप ले सकते हैं। इसी तरह से जो लोग टैक्स इवेशन करते हैं, टैक्सों में हेराफेरी करते हैं उसको भी आपको रोकना चाहिए। अखबारों को ही लीजिये यहां पर मुझे जवाब दिया गया कि कुछ अखबार को मुनाफा होता है लेकिन वे घाटे वाली दूसरी कम्पनी जायन कर लेते हैं और मुनाफा नहीं दिखाते हैं। उस कम्पनी का डायरेक्टर ऐसे व्यक्ति को बना देते हैं जिसका एक भी शेयर नहीं होता है। वे लोग पैसा लेते हैं, भत्ता लेते हैं और अपना इलाज कराने के लिए विदेशों में जाते हैं जिसके लिए 2 लाख रुपये तक दिये जाते हैं। ऐसे लोगों के खिलाफ आपको ऐक्शन लेना चाहिए। ऐसे लोग जो हेराफेरी करते हैं, इनकम टैक्स नहीं देते हैं उनको आपको पकड़ना चाहिए अगर आप टैक्स ज्यादा वसूल करें तो आपको टैक्स लगाने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी। जहां तक पब्लिक सेक्टर का संबंध है पब्लिक सेक्टर में ज्यादातर बीमार मिले हैं। कामगारों को रोजगार देने के लिए टैक्सटाइल की बीमार मिलों को सरकार अपने हाथ में लेती है, लेकिन देखने में यह आता है कि इन्हीं बीमार मिलों के मजदूरों स्ट्राइक पर चले जाते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर बीमार मिलों के मजदूर भी स्ट्राइक पर चले जाएंगे तो काम कैसे चलेगा? अगर बीमार मिलों में मजदूर स्ट्राइक करें तो ऐसी मिलों को सरकार को बंद कर देना चाहिए। घाटे

में सरकार इन मिलों को चलाती है, इसलिए घाटे की मिलों को स्ट्राइक करने का अधिकार नहीं होना चाहिए। सरकार को इन मजदूरों को कहना चाहिए कि तुम इन मिलों को चलाओ, ट्रेड यूनियन को कहना चाहिए कि तुम इन बीमार मिलों को वायबल बनाओ। अगर इस तरह से ये बीमार मिलें घाटे में चलती रहेगी तो सरकार का दीवाला निकल जाएगा। हम यह देख रहे हैं कि कई इंडस्ट्रीज ऐसी हैं जैसे स्टील इंडस्ट्री है वहां पर ट्रेड यूनियनों की वजह से घाटा हो रहा है क्योंकि लोग काम पूरा नहीं करते हैं। ये लोग कहते हैं कि कम काम, ज्यादा दाम। घाटे की मिलों में ट्रेड यूनियन को नहीं रखना चाहिए। जब तक कोई इंडस्ट्री वायबल नहीं हो जाती तब तक वहां पर स्ट्राइक नहीं होनी चाहिए, वायबल होने पर ही वहां ट्रेड यूनियन होनी चाहिए। घाटे की मिलों में मजदूरों से यह कहना कि काम कम करो, सजे चलो, ठीक नहीं है। पब्लिक सेक्टर की इंडस्ट्रीज सरकार द्वारा चलाई जाती हैं और वहां पर जो यूनियन्स हैं वे सब लेफ्टिस्ट्स हैं। सोसलिस्ट कंट्रीज में तो यह हाल है कि स्ट्राइक करने का किसी को अधिकार नहीं है। मैंने उनकी लेबर पालिसी को देखा है और डिसकस भी किया है। वहां पर सारी जिम्मेदारी कामगारों पर होती है। उनके ऊपर प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने की जिम्मेदारी होती है। उनको स्ट्राइक करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं होता है। जिस तरह से कम्युनिस्ट कंट्रीज में है वहां की लेबर पालिसी में है कि उनकी मजदूरी प्रोडक्शन के सांख्यिक की जानी चाहिए। अगर वह ज्यादा प्रोड्यूस करेगा तो उसे ज्यादा मजदूरी मिलेगी और कम करेगा तो कम मिलेगी। यह चीज हमारे यहां भी होनी चाहिए और बुल्गेरिया तथा रूस में जो लेबर पालिसी है वहां हमें अडाप्ट करना चाहिए। यहां पब्लिक सेक्टर में नुकसान हो रहा है...

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) :
प्राइवेट सेक्टर नहीं है उसके बारे में भी... (व्यवधान)....

श्री विठ्ठलभाई मोतीराम पटेल :
पब्लिक सेक्टर के बारे में कह रहा हूँ।

प्राइवेट सेक्टर कुछ भी करे लेकिन पब्लिक सेक्टर में तो नहीं करना चाहिए। वह तो नेशन का है।.... (व्यवधान).... पब्लिक सेक्टर में जो नुकसान होता है वह नेशन का होता है। मान्यवर, अगर पब्लिक सेक्टर में कोई चीज बनती है तो सरकार को उसको खरीदना चाहिए। लेकिन सरकार कुछ चीजों को पब्लिक सेक्टर से नहीं खरीदती है, प्राइवेट वालों से खरीदती है। इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन है उसको अगर सिलेंडर खरीदने हैं तो वह नेशनल बैंगन इंजीनियरिंग कारपोरेशन, जो सिलेंडर बनाती है, उससे नहीं खरीदती बल्कि वह प्राइवेट कंपनियों से खरीदती है। इसे अलाऊ नहीं करना चाहिए और अगर नेशनल बैंगन इंजीनियरिंग कंपनी लास करती है तो ऐसा गवर्नमेंट को होने नहीं देना चाहिए। इसके लिये गवर्नमेंट को पब्लिक सेक्टर कंपनीज से ही माल खरीदना चाहिए। दवा हो या कोई भी अन्य चीज हो सरकार को जिन चीजों की आवश्यकता है वह सरकारी कंपनियों से लेना चाहिए।

अब मैं शुगर पालिसी के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। अभी जो शुगर पालिसी तय की गई है उसमें शुगर मिल एसोसियेशन ने जो मांग की थी वह उनको मिल गया। मैंने मंत्री जी से हाउस में पूछा था कि शुगर एसोसियेशन वालों ने जो डिमान्ड्स की हैं कि एक्सपेंशन करने के लिये 2 हजार 5 सौ टन मिनिमम कर दें तो इससे छोटी मिलें को अपरेटिव सेक्टर में आ ही नहीं सकेंगी। जहां बहुत ज्यादा शुगर केन होगी वहां ही यह इसके अंदर आ सकती हैं। हमें तो इतना शुगर केन मिलेगा ही नहीं। हमारी केपेसिटी 12 सौ, 13 सौ टन से ज्यादा नहीं है। लेकिन भगत जी कहते हैं कि यह नहीं हो सकता। इसके लिये 25 सौ मिनिमम कर दिया है वह उनकी डिमांड थी। जो प्राइवेट मिल एसोसियेशन वाले हैं वे कहते हैं कि नये लाइसेंस न दो बल्कि हमें एक्सपेंशन करने के लिये दे दो तो आप उनके सामने सरेंडर क्यों करते हैं? इसलिये सरकार की वर्तमान शुगर केन पालिसी है सरकार को वह बदलनी चाहिए।

[श्री विठ्ठलभाई मोतीराम पटेल]

दूसरा, जो क्राप इश्योरेंस स्कीम है, जो कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटी के मेम्बर हैं केवल वह ही इश्योरेंस कर सकते हैं। हर एक फार्मर, किसान अपनी क्राप का इश्योरेंस करवाना चाहता है। इसलिये सरकार को उनको भी इसकी इजाजत देनी चाहिए और इस संबंध में जो वर्तमान रूल्स हैं उनको बदलना चाहिए ताकि वे किसान जो कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज के मेम्बर नहीं हैं वे भी इस स्कीम का फायदा उठा सकें।

अंत में जो नेशनल बैंक बनाने का तय किया गया है वह बहुत अच्छा काम किया गया है। लेकिन जहां तक इसके इम्प्लीमेंटेशन का सवाल है, वर्तमान समय में जो अरबन लैंड सीलिंग है वह सारे देश में एक तरह का नहीं है। आज वह अलग-अलग स्टेट में अलग-अलग है उसका अलग-अलग इन्टरप्रेशन किया जाता है। इसमें काफी पैसा खर्चा जाता है, इसमें काफी अष्टाचार चलता है। तो ज्यादा हाउसिंग को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिये जो प्रोविजन किया गया है वह अच्छा है। लेकिन अभी लोगों की हाउसिंग एक्टीविटीज बहुत कम हैं क्योंकि लैंड सीलिंग ऐक्ट की वजह से यह नहीं हो पाता। इसलिये मैं सरकार से विनती करता हूं कि हर स्टेट में एक तरह का लैंड सीलिंग ऐक्ट इम्प्लीमेंट करे। धन्यवाद।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am somewhat inhibited in my task to see that soon after me is to participate in the debate my very eminent colleagues and very eminent economist Mr. Jha. Now my inhibition is on account of the fact that I have once had the occasion in Parliament to refer to him as a walking encyclopaedia of experience. I am also inhibited by the fact that he is a renowned economist. But I am encouraged in what I have to do on account of two factors. Firstly, I do believe that every budget document has inherent in it a political statement. Every budget of any Government has inherent in it a political statement. And,

therefore, when we come to examining the Budget 1987-88, we cannot merely examine it as a purely fiscal or an economic document. Here I am faced with the second difficulty because the Indian Budget as an instrument of fiscal policy, as a device of development and of the management of our economy, as our blueprint for progress, is considerably eroded in its functioning. The Indian Budget is no longer the instrument of fiscal policy. Therefore, this erosion of its economic content and a preponderance of the political content make my task somewhat easier, particularly when eminent economists are to follow in the debate.

Now, why do I say that this Budget has like every Budget would have, a political comment inherent in it? I read with some interest the debate that has taken place in the other House and I have read with some interest, and heard some of the participants in this House. The Treasury Benches have sent out messages which confuse me. But I accept them. They say that this Budget is a Budget for the poor, that this Budget is a Budget for growth; it has in it every possible good quality that a Budget can possibly have. I do not refute any of these points. I concede to the Treasury Benches and to the Government that this Budget is all that you say it is. I do make one request. Please go over your own comments about this very Budget. This Budget cannot be all that you say it is. Considerable talent is attributed to the Finance Minister who has presented the Budget—the Prime Minister. Till lately, he was the Defence Minister and then we were informed by the Treasury Benches that he is a very astute and a very able handler of the country's defences. We accept that. We were then informed that we were in the middle of a smouldering nuclear core of a crisis, and in the middle of that crisis, this very astute and very able Defence Minister chose to stand aside, as it were, and asked of his distinguished colleague from the Finance Ministry, to take over charge of an impending battle. We were then told that there might be a battle. I do not know how fair or unfair this was to a very able Finance Minister. I have had the occasion to say it in print; therefore, I do not hesitate now to say it in Parliament that

the former Finance Minister is a considerable political asset of this country and epitomises in his public life integrity and uncorruptibility. Because I have said this in print, I have no hesitation in saying it statement. I approach this Budget. I am baffled when the Treasury Benches tell me that in the middle of that crisis, a very able Defence Minister chose to become suddenly overnight a very able Finance Minister. Therefore, with that originally confusing statement, a political statement. I approach this Budget. I am informed by the treasury benches and the Government that it is a Budget for the poor that it is a socialistic Budget that it is a Budget for growth, that it is a Budget which will revive our industry, that it will eliminate poverty, that it will encourage agriculture, that it will result in a boom in our exports, that prices will come down and that commodities will be easily available. I am not rejecting any of these points.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very good.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am very glad, the treasury benches would like to convey to us that a golden era has already dawned on the Indian economy. This is the sum total of the messages of the debate that has so far taken place in both the Houses. We are informed that this Budget is the most revolutionary kind of Budget which will now usher in a true socialistic India and all this praise leaves me somewhat confused. The Prime Minister when presenting the Budget was good enough to start with a quotation which is 29 years old. He commended that quotation of the first Prime Minister to the country. (Interruptions) Having commended that quotation,—I do not want to repeat the quotation, because it is part of the Budget papers—the Prime Minister and Finance Minister said that the task announced by the first Prime Minister of the country, twenty-nine years ago, continues and is, therefore our task even today. If you just reflect on that for a moment it is a very ironical statement, it is a very ironical quotation, to be used. A task which was announced as the task of the Government twenty-nine years ago is today repeated as the task of the present Government. There is in this a sought-

after image. I am still on the politics of Budget-making. The sought-after image, Madam, is that of a protector of the poor. But herein lies the dilemma of the present Government. Rightly, they chose a certain direction in that first Budget of the Government. But because the thought underlying the first Budget had not been thought out to its logical conclusion and because the necessary political courage to implement that thought was lacking because, following upon the first Budget, the overriding impression that came into existence in the country was,—these were the phrases which were mainly used then—the Prime Minister is a messiah of the middle-classes, that the Prime Minister was not for the poor, therefore, the Government was not for the poor but it was for the rich,—that was the political message of the first two Budgets—thwarted by that political message, inhibited by it there is now an attempt to retract, to go back and that is where, I feel, the Government has fallen between two stools of the political image-making through the Budget, and following economic sense by utilising the Budget as an instrument of fiscal policy. A word of caution here, Madam, to the Government would be necessary. There is an etymology of political images which you cannot correct by cosmetics and that etymology of political images has given your Government a certain public image. If you want to correct that image, it cannot be by cosmetic efforts. Therefore when I come to examining the economic innards, as it were, of this Budget, I have to make this point to you because you are currently troubled by the overriding political message of your economic policies that they are not for the poor, therefore, you have neither the economic sense, nor the political courage to either retract wholly, altogether, and come back to a well developed economic thought on the socialistic end of fiscal policy making, or a well developed economic thought which a very eminent civil servant, currently an eminent member of the Planning Commission, in a seminar put across, that the growth of the Indian economy has to be on the back of consumerism. These are not perhaps the exact words, but the sense of it is that the Indian economy of India, as such will not be able to move unless it moved by

(Shri Jaswant Singh)

that top layer of 8 per cent, 10 per cent or 12 per cent, depending on how you look at it. Unless that top 8 to 10 per cent were not freely permitted to indulge in consumerism and thus result in growth, the rest of the country will not be able to come up. A large section in the Treasury Benches, indeed the Government itself is inspired by this thought, but the Government is inhibited by an innate lack of political courage and conviction and therefore, it falls between the two stools.

On the eve of the budget making, I give this as an illustration of the paradox, the Prime Minister, after he had taken over the Finance portfolio said—I do not recollect where the speech was made but he had said—that I will do everything to ensure that there is a growth in the capital market. This is a very sound proposition with which nobody can have any dispute. Stop for a moment, and reflect as to why then did all the stock exchanges in the country have a precipitous decline, a fall, straight after the presentation of the budget. It was the Prime Minister who was presenting the budget and, therefore, not unnaturally, the occasion was looked forward to with a great degree of anticipation. It was a great degree of anticipation because the high office of the Prime Minister was engaging itself into the formulation of the nation's fiscal policy. I am afraid, those expectations not only were not met, not only were not fulfilled, in fact, they were belied. Routinely, outside of the chambers of the two Houses or outside of the limited realm of political partisanship the comment that has come about the union budget of 1987-88 is that it is a budget without character, that it is a budget which cannot be identified. Where does this budget, actually stand? Some eminent Indians have described it as a bureaucratic budget, as a bureaucrat's budget. They have gone to the extent of describing it as a bureaucrat's revenge on the Indian nation. They have gone to the extent which I think, if only the Treasury Benches would stop for a moment and reflect on the insulting implications of the suggestions, they have gone to the extent of saying that the

Discussion

Prime Minister has been fooled because he has been persuaded by the bureaucrats to present a budget which he had himself not read.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Where is the persuasion? The persuasion is when you know something and you act something to the contrary.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That would be even more alarming to me. Madam, if I followed what my dear colleague Murlidhar Bhandare said that there was no persuasion, I am even more alarmed. If the Prime Minister was persuaded to present budget which he had not read and my friend says, where is the persuasion?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE: There could be persuasion only when he had read it. There would be no persuasion if he had not read. You have not understood the fallacy of your argument.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Madam, he read his Budget speech in Parliament on the floor of the House.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, the point is made.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him continue.

SHRI SAT PAUL MITTAL (Punjab): The Budget does not lack character; his speech lacks character.

AN HON. MEMBER: His party lacks character.

SHRI SAT PAUL MITTAL: I won't go to that extent.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Mittal, don't get agitated.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When any Minister makes a statement it is presumed that he has read it. You cannot say the Prime Minister has not read it.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): It is a deliberate attempt to denigrate the Prime Minister.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): He did read it in the Lok Sabha.

Discussion

[Shri Jaswant Singh].

with the last comment that it is an attempt to denigrate the Prime Minister, I wholeheartedly agree. Of course it is. I do not deny it, for a moment. But for the rest of the comments, if the Treasury Benches are so aggrieved about it, they have had an occasion and a number of them have participated....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes please continue.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Right, Madam. I have three propositions to make here. Firstly, I believe that no great expertise is needed in spending public money. That is why I discount what these great Indians have said about the Prime Minister. For preparation of the Budget and its presentation, no great expertise is needed in spending public money. Now if therefore the Budget is an exercise in spending public money and if no great expertise is needed in spending it, I don't think the Treasury Benches need necessarily be very alarmed about it.

Then I put across my second proposition, which is that budgetary figures with which we are engaged today, purporting to the facts, are in fact fiction. In attempting to explain what I am trying to say, I have to come to the first aspect of one of the components of the 'innards' of the Budget as it were, which is the size of the deficit. Now I approach my task by prefacing and saying that I am not an economist; I am in fact not even a student of economic theory.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): That explains all that you are talking.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE
SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: That is the real deficit.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I accept this.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Does it mean that your deficit is also of the same type?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, I accept that this is real deficit.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: That could be bridged.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am approaching my task not as an economic theoretician, but certainly as some body who is routinely concerned as a political activist, yes as somebody who is engaged with and involved with economic policy formulation of the country. Now about the deficit, about which a number of speakers have spoken, I am reminded of a well-worn epigram of Maynard Keynes which is, whenever you owe a bank one thousand rupees—I am paraphrasing it—it is my problem. But if the bank owed me a million rupees, it is the bank's problem. In like manner, if I could utilise this well-worn epigram to say that with this size of deficit—of 8300 and odd crores of rupees—I am unable to make out exactly whose problem it is. The Treasury Benches would have us believe and the Government would have us believe that this deficit is no problem; 8300 crores of deficit is no problem to the Government. If it is not a problem to the Government, Madam, I would really like to be informed: is it the problem of the people of India? Is it the problem of the Reserve Bank of India? Whose problem is it then? Here I have to elaborate a bit more what I am saying on the question of deficit by relying on some facts and figures. In the face of this deficit, the two outstanding aspects of this deficit are that the corresponding revenue raising effort results in roughly Rs. 322 crores net and then, therefore, the uncovered deficit gets reduced and we get an uncovered deficit of roughly Rs. 5,700 crores, the actual figure being Rs. 5,688 crores; but I am rounding off. Now what we have to do is, therefore, to examine the trend of these deficits. The previous Finance Minister had done considerable exercise in this field and indeed presented a long-term fiscal policy and now all that long-term fiscal policy is now reduced to nothing, adding only to the volumes of the Indian Archives because one of the casualties of the present budget is the long-term fiscal policy. Please examine, just for a moment, the trend of these deficits. In 1985-86 the deficit budgeted was Rs. 3,316 crores. The actual turned out to be Rs. 6,565 crores, that is, in 1985-86, the first year of the present Government's regime. In the current year, 1986-87, the estimate in the original was Rs. 3,703 crores, actually

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

it mounted to Rs. 8,285 crores. Now if you are applying the same rough rule of three, the current deficit estimated, presently, is at around Rs. 5,700 crores and if we apply the same pattern it might well go up to Rs. 12,000 crores.

Now I am here, Madam, faced with another difficulty, which is that I am honoured that the previous Finance Minister and the Leader of the House is present here to do me the great honour and courtesy of listening to what I am saying; but I am also somewhat aggrieved that no one from the Finance Ministry is present here. None of the Ministers from the present Finance Ministry are here. There are three Ministers of State and not one of them is here. I am sure the Leader of the House would stand up now and say it is a joint Cabinet responsibility and somebody is taking notes... (Interruptions)... My friend from Assam taking notes is as good as my taking notes and informing the Prime Minister because this is a complex subject.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): The Finance Minister was here just now. He just left. He will be coming back in a couple of minutes.

श्री जसवंतरी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार): यह राज्य सभा को अवमानना है... (व्यवधान)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Now it is a problem. However....

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: He will now report only about defence matters.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, the next question is: what are we engaged in, what is all this development for? Here I would like to share with the Government a thought which is being expressed a great deal outside in rest of the country now, that India is becoming two countries—that India is getting divided between 'India' and 'Bharat'. And they go to the extent of saying that this division in finding its roots between the village and urban India, between the poor and the rich and is going to have very

telling social consequences for the rest of the country. Now, how do I substantiate what I am saying? In the fifties—and I may be corrected about the exactness of the percentages, that am quoting—the agricultural sector's contribution to the GNP was roughly 60 per cent. There was rural population, was contributing 60 per cent to the national income. In the eighties, the agricultural sector's—rural India's—share of contribution to the national income has declined to 30 per cent. Perhaps the Government would confirm to me that the population share does remain the same. Seventy per cent of India contributed 60 per cent of the income in the fifties and that very 70 per cent, which means the balance of 30 per cent of the country is enjoying 70 per cent of the income of this country. Please reflect on this great divide that is taking place. And it is because of this divide that the next aspect comes up. It is about poverty. I am not going into the aspects of how much budgetary allocation you are making on poverty alleviation of all the various acronyms which today clutter our vocabulary on poverty alleviation, what the net effect of it is on the ground as far as actual poverty alleviation is concerned. And I take the example only of my home State, Madam, which is Rajasthan. I am neither a statistician nor an economist. Therefore, I have perforce to rely on an economist and statistician, and it will take me a minute. I am quoting here, Madam, from a Mid-Year Review by Dr. Malcolm Adiseshiaiah, which says:

"We have broad agreement on what is meant by poverty. Using income as the means of measuring poverty, and in the absence of a nation-wide data on income using expenditure data as the only available proxy for income, we have the Planning Commission's definition of the expenditure of Rs. 65 per capita per month in rural and Rs. 75 per capita per month in urban areas at 1977-78 prices which will assure the individual 2400 calories of food in rural and 2100 calories of food in the urban areas to live above poverty."

This is the definition of the Planning Commission. On the basis of this definitional agreement there are today broadly three groups or points of view on the status of poverty in the country. Now I am not going to engage myself on these three groups and their different approaches to the definition of poverty and, therefore, what the percentage of poverty is with which we are today involved. I take the example, Madam, and reduce it to the level of my own State. Accepting for the present the validity of the NSS methodology—I am not going into all the various methodologies and there is a controversy on the NSS methodology itself—the table of the Planning Commission and the NSS itself confirms as well as shatters some well-known judgements and correlations. The lowest levels of the rural poverty in 1983-84 were recorded in Punjab and Haryana, which of course, are accounted for by a higher agricultural produce. But when it comes to the percentage of increase in rural poverty, one of the States affected is Rajasthan. Rajasthan, on the basis of the NSS data, not on any external criteria which is controversial—I am accepting the facts and figures which are the Government's own facts—records an actual increase in poverty, rural poverty.

Now, Madam I am not going to go into the controversial aspects of the definition of poverty and the methodologies involved. I would request the Government to explain to me how poverty has in fact, given the controversial nature of poverty definitions and arrivals of percentages, actually gone up in Rajasthan when you claim that it has declined nationally and in other States and what you are going to do about it as far as my State is concerned.

There are three aspects of the Budget Madam, to which every speaker and every commentator has referred and the Prime Minister, in his presentation of the Budget, has also mentioned them—interest subsidies and defence. I am not going to go into the aspects of interest and subsidies because a number of previous speakers have spoken about them.

Before coming to defence, I just want to take a minute each on two other aspects of the budget, which are the taxation philosophy and the balance of payments.

I am unable to make out the government's taxation philosophy, what taxation philosophy should I determine from the present Budget. Perhaps, consideration of the Finance Bill would be a more fitting occasion to go into more detailed aspects of the taxation philosophy. I cannot, however help reflecting that when it comes to direct taxation, I am unable to determine the rationale behind a number of measures which have already been referred to. On balance of payments I am considerably more alarmed. The situation that the country is facing in large trade deficits and in considerable draws of foreign exchange is on account of many factors. It could be—perhaps the Government would inform me about this—on account of large bill for petroleum imports; it could also be that our non-petroleum imports, including capital goods, intermediaries etc., and the bulk imports have not really shown decline by controls or management as it ought to be. There is a new element, to my understanding, in India's balance of payments position. It is that now we are possibly coming to, what the economists would call, a hump in our debt servicing ratio and in our debt servicing liability. Therefore, because in the current year we are going to enter this hump, this high peak of debt repayment obligations and that having fulfilled this debt repayment obligation the situation is not going to correct itself and revert to a position of comfortable debt service ratios. So, what is the Government going to do about it? By my reckoning, the current debt servicing ratio is in excess of 22 per cent. I remember a period in Parliament when an increase of debt servicing ratio to 16 per cent had caused us an alarm. Now 22 per cent is being taken as normal. Possibly, there is a Government fiscal rationale for it. We could perhaps be convinced that the Indian economy has grown in such a manner that its inherent dynamism is such that we can absorb debt servicing ratios of 22 per cent. But I would like the Government to clarify this aspect and convince us about it.

Now, I would take also this opportunity to caution the Government about what to my unlettered eyes, look to be that there

[Sari Jaswant Singh]

are some dangers on his external trade deficit front. The era that we witnessed of the newly industrialised countries demonstrating export led growth, cannot be repeated in India. There are dangers inherent in attempting to apply that same blueprint. Therefore I would like to ask the Government what is their philosophy about exports? Why exports? What purpose do you see in increasing exports? This is not a rhetorical question. I would really like to be explained by the Government of India. Why do you export? Is it merely to meet our trade deficit? Is it merely to keep the book balance? What is the rationale? What philosophy persuades you to indulge in export promotion?

There are two other difficulties. To my unlettered eyes it looks that the Indian economy is currently manifesting, on account of very high capital-output ratio; it is demonstrating our being priced out of the international markets because our domestic costs of production are very high. Now, if you are priced out of the international markets because our capital-output ratio is high, because our cost of production is high, what therefore, are you going to do?

There is one more administrative difficulty. Whenever you talk about balance of payments your figures are always three years old. The Prime Minister tells us that we are to move into the 21st century. If Gregorian calendar is to be followed and Newton's laws do not change and the Sun keeps on rising, then willy-nilly we will enter the 21st century. But if the Ministry of Commerce and the Government of India do not have figures of actual trade pattern of earlier than three years, how are you going to do advance planning? Please try and answer some of these questions.

Now I come to Defence. With that I shall conclude. On this I would be very brief. Is it not that the Defence Budget is the price that we pay for our foreign policy? As Rs. 12,512 crores net of defence revenue, which if it was not taken into account, the actual defence budget would be Rs. 13,768 crores which is the

highest ever. Even if the GNP figures are a collection of a muddle roughly 6 per cent of our GNP, roughly a fifth of our total budget and roughly a third of our non-plan expenditure goes into defence. There is an even more telling statistical index which I would like to put across to the Government and that index is between the revised figures of budget estimates of 1986-87 and the budget estimates of 1987-88. The defence budget reflects a hike of 43 per cent. This is a pattern. If you reflect it against the defence budget of 1979-80 to the defence budget of 1987-88 1979-80 actuals to the 1987-88 estimates, the hike is of the order of 400 per cent. Madam, there is a cryptic sentence in the budget speech of the Prime Minister who informed the House and the nation by stating the obvious. What is the obvious? The obvious was that we shall not be found wanting when it comes to national security and we shall not shrink from any sacrifice. National security is not a purchasable commodity to be obtained through budgetary figures. National security is an extremely complex web of many, inter-woven strands, social economic, industrial and moral. Therefore, I would like to ask the Government to examine the propositions on which this high level of defence spending is based. We will have an opportunity to examine the defence budget itself at much greater length when it comes to debating the demands for grants. I do put to the Government, therefore, only one question: Firstly, examine closely the social costs of such high level of spending on defence, and depending on how you look at it, India might or might not be a poor country, but India is a country of the poor. Secondly, please examine very closely the foreign policy which forces us to engage in this high level of spending on defence. I would now like to conclude my somewhat unlettered presentation about the budget. (Time bell rings). I will take only two minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes all right.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, I would like to conclude by a quote:

"It is for the first time since independence, that we have in New Delhi an administration which has unabashed allegiance to a specific ideology. This ideology has three strands: development is best left to private initiative, taxes are an evil and the poor are dispensable. It is a floundering budget presented by an uncertain Prime Minister, who by instinct belongs to the days gone by and by inclination is attempting to move to the twenty-first century and who is baffled no end by the present century's obsession with democratic institutions. Since our nation has chosen him for a full term, it has no choice, it has to bear with his amateurishness."

Thank you.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Madam, may I know from him whose quotation is this? Can he tell us on whom he depends for his wisdom.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Lakshmi Kant Jha.

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairman, speaking on the Budget, it is to be expected that I am going to support it just as it was to be expected that members of the Opposition were critical of it. What amazed me however, was that so much of the criticism was based on very questionable assumptions and without regard to facts. One point which was raised time and again was about the direction. Now, the long term direction of our policy has been uniform. It does not fluctuate from year to year, from Budget to Budget, not even from plan to plan. The strategy has to be adjusted, the tactics have to be modified having regard to the situation on the ground and therefore, when the Prime Minister quoted his own grandfather's words, it was to imply the sense of continuity, which has guided our policies. Now, I was a little amazed to find that my friend Shri Nirmal Chatterjee, did not approve of this particular quotation from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, namely "that

socialism is not the spreading out of poverty. "The essential thing is that there must be wealth and production." Now, I was wondering why he was so uncomfortable about this and then it came to me that this, perhaps, is the basic difference which divides us on this side of the House, from the philosophy presented by Shri Nirmal Chatterjee and those of his way of thinking. It is this we do not believe that socialism means that everybody should be equally poor. We believe that socialism means that nobody should be poor. Our attack, therefore, is on poverty, his attack is on wealth and that is the line of demarcation which I think I should highlight.

Now, as I said, the Budget each year tries to focus attention on different areas, not to change direction but to adjust priorities to see and ensure that where there are gaps and shortcomings they are filled up, imbalances are remedied. It is from this point of view that in each different Budget, the accent changes because the situation changes and also because the perception of what gone right and what is going wrong also changes. Now look at this Budget from that angle. What are the main lines of priority or, emphasis call it what you will? I think one of the most important contributions is the decision to appoint a commission to look into the conditions of agricultural labour. We have not quite frankly done enough about it. Everybody knows that they are exploited. We have a minimum wage legislation. (Interruption). I am sorry, the point which I am driving at is that something more is needed that what that Committee had reported it is towards that end that a commission is going to be set up.

Now, I come to the next major area, which is the emphasis on housing.

(Interruption).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA: Now, housing is one of the basic needs of the

[Shri Lakshmi Kant Jha]

community. It has now received, rather belatedly, I would say, the recognition it deserved from two points of view. Firstly it provides shelter, a basic necessity. Secondly, it makes the biggest contribution to employment generation. Not only to builders but to those who supply wood-work, windows, glass panes, furniture furnishing, electric fittings, plumbing and all that. A whole range of activity most of it carried on by small people, is sustained by housing. Therefore, allocation has been made of public funds for rural housing.

Side by side private funds also have to be involved and, therefore, a candid reappraisal has been made of the working of rent control as well as of urban land ceiling. I was chairing a commission from where I had recommended that both these need a second look. Rent control is believed to protect the poor tenant from the rich landlord. But the idea that tenants are poor is borrowed from agriculture. In actual fact you find that individuals, retired officials, widows owning a house, are getting a rent which was determined ten years, twenty years ago from joint stock companies, from diplomats and others. Again, because of this restriction a lot of black money is generated and those who have no black money cannot get accommodation. The 'Caves' are quite happy because they have rented accommodation which the 'have-nots' are denied. Now there is a decision to reconsider this. Of course, this is a State legislation but I hope the Central Government will come forward with a proposal regarding Delhi to set a model.

Then about the urban land ceiling, it was hoped and intended that it would release more land for housing, specially for housing the poor. But what has happened is the supply of building sites was frozen and urban land prices have been shooting up and so has the price

of real estate in all the major cities. Here are two major decisions—one, amending the laws; you must have the candour to admit this is not working well, and you must be prepared to revise it or scrap it. That is what is expected from an honest administration.

Then, emphasis on public sector. The emphasis has a qualitative element in it. It is the infrastructure for which there has to be a special accent and this, to my mind, is very fundamental. We began the First Plan with special emphasis on the infrastructure in the public sector. It provided the base on which high rates of growth in industry and overall, were achieved during the Second and Third Plans. But for various reasons—I don't need to go into them—the public sector performance in regard to the infrastructure—power generation and others—has been wanting. If we revise this, it will give a short in the arm to the economy as a whole.

Finally, the attempt is to revitalise the capital goods industry because they had suffered from what was a cleavage in policy. While imports in terms of licensing were liberalised, it was intended that duties will be adjusted to give adequate protection. Unfortunately, with the other consideration that we want to cheapen the cost of projects, project imports were allowed at very low rates of duty, and then the capital goods industry began to suffer. This again is a corrective measure, a timely measure, a welcome measure. I would only draw attention to one minor point, that the revised duty on project imports would affect those where equipments have already been ordered by the licensees, and suddenly those responsible for the project—some may be in the joint sector, some in the private sector, some large, some small—may find it necessary to find crores of extra finance. And I think this is a matter to which the Government should give attention. My suggestions would be two: Firstly, make this enhanced duty applicable for equipment arriving after a certain date; you can have 1st April or 1st May or 1st June. It does not mean any loss

to domestic industry because it will not lose any new orders. Secondly, whatever the date, tell the financial institutions that for filling the resource gap generated by the high duty not to embark on a fresh examination of viability. They should provide finance without delay and without hitch.

Now, Madam, I will turn to a point on which there has been considerable debate and that is the impact of the deficit on the price level. I have spoken on the subject before in different forums and my views are not in conformity with many economists whom I respect. But I do claim that what I am saying I am relating to the felt experience of the Indian situation and not to the doctrines and philosophies evolved in the other countries having regard to the conditions in their set-up. Now, being an old man, my memory goes back to what happened in the past. Between the years 1963 and 1967, we had an upsurge in prices, a 12 per cent rate of inflation against the rate of 3.7 per cent in the preceding seven years. Now, this was due to the fact that we had drought conditions and the crops failed, the foodgrains prices went up, the wages had to go up and everything went up. But the monetarists advocated: "No, no, no. This is due to the money put into circulation during the Chinese war which is now hitting the economy as a tidal wave and pushing up prices. So, cut down, cut down and cut down." He suspended our five-year planning; and we had Annual Plans. We thought that this would bring the problems under control. But what was the consequence of that? The consequence was that industrial growth rate slumped from 9 per cent to 2 per cent, and the particularly hit areas were those which were dependent on Government orders. The wagon-building industry in Calcutta was the worst casualty and one of the consequences, the last consequence of that, was that not only the engineering industry declined, but also West Bengal got saddled with a different kind of Government on its shoulders. Then the gross fixed investment which grew at the rate of 8.7 per cent in the Third Plan declined to 1.5 per cent. Now, is this the approach. Is this the remedy, that you want?

Now, let us look at the price behaviour. In the immediate past, during the last two years, we had a very heavy deficit, this year and last year also. But here in this House I heard Members getting up and protesting against the fall in prices of cotton, of jute, and of oilseeds etc. Now it shows that the assumption which the economists make that more money supply is giving rise to increase in prices is not correct. We have to put more money to sustain prices. Our foodgrains stocks, although production did not pick up, actually were going up. Should we make those poor people eat the foodgrain stocks in storage or allow the rats to chew them and spend money on storing them when there are empty stomachs which can be filled with them? But the way to do that is to make have purchasing power through higher employment. **Unemployment is, to my mind, a much bigger threat to our economy than variations in the price level.** Price rises worry whom? Only those who have an income. So, when the prices go up, their consumption may be reduced. But the unemployed are those who have no income. And it is to them that we have to reach out. Therefore, the anti-poverty programmes despite the deficits are necessary, economically justified and non-inflationary. Second, employment generating programmes are most desirable. 'Food for Work' is one of them. Again, if I may be immodest enough to claim, I was the first to ask for it in 1977. So these are the positive things which we cannot derive from the experience of western countries, socialist countries. These are the ways in which we can deal with our problems.

Now, what has the Budget done for the price level? I think it has done most sensible things. It has reduced levies on a large number of products which will benefit the common man.

Now, I want to make one more point about the state of the economy, about those who fear about deficit, about the demand. It is that the industry today is having a lot of idle capacity for lack of demand, for lack of orders. Time was when cement was scarce you had to

[Shri Lakshmi Kant Jha]

queue up for it and pay black money for it. Time was when scooters, tractors, trucks—for all these there was a shortage. Now, thanks to the liberalisation policies, production has caught up. The buyers' market has disappeared, and now the industries are looking for customers. In the textile industry stocks are going up. These industries which I named are suffering for lack of demand, lack of orders. So, are we to worry about price rise or should we be pumping in money to activate this capacity? In 1936 an idea was put forward by Keynes that when you have recessionary condition and unemployment, have deficit financing and start public works. I am not simply borrowing his idea, though I worked under him. But today's conditions in India, the state of economy in India, can not only sustain deficit financing but also benefit from it. Therefore, I am not worried about deficit financing. But we must watch out.

I am concerned about increase in non-productive expenditure. This is an item where I fully share the concern voiced. The Prime Minister stated that he was not happy with this deficit. I would agree with it in the qualitative sense. If all deficit was going into development, I would be very happy; it would have a real spurt. But we have a problem here. You cannot cut down non productive expenditure overnight by simply saying in this Budget: cut. It needs a determined effort to reduce the level of expenditure, and it has to be done, if I may say so, not by under-paying public servants, not by letting them have a deterioration in their standard of living, while every other sector, the private sector, prospers and blames the bureaucracy in the bargain. I think it is right that the Pay Commission's recommendations have been accepted by the Government. It was, to my mind, shocking that a Secretary to the Government today had a basic pay which, in rupee terms, was less than I drew when I became a Secretary in the 50's and was drawn by a Secretary to the Government in 1931. At that time the Indian National Congress at Karachi gave

a call for a ceiling of Rs. 500 per month for a public official. Translate that Rs. 500 of 1931 at current prices and see whether we are over-paying them. We are not, and they are doing...

SHRIMATI KALPNATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): How much will it be?

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA: I am not sure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty times.

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA: So, the attempt to take better care of the bureaucracy is necessary and our economy will come by shrinking its size and not by having an underpaid bureaucracy. We can have economy by changing the working methods. (Interruptions) I have made it clear that don't underpay your bureaucracy, but effect economy by changing working methods so that fewer people are engaged in doing a job. Today each file travels to so many people. It wastes time and it wastes public money. This is a badly needed reform. Nobody will stand retrenchment. You cannot shrink the size of the bureaucracy even by these means. But you can slow down recruitment and take benefit of retirement, provided you are doing what is needed in order to get efficiency along with a reasonable satisfaction in terms of living standards for your staff.

Madam, a point was made and is often made that the Budget has been made the bureaucracy. Now the bureaucracy can be blamed for delays, for callousness and whatever it may be. But when a budget is presented by the Prime Minister, it has the full Government's backing and responsibility and to say that it is a "bureaucratic revenge" is to my mind hitting someone below the belt because the bureaucracy cannot answer back.

Madam, I would like to conclude by referring or saying a few words about tax adjustments. I think I have already referred to the import duty on capital goods. The basic thing there was that import duties on the finished products were raised somewhat, but much more significant and important import duties on some of the

raw materials were lowered, particularly certain varieties of special steel. Now, this kind of scrutiny needs to be applied to the entire customs tariff. The excise duties have been rationalised in a major way with the extension of MODVAT. But in the customs duties there are tremendous anomalies and regret to say that only this morning my attention was drawn to a case where the import duty on PVC has been lowered. I welcome it. It is a raw material. But the raw material used by domestic producers of PVC has been subjected to a higher customs duty. It has been enhanced. It is something called VCM. This kind of thing has happened because the people who look at customs tariff are not so familiar with what raw material is used for what. This kind of review has to be undertaken for customs purposes just as we have been streamlining the excise duties and I think this exercise should be undertaken.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EXPENDITURE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. K. GADHVI): Is it on customs or indigenous production?

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA: On imports. The customs duty has been raised. So the domestic cost goes up. At least that enhancement should be immediately reconsidered. But overall there is need to see that the customs duty on raw material is lower than the customs duty on finished product. It is not a one-day exercise. But this has to be done.

Finally, I would say that in direct taxes there were hopes of some further reduction so far as the lowest limit is concerned. I personally have some sympathy with that cause. All the income groups get taxed through excise duties. Therefore, the need to have direct taxes is much greater for those who are in the higher income groups than for the very low income groups, very low meaning border line groups.

And to some extent that class of people not only deserve relief but it will do a tremendous reduction in the work of filing returns and so on if some relief is

given. But here I must comment on one or two of the proposals. At least one of the proposals made regarding the deduction of tax at source has caused me a good deal of concern because it will mean not only harassment to the parties concerned but it will be also a tremendous amount of work in claiming refunds. And people will be in difficulties because they have not been fully paid for their supplies and people will start inflating their price in order to cover the tax deduction at source in order to make their both ends meet. And also a regret to add that so far as payment for services is concerned, there will be a greater use of cash transaction than of payment by cheque. So, on all these considerations, I think, that measure needs consideration.

Madam, I think I have come to a time when you would want to adjourn. I thank you for the patience with which you have listened to me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the House stands adjourned for lunch. We will meet again at 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-two minutes past two of the clock. The vice Chairman. (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal) in the Chair.

श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह (बिहार)

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री राजीव गांधी प्रधानमंत्री जी, जो कि वित्त मंत्री भी हैं, उनके द्वारा प्रस्तुत वर्ष 1987-88 के बजट का मैं समर्थन करती हूँ। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले दो-तीन वर्षों ने सदन में जो बजट पेश हो रहा है, वह एक विशेष नुक्ता सामने रखकर ही हो रहा है, लॉगटर्म फिस्कल पॉलिसी को ध्यान में रख कर देश की आर्थिक स्थिति में स्थिरता लाने का प्रयास हो रहा है और इसके फल भी सामने आए हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक तरफ देश में औद्योगीकरण बढ़ाना है और दूसरी

[श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह]

तरफ समाजवाद को सामने रखकर जनता के स्तरों को ऊंचा उठाने का प्रयास करना है। जैसा पहले कुछ विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों ने कहा कि समाजवाद कहां है? उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, समाजवाद गरीबी को कोई वांटना तो नहीं है; संपत्ति और उत्पादन में वृद्धि होनी चाहिए और इसी दृष्टिकोण से पिछले दो-तीन साल से बजट को बनाया गया है, यही उसका लक्ष्य रहा है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस 1987-88 के बजट के द्वारा हमारे प्रधानमंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी ने, जो कि वित्तमंत्री भी हैं, उन्होंने देश को एक नई दिशा की ओर मोड़ देने का प्रयास किया है। यह कैसा प्रयास किया है, मेरे विचार के अनुसार तीन मुद्दों के द्वारा यह लक्षित होता है। एक तो शिक्षा है, जिस पर पहले 350 करोड़ की राशि आवंटित होती थी, अब उसको बढ़ाकर इस बार 800 करोड़ की राशि रखी है। आज तक शिक्षा को किसी ने इतना महत्व नहीं दिया, बहुत से दूसरे विभागों को महत्व दिया जाता था। लेकिन शिक्षा देश की प्रगति के लिए, औद्योगिकरण के लिए या विकास के लिए इतनी आवश्यक है, इसको इतनी गहराई से किसी ने नहीं सोचा था, जितना हमारे मौजूदा प्रधानमंत्री वित्त मंत्री ने सोचा है। यह पहली बार अनुभव किया गया है कि देश के भविष्य के लिए तकनीकी विकास, वैज्ञानिक विकास या कोई भी काम करने के लिए शिक्षा आवश्यक है। इसीलिए उन्होंने इस कार्यक्रम को शुरू करने के लिए नई शिक्षा नीति रखी। उस पर सदन में बहस हुई और उस पर दोनों सदनों के सदस्यों ने अपने अपने विचार रखे। नवोदय स्कूलों की कल्पना हमारे गांवों में अच्छी शिक्षा ले जाने की कल्पना है। उसके लिए सरकार पहले नीति लाई और उसके बाद उसे कार्यान्वित करने के लिए बजट में राशि रखी। इसमें मुझे एक बात कहनी है कि स्त्री शिक्षा भारत में आज भी बहुत परतेट कम है। वो इस 200 करोड़ में से कुछ राशि

महिलाओं के विकास के लिए, उनकी शिक्षा के लिए जरूर अलग अलग रखी जाए और प्रत्येक राज्य में यह देखा जाए कि वे उस राशि को उसी मद पर खर्च करें। जब तक शिक्षा में उन्नति नहीं होगी तब तक बेरोजगारी कैसे दूर कर सकेंगे? शिक्षित समाज जब गांवों में हो जाएगा तब हम सेल्फ एम्प्लायमेंट चला सकते हैं वरना जो स्कूलों में हम बनाते हैं वे पूरी नहीं हो पाती हैं। इसीलिए ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में हमें अर्थकरी शिक्षा पर जोर देकर छोटे छोटे उद्योगों का विकास कर उनको सेल्फ एम्प्लायमेंट देने की योजना बनानी चाहिए ताकि सरकार पर यह भार न पड़े कि इतने लाख लोग हमारे देश में अन-एम्प्लायड हैं। सरकार यदि सफल होना चाहती है तो उसके लिए उन्हें कोई सेल बनाना चाहिए जो यह देखे कि यह जो 800 करोड़ की राशि है वह चाहे स्कूलों का भवन बनाने के लिए हो, या शिक्षकों को ट्रेनिंग करने के लिए हो या विद्यार्थियों के बहुमुखी विकास के लिए हो, वह सही रूप से खर्च हो क्योंकि हमारा अनुभव पिछला यह है कि वह सही रूप से खर्च नहीं होता है। भवन निर्माण के लिए राशि दी है लेकिन भवन पर छप्पर भी नहीं पड़ पाता है और वह भवन गिर जाता है। शिक्षक की जो ट्रेनिंग होती है वह आज की मौजूदा परिस्थिति में कैसी हो उस पर विचार करना चाहिए। जो अंग्रेजों को जमाने में क्लर्क पैदा करने के लिए जो शिक्षा नीति थी वहां तो हम नहीं चाहते हैं। इसलिए हमारी अपनी आवश्यकताओं के अनुसार शिक्षकों की ट्रेनिंग होनी चाहिए गांवों के स्तर पर उन्हें कैसे काम करना होगा, यह भी देखना चाहिए। इसलिए जहां पर सही खर्च हो वहां पर ईनाम दें और जहां पर गलती हो वहां पर थोड़ी बहुत सजा भी होनी चाहिए।

महोदय, दूसरी बात जो बजट में है, जो देश को नई दिशा की ओर ले जाती है, वह मेरे विचार से मकानों का निर्माण कार्य है। इसको भी किसी ने इस महत्व की निगाह से नहीं देखा था। सौ करोड़ों रुपये की इक्विटी शेयर से एक आवासीय बैंक स्थापित किया जाएगा। मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि वह एक नया कदम

है जो कि देश की एक निवादी आवश्यकता है। अभी जिस ढंग से वह किया गया है उस ढंग से पहले कभी नहीं किया गया। इसके लिए वित्त मंत्री महोदय को जो कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री हैं, उनको बधाई देती हूँ। लेकिन इसके साथ ही मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह जो भी करोड़ रुपए की राशि है उसको बढ़ाया जा सके तो अच्छा होगा मुझे यह मालूम है कि यह जो सौ करोड़ की राशि है इसमें सिर्फ शुल्कात है, इसमें देश की आवश्यकता को देखते हुए और प्रदेशों की कमियों को देखते हुए और वृद्धि की जाए तो अच्छा होगा साथ ही मकानों के निर्माण कार्य को यदि हम बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान में हमको हाउसिंग को इंडस्ट्री डिक्लेयर करना पड़ेगा क्योंकि इंडस्ट्री डिक्लेयर करने से बैंकों से कम दर पर लोन आदि की सुविधाएं हमको प्राप्त हो सकेंगी और आज जो बड़े बड़े कॉन्ट्रैक्टर्स हैं जो इसमें काम करते हैं उनके अतिरिक्त साधारण लोगों को भी इसमें काम करने का मौका मिलेगा और लोहा, लकड़ी आदि खरीदने में मुहय्या करने की सुविधा होगी क्योंकि इसमें कॉन्ट्रैक्टर्स को ही काम नहीं मिलना है, इंजीनियर्स, ओवरसियर्स और आर्किटेक्ट्स को भी और मजदूरों को भी रोजगार मिलना है। इसके अतिरिक्त लोगों को मकान बनाने के लिए, इसमें पैसा लगाने के लिए भी प्रोत्साहन मिल सकता है यदि आप रेंट कंट्रोल अमेंडमेंट बिल को शीघ्र पार्लियामेंट में पास करा दें।

राष्ट्रीय गृहरीकरण आयोग में अपनी अन्तरिम रिपोर्ट में भी इस बात को कहा है कि जितना भी शीघ्र हो इस रेंट कंट्रोल अमेंडमेंट को लाया जाये और कम से कम जिन मकान मालिकों की लीज किरायदारों के साथ खत्म हो जाये वह मकान इन मकान-मालिकों को वापस मिल जाये विशेषतः धनी किरायेदारों से, जो लीज

खत्म होने पर मुकदमों में फंसा कर मकान पर कब्जा किए रहते हैं।

इन्दिरा आवास योजना के अन्तर्गत 125 करोड़ रुपये की राशि निर्धारित की गई है जिससे अनुसूचित जाति, जनजातियों के लिए 10 लाख मकान बनाये जायेंगे। इसमें राज्य सरकारों को विशेष हिस्सा मिलना चाहिए और खासकर पिछड़े जो राज्य हैं उन्हें विशेष राशि आवंटित की जाये। जो आदिवासी, जनजाति राज्य हैं जैसे राजस्थान है, बिहार है मध्य प्रदेश है इनको विशेष राशि मिलनी चाहिए। यह मेरा मुद्दाव है कि एन० बी० सी०सी० आदि संस्थाएं जिन्होंने रिसर्च की है कि सस्ते मकान कैसे बनायें, गांव के घरों में आग लगने पर कौन सा छिड़काव किया जाये, पहाड़ और पर्वतीय क्षेत्रों में अतिवर्षा होने पर मकान नष्ट न हों इसके ऊपर उन लोगों ने अच्छा काम किया है तो इसकी जानकारी मीडिया तथा प्रेस द्वारा अधिक से अधिक जनसंख्या तक पहुंचाने का प्रयास किया जाये।

तीसरा मुद्दा इस वजेट का यह है कि राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण श्रमिक आयोग की स्थापना की जाये। कई बार कृषि क्षेत्र के श्रमिकों के बारे में पार्लियामेंट में भी विचार किया गया किन्तु इसे क्रियान्वित करने का श्रेय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी एवं वित्त मंत्री को ही मिला है। इन श्रमिकों की समस्या बहुत ही शौचनीय है। इनका रोज का वेतन, रहने का स्थान, पीने का पानी आदि बहुत ही गंभीर समस्याएं हैं जिनमें बहुत ही गहराई के साथ-जाने की आवश्यकता है।

ग्रामीण विकास पर 1987-88 में परिव्यय 2000 करोड़ से अधिक होगा। छठी पंचवर्षीय योजना में 3,600 करोड़ था किन्तु इस बार इस वजेट में एक साल के लिये दो करोड़ की राशि रखी गई है। 39.11 लाख परिवार इससे लाभान्वित होंगे। अतः देश को मजबूत करने के लिये तीनों मुद्दों पर यानी शिक्षा, आवास और ग्रामीण विकास पर सिर्फ अधिक राशि ही

[श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह]

नहीं रखी गयी है बल्कि उनसे संबंधित प्रत्येक समस्या और उसके खर्च पर गहराई से सोचा गया है।

इस साल के बजट में 8,285 करोड़ का घाटा है। इस पर विरोधी पक्ष ने बहुत छीटाकशी की है। किसी भी प्रगतिशील देश में घाटे का बजट होगा ही। हाँ, अगर हम यह विचार कर लें कि हमारे देश की आगे नहीं बढ़ना है, हमें इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर आगे नहीं बढ़ाना है, हमें अपने हिन्दुस्तान में उद्योगीकरण नहीं करना है, हमें अपने देश में इंडस्ट्री नहीं चाहिये, नई रेलें नहीं चाहिये, नये बिजली घर नहीं चाहिये तो फिर ठीक है हम बचत का बजट भी निकाल सकते हैं। लेकिन आज तक हमारे खाद्यान्नों का भंडार भरा हुआ है इसलिये हमें काफी राहत है। यह दूसरी बात है कि हमें अपने खर्च में समझदारी जानी होगी। ऋणों के व्याज को कैसे सीमा में रखें इसके उपाय सोचने होंगे, विशेषकर विदेशी ऋण के व्याज पर ध्यान देना होगा। हमें यह देखना होगा कि उनका इंटरेस्ट एक सीमा से आगे न बढ़े। इसके लिये मेरे कुछ सुझाव हैं। एक तो यह है कि अपना उत्पादन बढ़ा कर हमें दुनिया के बाजार पकड़ने होंगे, मार्किट में लॉन्स फ्लोट करने होंगे।

प्रवासी भारतीयों को अपने अर्जित रुपये को स्वदेश में उद्योगों में लगाने के लिये पुराने अनुभवों के आधार पर नये इन्सेंटिव्स देने होंगे।

खाद्यान्नों का भंडार हमारा भरा हुआ है। तिलहन अधिक पैदा कर हम इनका निर्यात, इनका एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ा सकते हैं। ताकि हमारा ट्रेड बैलेंस कूड़ तेल बाहर से लेने से बिगड़ता है उसे थोड़ा बहुत ठीक कर सकें। राष्ट्रीय तिलहन परियोजना इस समय इस ओर कार्य कर रही है। हमारा रक्षा बजट 12,512 करोड़ रुपये का है। सैनिक वर्ग के परिवारों को खास कर जो सैनिक सीमा

पर हैं और नान-फैमिली स्टेशन पर हैं उनकी सुविधा पर विशेष ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। रक्षा के लिए हमें ज्यादा धन देने की जरूरत होती है और इसलिए हमारा डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग भी थोड़ा बढ़ जाता है। लेकिन ये सब हमारे देश की रक्षा के लिए आवश्यक है। बहुश से स्थानों पर करों में छूट दी गई है और बहुत से स्थानों पर नये कर लगाये गये हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इंडिविजुअल इनकम टैक्स की छूट 18 हजार सालाना तक है, उसको बढ़ाकर 25 हजार तक करने की मैं सिफारिश करती हूँ। इससे फिक्स इनकम वालों को विशेष सुविधा होगी। आप जानते हैं कि पे कमीशन ने मंहगाई भत्ते की सिफारिश की है। अगर हम यह छूट उनको नहीं देते हैं तो पे कमीशन ने जो मंहगाई भत्ता उनको देने की सिफारिश की है उसका उन्हें लाभ नहीं पहुँच सकता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, बजट सिर्फ रेवेन्यू क्लैक्शन की मशीन नहीं है यह इकनॉमिक ग्रोथ का एक मजबूत हथियार भी है। इसी दृष्टिकोण को सामने रखकर सैक्शन 194-ई पर पुनः विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। इसमें संदेह नहीं है कि बिना इंटरेस्ट के सरकार के पास प्रचुर धनराशि एक साल के लिए होती है क्योंकि हिसाब करने के बाद रिफण्ड का सवाल साज भर के बाद ही होता है। लेकिन इससे प्रोफेशनल्स जिनके पास रिसोर्सिज सीमित हैं उनके लिक्विडिटी और बैंकिंग केपिटल कम हो जाती है। नये काम के लिए उनमें जोश नहीं रहेगा और न ही धनराशि होगी। कम्पनी के ओवरहेड एक्सपेंसेज बढ़ जाते हैं क्योंकि रिफण्ड की पूरी तैयारी और कागजात और सर्टिफिकेट आदि तैयार होते हैं। इनकम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट पहले तो सोर्स पर क्लैक्शन का हिसाब और बाद में रिफण्ड के हिसाब में उलझा रहेगा। इसका परिणाम यह होता है कि समय की कमी होने से बड़े-बड़े करों की चोरी वाले ऑफेन्डर्स और इवेडर्स छूट जाएंगे। कहीं पर दोहरा कराधान भी होगा।

इस प्रकार की शंकाएँ इस धारा से उठती हैं। इसलिए इस सैक्शन पर पुनः विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। इसी प्रकार से 115-जे सैक्शन के बारे में भी कहना चाहती हूँ। इसको देखने से लगता है कि कहीं बड़ी मछलियाँ छोटी मछलियों को खा न जायें क्योंकि जिनके पास आर्गेनाइजेशन है, टैक्स एक्सपर्ट्स हैं वे तो सभी कुछ कर सकते हैं, लेकिन जो कमजोर कम्पनियाँ हैं उनका क्या होगा? इसकी आशंका होती है। इस प्रश्न को चारों तरफ से विचार कर देख लेना चाहिए क्योंकि जीरो टैक्स वाली कम्पनी तीन कटेगरीज में आती है। एक तो वे कम्पनियाँ हैं जिनकी दशा ऐसी बुरी है कि टैक्स वे नहीं पाएँ, दूसरे वे जिनके बुक प्रोफिट खत्म हो जाते हैं पिछले घाटे से केरी-ओवर लोसेज से। तीसरी वे जो मुनाफे वाली कम्पनी हैं जो टैक्स से बचते हैं, डेप्रिसिएशन के नाम या प्लान्ट या मशीनरी और एक्सपेंशन के नाम पर। यह सही है कि ये लोग नए एसेट्स बना कर देश की नेट बैलेंस बढ़ाते हैं और इम्प्लायमेंट भी बढ़ाते हैं। इसलिए इस सैक्शन की तरफ ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। ताकि कैपिटल मार्केट में बहुत उदासी न हो जाये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं काले धन के बारे में कुछ बातें कहना चाहती हूँ क्योंकि काले धन के बारे में बहुत से प्रश्न उठाये गये हैं। मैं चाहती हूँ कि वित्त मंत्रालय इन मुद्दों के आधार पर कुछ संशोधन करें। क्या केवल धड़पकड़ से ही हम कालेधन को खत्म कर पाये हैं? क्या इस चीज की स्टडी कर पाए हैं कि कालाधन कहाँ से पैदा होता है? क्या कालाधन केवल कर की चोरी से पैदा होता है, स्मगलिंग का कालेधन, क्या हिस्सा है, पिछले वर्षों का क्या अनुभव है, इस समानान्तर एकानामी को कैसे रोका जाये जिसमें कई सौ

करोड़ रुपये फँसे हुए हैं, इस धन के कुछ हिस्से को राष्ट्रीय विकास में लगाया जाये या नहीं यह भी एक प्रश्न है। मुझे आशा है कि सरकार इन बातों पर सोचेगी और इस संबंध में आवश्यक संशोधन लायेगी।

महोदय, बिहार एक पिछड़ा प्रदेश है। वह आगे बढ़े हुए प्रदेशों के साथ कैसे बराबरी में आ सकता है। वहाँ पर पावर जनरेशन किस तरह से हो सकेगी, रिवर वाटर रिसोर्सेस, मिनरल रिसोर्सेज हैं उनका किस तरह से प्रयोग किया है उनका किस तरह से प्रयोग किया जाये इसके विषय में भी सोचने की आवश्यकता है। जो वहाँ के प्रोजेक्ट रुके हुए हैं उनके लिये धनराशि की शायद कुछ अधिक आवश्यकता है, मेरा निवेदन है, उसे वह देने की सुविधा दी जाये ताकि वे प्रोजेक्ट्स पूरे हो सकें।

अंत मैंने यह कही कि यह बजट कांसेंस बजट है, समझदारी का बजट है, उसके लिए बधाई है क्योंकि इसमें ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के विकास पर विशेष जोर दिया गया है। यह जो कहा गया है कि ग्रोथ रेट इस साल अधिक बढ़ा नहीं है, पिछले साल 3.5 था अब वह 5 परसेंट हुआ है तो यह विकास का बजट है, जो डेफिसिट है वह 13 परसेंट टोटल एक्सपेंडिचर पर है। जैसा मैंने कहा कि किसी भी डेवलपिंग कंट्री, किसी भी विकसित होते हुए देश के लिये डेफिसिट बजट आवश्यक है। इन सब बातों के साथ में 1987-88 के बजट का समर्थन करती हूँ और मैं आशा करती हूँ कि इस बजट में इन मुद्दों को लेकर, उन पर जाकर हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी जिस तेजी से हमारे देश को आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, उनकी कल्पना का जो इक्कीसवीं शताब्दी का भारत है जहाँ वह जल्दी से जल्दी जाना चाहते हैं वहाँ जाने में सफल हों। वे अभी नौजवान हैं, उनमें जोश है इसलिए वे इसको गी प्रातिशीघ्र करने में सफल होंगे, इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बजट का समर्थन करती हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल): श्री चतुरानन मिश्र । आपके लिये दस मिनट का समय है ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : ऐसा आप हमें क्यों बोलते हैं । आप लोग ही तो राजपाठ चलाते हैं, हम तो खाली बोलते हैं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यद्यपि इस बजट में पिछली गलतियों को सुधारने की दिशा में कुछ साधारण कदम उठाए गये हैं, जैसे कि कैपिटल गुड्स के लिये फिर से संरक्षण देने की बात आई है पुरानी जो लांग टर्म फि सकल मालिसी श्री उसकी गलती को समझा गया है । जब आप जीरो वजटिंग करते थे तो पूंजीपतियों ने भी जीरो टक्स सिस्टम शुरू किया और आपने बुक वैल्यू के प्रॉफिट पर टैक्स लगाने का प्रस्ताव रखा है और इसी तरह से मजदूरों के प्रॉविडेंट फंड वगैरह को टक्स की तरह वसूलने का प्रावधान किया गया है, ये सब कुछ अच्छी बातें हैं लेकिन पूरे तौर पर यह बजट स्टिरियों टाइप है और यह अत्यन्त निराशाजनक बजट है । मैं तीन बिन्दुओं पर इसका विरोध करता हूँ ।

पहली बात तो यह है कि हमारे पास अच्छे अन्न भंडार थे, इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर का भी उत्पादन बढ़ा था, कर भी अच्छा वसूल हुआ था । इसके बाद कोई ऐसा बोलड स्टेप उठाना चाहिए था जिससे देश में अभी जो भयंकर बेरोजगारी है, खासकर शिक्षित बेरोजगार हैं और जो विवटनवादी रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं उनको रोकने के लिये कोई रास्ता निकाला होता, उनके लिए कार्यक्रम होते जिनकी ओर वे आकर्षित होते पूरा युवा समाज का ध्यान उधर जाता लेकिन ऐसा कुछ इस बजट में नहीं है । अभी बेरोजगारी का यह आलम है कि हम साल में जितने नए कारखाने खोलते हैं उनसे दुगुने तिगुने बंद कर देते हैं । इसलिए यह निराशाजनक बजट है । दूसरा कारण जिससे मैं इसके खिलाफ हूँ वह यह है हमारा पड़ोसी देश है चीन । चीन हम से अभी भी इस्पात,

कोयला, अन्न वगैरह में पांच गुना से ज्यादा उत्पादन करता है । हम उसके पड़ोसी हैं और हम अगर इतना पीछे जायेंगे तो पता नहीं इसके भविष्य में क्या खराब नतीजे निकलेंगे । अभी जो परिकल्पना की जाती है कि इस शताब्दी के अन्त में भारत 15 मिलियन टन इस्पात का उत्पादन करेगा तो कब तक चीन डेढ़ सौ मिलियन टन से ज्यादा चला जायेगा । इसलिये यह एक चिन्ता की बात है ।

तीसरी बात यह है कि इस बजट से गरीबी और भी बढ़ी और इससे तबाही आयेगी । देश में खास करके कुछ बहुत बड़े पाकेट हैं जहां पर बहुत ही दरिद्र लोगों का केन्द्रीयकरण हो रहा है । बिहार, यू०पी० के पूर्वी हिस्से में तथा उड़ीसा और बंगाल में एक विशेष स्थिति है । यहां जो पुराने उद्योग थे वह अब नीचे गिरते जा रहे हैं जैसे जूट, चीनी, काटन तथा दूसरे ऐसे उद्योग जो ये वे बरबाद हो रहे हैं । बिहार में डालमिया नगर जैसा इंडस्ट्रीयल कॉम्प्लेक्स बन्द हो गया है । बदले में नये उद्योग वहां स्थापित नहीं हो रहे इसके चलते हम को लग रहा है कि इस क्षेत्र में एक बड़ा विस्फोट होने वाला है । अभी तो आप छोटे छोटे राज्यों में सेना भेज कर सम्भाल लेते हैं लेकिन हम यह अन्दाज लगाते हैं जब यह क्षेत्र उठेगा जैसी घटनाएं अभी सांगली में घटी हैं वंसी जब हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरियाज में शुरू होंगी तो यह सम्भालने लायक स्थिति नहीं रहेगी । इसलिए यह बजट मुझ को निराशाजनक लग रहा है । मझे इसलिए ऐसा लग रहा है कि मैं समझता हूँ अभी देश में जो डेथ डांस चल रहा है चाहे बिहार हो या पंजाब हो उसका एक प्रधान कारण यह है कि जो फ़्यूडल एलीमेंट्स हैं वह आफेंसिव स्थिति में चले आए हैं, तो इनको कर्ब करना जरूरी है । लेकिन इस बजट में मात्र 5.75 करोड़ रुपया भूमि सुधार की मद में रखा गया है यानी फ़्यूडलिज्म को सामन्तवाद को इन-टेक्ट रखा जाएगा वैसे ही हरिजनों की हत्याएं होंगी, कास्ट रायट्स होंगे, उसी

तर्ह से सारी चीजें चलती रहेंगी । इसलिए मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ । हमारे शासक वर्ग के लोग और मुझ से कुछ देर पहले अभी जो माननीय सदस्या बोलीं और उनके पहले झा जी बोले इन लोगों ने कोई एक सिद्धांत बना लिया है वह है समाजवाद की फिलास्फी समाजवाद का बेसिक प्रिंसिपल है कि पहले आप शोषण बन्द कीजिए तब फिर वाकी बात आएगी । तभी आप उनको खुशहाल बनाएंगे लेकिन शोषण भी रखते रहिएगा तब आप समाजवाद बनाएंगे, यह तो हाथी के जैसे दो दांत होते हैं वैसे ही बात है । आपके भी दो दांत हैं, दिखावे में समाजवाद दर असल में पूंजीवाद नहीं तो आप समझते ही नहीं हैं मैं इस विषय पर आता हूँ कि इस देश में सबसे बड़ा कारखाना गरीब बनाने का कारखाना है महंगाई के कारण मुनाफाखोरी के कारण सूदखोरी के कारण, बंटाइदारी के कारण, बाढ़ और सुखाड़ के कारण हर साल 10 लाख आदमी जो अभी पावर्टी लाइन से उठे हुए हैं वे बिलो पावर्टी लाइन आते जा रहे हैं । सरकार ईमानदार नहीं है इनके आंकड़े रखने में । अगर हमारी शासक पार्टी के लोग ईमानदारी से आंकड़े दें कि कितने लोग हर साल नीचे जा रहे हैं तो बात स्पष्ट हो जाएगी । एक मिलियन आदमी हर 10 साल में गांव छोड़ कर शहर में आता है, इसकी सेंसस रिपोर्ट को देखने के लिए भी आप तैयार नहीं हैं । झा जी बड़े विद्वान सदस्य हैं । और उन्होंने तारीफ की कि प्रधानमंत्री ने एक मिलियन मकान बनाने का एलान किया है । लेकिन यह मिस्टर प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा है और मिस्टर फ्लड ने क्या किया है 20 लाख मकान ध्वस्त कर दिये हैं । अभी कृषि मंत्री जी यहां बैठे हैं । सदन को उन्होंने सूचित किया था कि 20 लाख मकान इस बाढ़ में ध्वस्त हो गये । 10 लाख आप बनायेंगे और 20 लाख ध्वस्त हो गये । 50 हजार मवेशी आपने बांटे हैं एंट पावर्टी योजना में जबकि 56 हजार मवेशी इस बाढ़ में मर गये हैं या बह गये हैं । आप कहां जा रहे हैं । एक स्टेप फारवर्ड और दो स्टेप बैकवर्ड होते जा रहे हैं ।

इसलिए मैंने कहा कि गम्भीर रूप से इस सवाल पर विचार कीजिये लेकिन दुर्भाग्यवश हमारे शासक पार्टी के लोग इसका विचार ही नहीं करते हैं । इतने पर सिचाई और बाढ़ की मद में मात्र 4 करोड़ रुपया ज्यादा इस वर्ष रखा है । कृषि में मात्र 10 करोड़ रुपया अधिक रखा है और बिजली जैसे महत्वपूर्ण मद में इन्होंने तीन प्रतिशत घटा दिया है । जो विकास की मद है उसको इन्होंने घटा दिया है । आप बताइये बिजली के बिना खेती और उद्योग सभी चौपट हो रहे हैं और आप इसे और बर्बाद करते जा रहे हैं । अब सब से ज्यादा बोझ देश के डिफेंस बजट पर बढ़ गया है । जब दुश्मन हम पर हमला करता है तो निश्चित रूप से देश की सुरक्षा पर अधिक व्यय करना पड़ेगा और इसके लिए अधिक प्रावधान करना पड़ेगा । कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इसकी आलोचना की है लेकिन मैं इस विषय पर उनके साथ नहीं हूँ । मैं समझता हूँ कि आपको यह करना ही पड़ेगा क्योंकि अमरीका आपको डिस्टे-ब्लाइज करना चाहता है । आप बोलते नहीं हैं, लेकिन प्रधान कारण इसका यह है जब तक वह पाकिस्तान को हथियार देता रहेगा आपको इकोनोमी बरबाद होती ही रहेगी और पाकिस्तान को भी बरबाद करता रहेगा । लेकिन इस डिफेंस मद में पूंजीपतियों पर एक पैसा भी नया टैक्स नहीं लगाया गया है । जनसाधारण के लोग तो टैक्स देंगे लेकिन डायरेक्ट टैक्स में एक परसेंट भी नहीं बढ़ाया जाएगा ।

तब किस बात के लिए ये पूंजीपति 3-00 P.M. है यह हमको बता दीजिए ।

मैं आपको आंकड़ों के साथ देना चाहता था कि जो इफेक्टिव टैक्स था कारपोरेट सेक्शन का वह 44 परसेंट से घटकर 38 परसेंट पर चला आया । आपने जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी के समय का उद्धरण किया है तो उद्धरण उनका, इम्प्लीमेन्टेशन प्राइम मिनिस्टर थेचर का, यह हमको समझ में नहीं आता है । आपने नेहरू जी के समय में जो शेयर आफ कारपोरेट टैक्स था उसको अभी घटा दिया है । डाइरेक्ट टैक्स में इन्कम टैक्स का शेयर था 33 परसेंट उसको आप 8 परसेंट पर ले

[श्री चतुरानन श्रीमश]

आये हैं। इसी तरह से ये पूंजीपति टैक्स भी नहीं देंगे। विदेशी मुद्रा जितना खानगी क्षेत्र ने अर्जित की उससे ज्यादा खर्च की, यह आर्थिक समीक्षा ने स्वीकारा है।

बेरोजगारी का यह हाल है कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर ने माइनस रेटा से इम्प्लायमेंट जनरेट किया है। ये रोजगार देंगे नहीं ये अपना मुताफा बढ़ाएंगे, शेयर मार्केट में उछाल आया, लेकिन चीजों की कीमतें घटेंगी नहीं। कितना ही उत्पादन बढ़े लेकिन कोयलें घटेंगी नहीं। विद्वान झा जी ने अभी चर्चा की कि देश में इन्फ्लेशन नहीं होगा डिफ्लेट करने से। (अवधान) शेयर का प्राइवेट डाउन तो ऐसा ही आपका चलता रहता है लेकिन आप उसी उछाल को लेकर कूद रहे थे कि हमारी नयी नीति सफल हो रही है। अभी फिर डाउन होने लगी है। डार महाराज भी डाउन होने लगा है। (अवधान) वह अलग क्वेश्चन है उस पर अलग समय दिलवा दीजिए अपनी पार्टी से पूछकर तो मैं उस पर बोलने को तैयार हूँ। मैं कह रहा हूँ कि न ये इम्प्लायमेंट दे, न प्राइसेज को घटाएंगे, न ये आपको टेक्स देंगे तो किस बात के लिए आप प्राइवेट सेक्टर की पूछा करते हैं यह हमको बता दीजिए। अब मैं सरकारी अष्टाचार, फिजूनवर्ची और बदइस्तजामी पर आना चाहता हूँ जिसमें इन्डिया टूडे के मुताबिक हर मिनट 4 लाख रुपए बरबाद हो रहे हैं। (समय की घंटी) थोड़ा सा टाइम मैं मांगूंगा। हम रुपया पैसा तो नहीं मांग रहे हैं। थोड़ा 5-7 मिनट का टाइम दे दीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल):
आपका समय पूरा हो गया है लेकिन आप अपनी बात कह दीजिए सूक्ष्म में।

श्री चतुरान मिश्र : अभी जो इंडिया टूडे ने छापा सिर्फ उसकी एक लाइन पढ़ कर सुना रहा हूँ :

"Every third rupee spent on the country is spent by some Government Departments and others. That is one lakh crores a year. And every fifth rupee out of that goes waste."

हमारे पास अभी खाद और आपूर्ति विभाग के मंत्री महोदय का खत है कि फूड जो स्टोरेज करते हैं उसमें 83-84 में 6.74 लाख टन, 84-85 में 5.72 लाख टन और 85-86 में 5.94 लाख टन बरबाद हो गया है। हम आपसे पूछना चाहते हैं कि 3 साल के अन्दर 18 लाख टन जो आपने बरबाद कर दिये यह किसी गरीब को दे देते यह आपसे नहीं हुआ, यह आप हमें बता दीजिए। इसका जवाब क्यों नहीं देते। यही हम लोग बार-बार कहते हैं कि आप बरबादी करवाते हैं, चोरी करवाते हैं, भ्रष्टाचार करवाते हैं और गरीबों को भूखा रखते हैं। इसका तो कोई जवाब दीजिए कि ऐसा क्यों हो रहा है। यह आपके भ्रष्टाचार का आलम है जो चारों तरफ से इस ढंग से हो रहा है।

मैं कुछ सुझावों पर आता हूँ। सब्सिडी को आसानी से 50 परसेंट घटाया जा सकता है। पहली बात यह है कि लीकेज को बन्द कीजिए दूसरी बात है कि जो फूड का संग्रह है भंडार है उसमें से 50 परसेंट आप फूड फार वर्क में जाने दीजिए। इसमें विकास का काम करेंगे, तरह-तरह का काम करेंगे, गांवों में जाकर नहरों की चैनल बनाएंगे, रोड बनाएंगे बहुत काम है। तो सब्सिडी आपकी घट जायगी दूसरी बात यह है कि जिसके चलते सब्सिडी ज्यादा है कि गैस को जिस प्राइस में भारत सरकार बेचती है फटिलाइज़र प्लांट्स को वह अमेरिका के मुकाबले में पांच गुना ज्यादा में जाता है। इसलिए खाद का लागत खर्च ज्यादा है। यह तो आपका किया हुआ क्रिएशन है। जो बैंक का इंटरेस्ट रेट है, अभी हमारे बैंकिंग सेक्टर के वित्त मंत्री यहां बैठे

हुए हैं, 17 परसेंट का क्यूमुलेटिव इंटरेस्ट कंपाउंड इंटरेस्ट आप लेते हैं। जापान और साउथ कोरिया की चर्चा आप करते हैं जहां 6 परसेंट से भी कम है। हम आपको कहां से सस्ता समान दे देंगे। एक माननीय सदस्य ने मजदूरों की कम-जोरी के बारे में कहा था। मैं मेहता जी से कहूंगा कि फटिलाइजर के टोटल कास्ट का सिर्फ 3 परसेंट मजदुरी में लेते हैं और आप 42 परसेंट खर्च करते हैं इलेक्ट्रिसिटी और दूसरे प्मूल्स पर, यह बरबादी आप नहीं देखते हैं और इसके चलते हाई कास्ट इकानामी हो गयी है जिसके चलते यह इतनी खराब हालत होती चली जा रही है। हम मजदूरों के चलते ऐसा नहीं हुआ है।

इसी तरह रिटेंशन प्राईस रखे हुए हैं और बहुत सी चीजें हैं, अगर मुझे समय रहता तो आपसे कहता कि खूशी से आप सब्सिडी को घटा सकते हैं 50 प्रतिशत। मैं दूसरा सुझाव दूंगा कि देश को आकर्षित करने के लिए ओवर नान-प्लॉड एक्सपेंडिचर जिसको कहते हैं, उसमें 5 प्रतिशत की की प्रधान मंत्री कटौती की घोषणा करें, राष्ट्रव्यापी आस्टेरिटी प्लान आए जिसे सब समझें। बरबादी हम लोग चारों तरफ देख रहे हैं। कोई भी माननीय सदस्य अपने अनुभव से बता सकते हैं कि सरकार कितनी फिजूलखर्ची कर रही है। तो यह 5 प्रतिशत की कटौती कीजिए और इसकी जो राशि होती है, इस राशि को लेकर परमानेंट इंतेजाम कीजिए बाढ़ और सुखाढ़ का हरेक साल पांच सौ करोड़ रुपये इस मद में रिलीफ में आपको देना पड़ता है। इसको आप चाहें तो रोक सकते हैं।

फिर आप दाम को बांधिये, नहीं तो हरेक साल आप तीन सौ करोड़ या चार सौ करोड़ रुपया देते हैं और कभी पांच करोड़ भी सिर्फ डिपरनेस अलॉस में आपको देना पड़ता है। अगर दाम बांधा जाए, तो यह नहीं हो सकता है।

इसी तरह से हम चाहेंगे कि आपने जो छापामारी का काम किया था, जबकि पूंजीपतियों ने इसका विरोध किया, लेकिन मैं उसका पूर्णतया समर्थन करता हूँ। एक

ही काम आपने अच्छा किया था कि छापामारी कर रहे थे और अब यह शंक प्रकट की जा रही है कि वर्तमान प्रधा मंत्री इस पर रोक लगाना चाहते हैं अगर यह आशंका सत्य है, तो अत्यन्त घातक होगा : यह मैं आपको कहना चाहूंगा।

तो मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि भ्रष्ट राजनीतिज्ञों पर भी छापामारी हो, जो भी अनुचित ढंग से सम्पत्ति जमा किए हुए हों, उनके ऊपर छापा मारा जाए।

अंत में सरकार की जो मूल्य नीति है, उसके बारे में कुछ कहना चाहूंगा। मूल्य नीति आपकी यह है कि कितना ही उत्पादन बढ़ेगा, तो दाम बढ़ता चला जाएगा फूड स्टोरेज में ज्यादा है, फिर भी दाम बढ़ेगा, काटन का दाम गिरेगा, कपड़े का बढ़ेगा। तो कौन आपकी सहायता करेंगे हम लोग जब कहते हैं कि किसानों को रेमून-रेटिव प्राईस दीजिए, तो इसका मतलब है कि मिडिलमेन्स प्राफिट को कट कीजिए और तब आप उनको दीजिए। ऐसा नहीं कि इनको भी दीजिए और उनको भी दीजिए और सारे देश को लूटिये। यह हम नहीं चाहते हैं। इसलिए इस संबंध में मैं आपको यह कहना चाहता था।

एक विषय और है वह है विदेशी सश्वेदारी का—यह जो भी अभी चल रहा है कोलेबोरेशन का, उससे हम लोग चिंतित हैं। मैं आपको स्पष्ट कह देना चाहता हूँ कि 1984-85 में 752, 1985-86 में 1024 और 1986-87 में 958 विदेशियों से सश्वेदारी की गई है। माननीय सदस्या ने अभी कहा कि अगर यह हम डेफिसिट फायनैंसिंग नहीं करेंगे, तो क्या . . . (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Just state your points and conclude. Otherwise I will have to call the next speaker.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: हम सिर्फ प्वाइंट्स ही कह रहे हैं थोड़ा सा समय तो प्वाइंट्स कहने में लगता है। हम उनसे य कहन चाहेंगे कि पावर हाऊस बनाने ह ल अगर आप डेफिसिट फायनैंसिंग करके तो

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

नहीं रोकते । आप पेप्सी कोला के लिए करते हैं, हैमबर्गर के लिए करते हैं, मारुति कार के लिए करते हैं, फाइव-स्टार होटल के लिए करते हैं। यह सारा इनवेस्टमेंट इस देश के लिए देशद्रोहियों का काम होता है। तमाम लोग आजिज आ जाते हैं। मैं उसी तरह से आपको कहना चाहूंगा कि अमरीका में नान रेजिडेंट इन्डियन्स का इन्डिया इन्टरनेशनल फण्ड बना है, जिसमें वहां के टाप-रैकिंग इंडस्ट्रियल कारपोरेशन मेरी लिच से साझेदारी हुई है वह आपके यूनिट ट्रस्ट के अंदर घुस कर भीतर घात करेगा और इसलिए हम आपको रोकते हैं। अगरचे मैं जानता हूं कि हमारे देश की हालत दूसरे डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज जो हैं, उतनी खराब नहीं है, उनसे हमारी हालत अच्छी है, लेकिन समय रहते हुए मैं इसकी चेतावनी देना चाहता हूं।

आखिर में एक बात मैं और कहना चाहूंगा कि विदेश व्यापार में जो असंतुलन है, जो पहले वित्त मंत्री थे, उन्होंने इस सदन को मेरे प्रश्न पर आश्वासित किया था कि हम लोग देखेंगे कि रुपी एरिया में जो ट्रेड हो रहा है, उससे हायर टेक्नालोजी और दूसरी चीजें हम लोग लें क्योंकि सभी एरिया के ट्रेड में यह खूबो है कि इम्पोर्ट और एक्पोर्ट दोनों सामान ढंग से चलता है। तो इसको हम करेंगे, उन्होंने कहा था कि हम एरियाज आइडेंटिफाई करेंगे और विदेश व्यापार घाटा हम रोकेंगे। दुख की बात है कि इस बार जो बजट पेश किया गया है उसमें कोई भी इस तरह का नहीं बताया गया है। (समय की घंटी) कि सरकार ने उसका कन्फ्रोटली अध्ययन किया है या नहीं किया है। आखिरी बात यह कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूं और यह है कि जो रीजनलिज्म की समस्या देश में आ गई है, इसको रोकने के बिना आपका बजट से यह बात बढ़ेगी। राज्यों को जो कस्टीडियनल फण्ड दिया जाता है। यह तो उनका अपना अधिकार है। आपने उनकी ग्रांट में मात्र 1581 करोड़ रुपये का ग्रांट दिया है। और उनसे इण्टरेस्ट में आप लेंगे 3,187 करोड़ यानी आप जितना देते हैं उससे दुगुने से भी ज्यादा लेते हैं। यह साइलोक का काम आप बंद कीजिए। मैं

आपसे अनुरोध करूंगा कि केन्द्र सरकार, प्रधानमंत्री ने कहा है और आपने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन भी किया था न्यू बिर्गनिंग के लिए, तो न्यू बिर्गनिंग कीजिए कि केन्द्र यह सौद नहीं लेगा, साइलोक का काम नहीं, करेगा। इसलिए सौद समाप्त कीजिए, नहीं तो पिछड़े हुए राज्य और भी तबाह होंगे और उन्नत राज्य ज्यादा लाभ उठाएंगे। यह कंसाइनमेंट व्यापार वगैरह का जब आप करेंगे, तब करेंगे, लेकिन इण्टरेस्ट सिस्टम को फोरन समाप्त कर दीजिए ताकि वह राज्य फिर से अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों और आगे चल सकें।

हमारे यहां जो पूर्वी क्षेत्र है बिहार का, उसके बारे में मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि वहां विस्फोटक स्थिति आ रही है और इस पर एक मिनट और लूंगा (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल):

मिश्र जी नहीं, अब मैं नहीं दे सकूंगा,
Just conclude now. I will call the next speaker now.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : बस समाप्त कर रहा हूं। माइका इण्डस्ट्री पर जो एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगती थी, उसको गवर्नमेंट ने हटा लिया है, लेकिन मिटको ने तुरन्त उतने दाम बढ़ा लिए, तो घटाया क्या आपने? यह हम जानना चाहते हैं। इससे यही होगा कि मिटको ने जितनी चोरी उन्होंने पिछले वर्षों में की थी वह सब ढक गया। उनके सभी स्टाफ का वह सबका दाम बढ़ा लिया 34 परसेंट इसके लिए हम सरकार से कहेंगे कि जब मंत्री जी जवाब दें तो इस बिन्दु पर भी अवश्य जवाब दें। इतना कहते हुए मैं इस बजट का विरोध करता हूं क्योंकि हम समझते हैं कि इस बजट से और भी ज्यादा पुलिस खर्च बढ़ेगा जो पिछले साल के बजट में से इस साल के बजट में 300 करोड़ ज्यादा पुलिस बजट में देना पड़ा। इसलिए यह बजट पुलिस बजट हो जायगा और देश अराजकता की तरफ जायगा।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बजट का विरोध करता हूं।

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE: We are discussing

this Budget which has come in a totally changed atmosphere. It is necessary for us to perceive and appreciate this change. In fact, I would not be wrong if I were to say that there is a considerable change in the face of the Budget. I have been repeatedly saying that the process of budgeting should be open. It should be relaxed; it should be known; it should be for a certain period. I never imagined that what I had been advocating, for would really come true in such a significant measure as I find it today. Therefore, the very first thing, which is expected of the Budget namely, uncertainty, namely some sort of sensationality, some sort of spectacularism, is missing in the new Budget. What is substituted in this Budget is a very large degree of sincerity. It is substituted by very solid measure perhaps invisible but definite and decisive.

It is easy to say that this is rudderless or lacks direction, but if one were to pay a little more attention, as I will endeavour to do, one finds that for the first time there is a definite direction. Not only is there a definite direction, but the progress along that path in that direction, is also substantial. Moreover it also comes in the wake of a very very persistent, very very conscious and almost deplorable and pathetic attempt at criticising the hon. Prime Minister. Well they cannot say anything against our politics of late. I have seen that they are trying to say something about of functioning, one must welcome it. It the style of functioning. If this is the style is open, it is relaxed, it is certain, it is matter of fact it means business. But unfortunately I think that there is in some quarters and those quarters are not in this country alone they are paying for people in this country to play the tune against the honourable Prime Minister and our Government. As an Indian I stand here with certain amount of pride, because when we see all around what our country has achieved what our Government has done for the country. I do not think anything comparable has been done anywhere else in the world.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Anywhere else in the world?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-

KANT BHANDARE: Yes, in comparable conditions. You don't try to compare U.S.A. with India. I will tell you, let us shift our population to U.S.A.; let us put 750 million people there and bring those and bring those 250 million people here, we can also prosper like America. In those circumstances they would have been worse than what we are today. Therefore, the point which I am saying is that let us stop this. My hon. friend from D.M.K. is particularly an expert at self-denigration. I do not know why we should not be proud of what we have been doing because we have preserved the largest and the best democracy in the world under the most adverse circumstances. Why should we not be proud of it? Why I welcome the budget here, I will come first to the charge of lack of direction. The first direction which is given by the budget (a) is a war which we have to declared on poverty. That will go on incessantly and there will be no let up in our efforts to fight against the poverty. I do not want to quote figures, because many speakers have already referred to them and those figures are eloquent that the Government has not a weelfit compromised on the expenditure to be done on these basic things. But what is most important is that in the context of today's population problem this one major problem which is facing the country which problem in alone tackled will be a solution to many other things. Population experts, demographic experts agree on one thing and that is the one thing which will reduce the population growth in any country is education. Without education we cannot succeed and it is proved. Let us go to the cities where couples are educated, you find that the birth rate is drastically reduced. Let us go to the rural areas and in the interior where there is ignorance, you will find that the birth rate grows first therefore thing is stress on education and there is such a large allocation of Rs. 800 crores in the budget I could not have imagined such a large allocation even in my wildest dreams, for education is the first charge after food, clothing and shelter for improving the dignity and a personal-ity of a human being of our citizens. It has got such a big impetus such a big

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

boost and for that matter I must congratulate the Prime Minister who is in charge of finance portfolio at the moment. One thing which is necessary for the development of our country is education. I am glad that Operation Blackboard Novadaya Vidyalayas and all other things will get a tremendous impetus. This is the direction in which we want to go. The second is, of course, emphasis on shelter Housing has got a big boost. I do not want to enumerate all those things, because they have been repeated more than once. I would rather take the time of the House in making one more point.

The third thing which I come to is the deficit. There are two things which I want to say and for which I want the Members of the Opposition to answer, if it is possible. Now a deficit can be bridged by two known methods, that is, either you tax more, that is one way or secondly, you have a 'drastic cut in your plans. I have not known of a third method but the hon. Members on the other side who are expert in coining invectives ... (Interruption).

MISS JAYALALITHA JAYARAM (Tamil Nadu): But the D.M.K. has a regional outlook. They cannot answer you because the DMK lacks a rational outlook.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Yes, but you will not deny that they are great experts in inventing invectives. I hope, they will find a third method to reduce the deficit. (Interruption).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Because they are an All India Party, but we have got a regional outlook.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Regional outlook can become national outlook and national outlook can become international outlook and hon. Member is a very very fine example. (Interruption).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: But we do not agree with your definition of nationalism at all.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Both these temptations of either cutting the plan or increas-

ing the taxes have been avoided by the Prime Minister. I must, therefore, congratulate him on doing this because it is this which also gives an answer to a criticism which sometimes apparently is valid but in substance is baseless namely that it is the deficit which will result in inflation. Nobody likes deficit as has been said by the Prime Minister himself but it is a myth which is really exploded by our Government that deficit Budgeting does not necessarily result in inflation and we must avoid inflation for this reason on the poorest of our people because inflation is the cruellest tax on the poorest of our people and I have no manner of doubt that this Government will see that this inflation is curtailed and when I say so, I do not express a pious hope. I am backed by the track record of this Government which is not excelled by any other Government and I challenge the Opposition to show it in any other part of the world where with deficit Budgets, we have contained the inflation and I will give figures to illustrate my point. 1979-80 those were the honeymoon days of the Opposition, Janata Party and what not. There was a budget deficit of Rs. 2,433 crores and inflation in the wholesale prices on point to point basis was 21.4 per cent. I think it is their experience which they see all the time saying that our deficit will result in inflation. Now, you should come to our record. 1980-81, Budget deficit was Rs. 2577 crores and since it was a hang over inflation in the wholesale prices was 16.7 per cent. In 1981-82, when we took command of the situation, now came the track record. It was Rs. 1392 crores and the inflation rate was 2.4 per cent. In 1982-83, it was Rs. 3399 crores and the inflation rate was 7.3 per cent. In 1983-84, it was Rs. 1817 crores and the inflation rate was 8.2 per cent. In 1984-85, it was Rs. 3985 crores and 7.6 per cent was the inflation rate. In 1985-86, it was Rs. 4937 crores and the inflation rate was 3.8 per cent and those who have talked about the large deficit of the last year. And those who are talking about large deficit of the last year—Rs. 8,285 crores unprecedented—what is the inflation rate? 5.9 per cent—all within the single digit. Therefore, I have no doubt that this Government will contain the deficit.

(Time bell rings) There are one or two suggestions. I want to make. Today you will have to create an atmosphere of thrift, an atmosphere of austerity, you will have to make sacrifices, you will have to tighten the belt, because it is only then that the prices will be controlled. You will have to improve the climate particularly in regard to the public distribution system. The Government's relief to the workmen particularly, I have no doubt, will result in greater industrial harmony and in greater production. I want to refer to a criticism which has been widely expressed by people, including the members of the Bar, as regards Section 194(E). Now, there are two or three things about it. Firstly, one of the characteristics, one of the hallmarks, one of the major stands of this Government has been that it will simplify the tax structure; it will reduce paper work. Now, I want to ask the Minister whether the criticism which is made that 194E will result in a large paper work, apart from the other hardships of affecting the liquidity in industry and other things, is really true. *Prima facie* as I have looked at it, I feel there is a great deal of substance in that criticism and I have no doubt that if that criticism is valid, this Government, which is always open to conviction, will not hesitate in taking the remedial measures and deleting 194E. Very little will be achieved and substantial will be gained if that steps is taken, of course after carefully considering the pros and cons. You must now make efforts to widen the tax base. Today it is really very, very narrow and many people who ought to be within the net are not there... (Time bell rings). There are only one or two points to make. I don't like you to ring the bell. I don't like you to look at the time. There are other better objects to look at in this House. I am just finishing....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): But you have not pointed out what they are.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Anyway I come to my point. For professionals you have given an allowance of Rs. 3000 for medical expenses. I know of professionals who suffers from cancer. I know of professionals who have to go for open-

heart surgery. I know of professionals who suffer from many other serious diseases. Two things happen when they fall sick. Their income stops and when they go for operation, they have to sell everything, dig out of all their savings and go for operation. This is not true in the case of any of the employed or other person for whom there is adequate protection and security. I would, therefore, like you to reconsider this and permit them to have up to 5 per cent of their income in a fund which can be invested every year and which can be utilised in times of such extreme health hazard either for the assessee himself or for any of the dependants of the assessee who is self-employed.

I would then only say that today Defence expenditure is Rs. 12,512 crores it constitutes 31 per cent of the non-Plan expenditure. The impact of the Pay Commission is Rs. 1,500 crores. These are the constraints of the Government which we must realise. If, for defending the honour, for defending the freedom, for defending the unity and for defending the integrity of this country, the citizens of this country are required to make any sacrifice, even supreme sacrifice, I have no manner of doubt in my mind that we will not be wanting in it and we will support the Government which deserves it and which enhances and strengthens the freedom and independence and democracy for our nation. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Now, Mr. Murasoli Maran.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-chairman, Sir, never before has a Budget been built on so much of expectations from the public as this year's Budget and at the same time, never before has so much of disappointment been created by any Budget as this year's of Budget.

Sir, in the annals of our history, there are two Finance Minister who stand in contrast. Though they are poles apart they are worth being mentioned because they are outstanding Finance Ministers in their own way. One is notorious and another is famous. Sir, at the moment, without meaning any disrespect to anybody, I would like put Mr. Charan Singh

[Shri Murasoli Maran]

in the first category. He created a Budget in sense that with a vengeance he butchered the urban elite and the middle class and he did not leave anybody. Next comes Mr. V.P. Singh. Perhaps he is the first Finance Minister in India to have produced the most innovative Budgets up till now. But, at the same time, I have to congratulate his colleague, Mr. Poojari also. In the wake of these innovative Budgets we have been expecting, the people have been expecting, something more, something beneficial, when the Prime Minister himself chose to produce the Budget. But the outcome is, I am sorry to say, a great disappointment. Take, for example, the outcome of the Pay Commission. Now even the lowest grade employee is getting more. But we all expected that the income-tax exemption limit would be raised giving place to what they call as the bracket creep. But that has not taken place. What the Government is giving more by the right hand is taken away by the left hand. This is not in the view of the Long-Term Fiscal Policy. Even Mr. Charan Singh had a philosophy, whether it is right or wrong is a different matter. He was thinking that he was doing it because he was pro-agriculturists, he was pre-farmers and all that. Now, Sir, I want to ask a question: what is the philosophy behind this year's Budget and what is the principle behind this year's Budget? The Prime Minister, after presenting the Budget, is reported to have stated, "I have prepared a Budget for growth and for the poor." The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Where is the provision for growth? Where are the things for the poor? Take, for example development. For development, the plan outlay has been increased just by four per cent above the revised estimate which means that if you take into consideration the inflation that is there, actually, it is something less than last year's provision. Then take the Central Plan outlay on rural development programmes like the IRDP and the NREP. What is the increase? It is only seven per cent. So, if inflation is set off, we are getting less for development. With regard to inflation, as Mr. Bhandare has pointed out, we are all very happy because in spite of the huge deficits created over the years in-

flation is not as much as was expected by the academicians and the economists. Even then we are having some misleading indicators, misleading indices, for measuring inflation. For example, we are measuring inflation by the Wholesale Price Index which shows that presently it is only 6.5 per cent. But, according to the Consumer Price Index, it is really 8.8 per cent. It means that every Indian who is holding a rupee in his hands will be having only 100 paise minus 8.8 which comes to about 91 paise only. The value of the rupee has gone down very much and the present value of the rupee is about 13 paise or so. Inflation means hidden tax. It creates intolerable conditions for the middle class, for the unemployed, for the salaried man. Sir, in fact the tax collector would always be very happy if there is inflation. This is true all over the world, not only here, in the States or as well as at the Centre. Because this, is a hidden tax the Finance Ministers need not go to Parliament for taxing it. Secondly, Sir, they will have more collections. Regarding income-tax, they will be getting more than in proportion to inflation because many people will move into upper income brackets. Regarding excise and sales tax, they will get roughly in proportion to the inflation. So that is the situation.

This year's Budget is predominantly characterised by a ballooning deficit and Himalayan non-Plan expenditure, including Defence. For example, the deficit last year was Rs. 8616 crores. Now the hon. Prime Minister says that this year it would be Rs. 5700 crores and he has assured us in his budget speech he will not add to the same, Sir, we doubt it. It will not happen. In the next session he will come with a Supplementary Budget, and I am sure, Sir, it may reach the Rs. 10,000 crore mark.

Sir, why is not the inflation reflected in our economy in spite of the huge deficits? Sir, the academicians and Government economists will say: we have got a huge stockpile of foodgrains. If there is no galloping inflation or two digit inflation, the reason is that we are having a stockpile of foodgrains. To

some extent it is true. Whatever any expert says we have to agree to it because economics is not an exact science. This is the first argument they are giving stockpile of foodgrains is acting as a buffer, and that buffer-stock of foodgrains is preventing two digit inflation. But this stockpile is acting as a double-edged weapon. I am reading from the Economic Survey, page 107:

"9.17. The fact that our food stocks are well in excess of desired levels for buffer stocking and food security in a bad monsoon year—and that too, following two below normal monsoon—suggests that a good monsoon could exacerbate the economic and financial costs of high foodstocks, unless measures are vigorously pursued to step up utilization of food in anti-poverty programmes."

Sir, here is the crux of the matter: If we do not have enough foodstocks, we will have double digit inflation. At the same time, if we have very good harvests the cost of storing foodgrains will go up very high. So the economic survey suggest: go and distribute these to the poor. So if they are resorting to poverty alleviating measures it is because of this compulsion and not out of their own volition. The stockpiling is going high. So the stockpile has come to us as a double-edged sword.

Sir, there is another theory advanced. Increasing the deficit to the Himalayan proportions of Rs. 8616 crores is unprecedented in the history of India. But they say that if the deficit does not reflect in the inflation then it will reflect in the trade deficit. That is the theory. There is a lot of evidence to show that the trade deficit is increasing. For example, in 1955-86 the deficit is supposed to be Rs. 8747 crores, according to the Economic Survey. So we have got foreign exchange crisis because of this. We have to retreat from import liberalisation. So if you ask me the question what is the effect of this huge deficit, the effect is that we are having a huge trade deficit. Because of that we are withdrawing from import liberalisation which made the Finance Minister very famous. Sir, at the same time, there is the third argument. I

am reading from the Economic Bulletin for Asia and Pacific released by the United Nations. They have come out with a very novel theory. Probably the hon. Minister will know about it. I will read out from this magazine. It is a research article. They ask: where is the missing inflation in India? In spite of this huge inflation, what is happening to inflation? Where is it hiding? What is preventing double-digit inflation? I want to read it for the benefit of the House. It says: "Consequently an upward shift in the saving schedule implies a reduction in the excess supply of money and lowers the rate of inflation." The authors who have written it are Indians. But the magazine is the United Nations magazine. They refer to a limited period. If there is no runaway inflation in India as in Latin American countries, it is because of savings. If at all the Minister has to thank anybody, they have to thank those people who have invested in small savings.

Now, another fear of mine is that we may get into a debt trap. For example, the national debt up till now is Rs. 63,000 crores including the debt of Rs. 21,000 crores abroad. This year, in the revised estimates for interest repayment, Rs. 10,650 crores have been allocated. This was our total foreign debt 20 years ago. We are now going to repay the same amount in the form of interest. On top of it, we are going to borrow another Rs. 20,000 crores. Then comes the IMF repayment. There are strange things happening in the IMF repayment. In terms of SDR, our repayment is decreasing. But in terms of Indian rupee, our repayment is increasing. I want to quote the RBI Annual Report of 1985-86. In rupee terms India's obligation rose from Rs. 4887 crores to Rs. 5284 crores. In the first quarter of 1986-87, in terms of SDR our obligation fell to 3300 millions, but in rupee terms it has increased to Rs. 5431 crores. This is because of devaluation of rupee. Therefore, my fear is that we are falling into a debt trap and like Mexico and Brazil we may have to go to IMF once again to lend more money to us to cover the mounting indebtedness. In this context I would suggest that we should plug all loopholes in foreign exchange. Take the case of

[Shri Murasoli Marun]

NRI's. Now they borrow at 5 or 6 per cent abroad and they deposit the amount in India in the name of repatriable funds at 15 or 16 per cent. Formerly they said they would invest in high tech areas. Are they investing it? No, it is nothing but black money. Let us not get enamoured of NRI amount. You are having the 'balance' of payment crisis. The IMF has reported to us that Indians in one year and in one country alone are maintaining bank accounts worth Rs. 1300 crores. The money which should be here legitimately is somewhere in Europe. If you take into consideration all the other countries, the total figure may be 5 or 6 times more. If you bring that money, you can overcome trade deficit. I request the hon. Minister to take urgent steps to bring back that money. I have been telling about savings. The saving is the saving factor of the Indian economy. We have got the highest saving rate. But who are saving Sir? According to the statistics, 90 per cent of the people are from the household sector. Yes 90 per cent saving is coming from the household sector. Then you should give due respect to that sector. They are the people who are preventing the double-digit runaway inflation. But, Sir, what have we done? You have not given enough concession and incentive to saving. You have now created a National Saving Scheme. But, I don't think it will attract savings at all. For example, it is like the Annuity Deposit Scheme introduced 20 years' ago but given up later. So, what is the incentive? How are you attracting the people? Only highly paid executives, senior bureaucrats and self employed professional people alone will go for this. Those who are going to have a decreased income over the years will alone resort to this scheme. In view of the fact that saving is an important element in the economy of our country, I would request the hon. Minister that you should bring all interest rates of various saving schemes into some kind of an alignment. I do not want total uniformity. But there are plethora of saving schemes. You should bring in some

kind of a uniformity with the variety, so that people may not shift from one scheme to another. (*Time bell rings*) Then there is the notorious 194E. Many people, including Mr. Jha and Mr. Bhandare have spoken about it. Sir, it does not leave anybody. It brings into its net all the people in the professional services, people who get royalties, fees for technical services, rent, commission payments for goods supplied, etc. Everything under the sun has been brought under this category. According to this, everyone will be given a number. Already we have got BAN—bank account number. We have got TAN—tax account number. Now there is the PAN—public account number. So, Sir, we are reminded of George Orwell's '1984.' So, this creates a funny situation. Hereafter everybody will be known by their public account number, tax account number. So, George Orwell's '1984' is being repeated. Sir, it is completely illegal and unethical also. Many are not tax-payers at all. In fact, they may get refund. But when? It will take one year or two years. So, you are creating, instead of a nation of tax-payers, a nation of refund-getters from the Government. In the mean-while, the Government will be having the money. They are not taking into account the cost at all. By this kind of tapping at the source. The Government will be having, according to one estimate, more than Rs. 1500 crores per year. Without paying interest they are going to have Rs. 1500 crores. And then the people, those who have produced, those who have spent much, those who have lent the services will be suffering a lot. In fact, it will attack almost all professionals. (*Time bell rings*) I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister that in the 1967 Finance Bill, a similar provision was brought forward. At that time, Mrs. Gandhi deleted it. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister that in the name of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, you reconsider it. There is no question of reduction at all. I plead for total deletion. It will create so much of complication and so much of harassment. I would even say that it is the Charan Singh element in Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's Budget. It

[Shri Dharanidhar Basumatari]

Desam, some in D.M.K. and they think only of their own party and own people and hence they cannot develop. They do not think of the nation as a whole. They think only of Madras and Telengana.

Now, Sir, when so many leaders got against Shrimati Indira Gandhi, they formed a party, called the Janata party. My friend is there. He was in the Congress before that. But how long could they rule the country? Just two and a half years. Within two and a half years they spoil everything, ruined everything. And when Shrimati Gandhi came back to power in 1980, she had to work hard to repair the damage done by them. Can you imagine the mentality of the people? I have no faith in any other party. It is only the Congress under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, the father of the nation and then Shrimati Indiraji which helped us to develop and we are developing our country. I have seen a long period of Parliamentary life for 40 years. We have to think what others have done for the country. When Shrimati Indira Gandhi came to power, she did so much for the country. You are lucky to have been born in independent India; we were unlucky to have fought for the independence and to have undergone all those difficulties I would only suggest that we should not pay heed to those who want to criticise for the sake of criticism alone, because they will neither support what we do nor will they offer any suggestions.

Coming to the Budget, I must say this is an anti-poverty Budget. Shrimati Indira Gandhi proposed 'garibi hatao' Budget; our present Prime Minister as Finance Minister has produced an anti-poverty Budget. When he came to power in 1984, nobody could imagine what he will be able to do. But we are amazed to see it now. I knew him intimately when he was 7 years of age. And when I heard him speak for the first time, I was surprised. I must say it is a quality which he has inherited. He has the enthusiasm which helps him to achieve his objective, and it also gives him courage. As soon

as he came to power, he came to agreement with various sections who were agitating and he signed accords. He was acclaimed by every section of the people. He tried his level best to settle all the pending disputes through such accords. Earlier to him, Mrs. Indira Gandhi had also tried to settle these issues. Our young, youthful and dynamic Prime Minister at once arranged a discussion and signed the accords. When the accord was signed with their representatives, we thought it was a wrong step. But now we realise it was the only course which was most desirable. And now the people fully realise it. It is very much conforming to democratic principles. It is now for the people to think and decide whether to accept that party or not to accept. It is not for us, the Members of Parliament or the members of the Assembly, to decide. Let the people decide. We have now seen how the Sadhus and Sikh priests joined together and met Sardar Darshan Singh... (*Interruptions*). Don't laugh at me. I am speaking what I feel.

I was very much disappointed when the accord was signed between the AGP students and the Government. I was disappointed because I was the President. I did not know what it was. But now, after one year, we are seeing the results. Initially, you will be surprised, all the local papers supported the AGP and whatever they did. But now, you will find all are against this AGP Government. I had also attended a meeting of the Congress and also I had discussions at a social function, because it is only at such social functions, you can meet all kinds of people, the common people. And now I could find that the common people fully realised that they committed a mistake in supporting the AGP Government. The other day, I met the Prime Minister. He said something. I do not want to divulge it. But Mr. Vice-Chairman, one thing is sure. As I said, people are dissatisfied with the A.G.I. Government, when the next elections are held, Congress will surely be returned to power. There can be no doubt about it.

Now, what is the position in Mizoram? Of course, a new Government has come

to power there after the elections, I had been there in last elections, with our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Now, the people are repenting what they have done. They want to come back to the Congress. This shows that the people are disillusioned with the opposition Governments, wherever they are.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I now come to my pet subject.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Very briefly.

SHRI DHARANIDHAR BASUMATARI: This is about the development of the tribal areas. I will be failing in my duty if I do not refer to this problem. Of course, I do say that many things have been done in regard to improving the economic condition of the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and other weaker sections of the society. I would not say that nothing has been done, but I would say, they are not up to the mark. Take the case of percentage of literacy. In the case of the Scheduled Castes, it is only 14 per cent and in the case of the Scheduled Tribes, it is only 8 per cent. In regard to appointments, even though reservation has been provided for, it now stands at 0.49 per cent in the case of the Scheduled Tribes and 2.39 per cent in the case of the Scheduled Castes. I would particularly address this question to Shri Poojari, the hon. Minister of State for Finance. We have not been able to develop these areas, we have not been able to improve the condition of the tribal and other backward people to the desired extent.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am glad, the new education policy specially aims at improving the condition of the tribal people. Rs. 800 crores have been provided for. It has also been mentioned that more attention will be paid to the tribal areas. It is in this background that the Prime Minister has been making an extensive tour of various backward areas, remote areas, interior areas; not only cities and towns. I am sure, he will do his best to bring the tribal people up.

Mahatma Gandhi said that unless the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes were brought on par with the rest of the people, the country would not develop. This was the motto of the Father of the Nation. This was his dream. We are his disciples. We, as well as today's younger generation, should endeavour to fulfil his dream. We should translate into reality the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Thank you.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Budget. You have asked me to be brief. Therefore, I shall try to omit many points on which I wanted to express my views.

Sir, the Central Budget is not merely a statement of accounts. It is also a document through which policy statements are made and formulated. These are done in the backdrop of the socio-economic situation. Sir, as far as the Budget is concerned, there are a number of lofty ideals in it. For example, there is mention of elimination of poverty and of building a modern, self-reliant and independent economy. That apart, there are many good features. There is a proposal to appoint a National Commission on Rural Labour in order to avoid their exploitation. On education, from an amount of Rs. 352 crores the proposal is to increase the amount to Rs. 800 crores. There are several measures for anti-poverty programme and additional allocation of foodgrains, as a result of which there will be additional employment of 128 million mandays. There is a proposal regarding construction of 1 million houses and I would like to mention that in case this could be achieved, it will boost demand all round. For example, it will boost demand for steel, for cement, for consumer durables, etc. and then there will be a chain reaction. So, in case one million houses are constructed, it will definitely boost the economy of the country. The fact that the Government are proposing for establishment of a new national housing bank with an equity

[Shri Krishna Kumar Birla]

capital of Rs. 100 crores, shows their seriousness as far as housing is concerned.

There is also liberalised depreciation, 100 per cent, 50 per cent and 33 1/3 per cent. On Plan outlay and rural development plans, the target is to spend more than Rs. 2,000 crores this year versus the entire Sixth Plan target of Rs. 3,600 crores. As a result of these objectives, it appears that we shall be able to achieve quantitatively 63 per cent of the Plan target at the end of 3rd year and if that is done, I would call it no mean achievement. In view of this, I have not been able to understand when some of my friends who are critics of the budget, have called it a lacklustre, aimless budget, directionless and a budget without character.

I would say, Sir, that in totality, it is a good budget, but certain proposals of the budget certainly need reconsideration and it is with that idea that I am offering a few suggestions.

Firstly, take the case of deficit financing on which almost every Member has spoken. The total amount of deficit financing which has been estimated is Rs. 5688 crores, and comes to 2.3 per cent of the GNP. The economic theory is that a deficit financing up to 3 per cent can be absorbed by any economy. I would only say that keep it under control. Let it not be further aggravated. But side by side, I would like to mention that deficit financing, if created for productive purposes does not lead to inflation. I would also like to mention that as far as India is concerned, agricultural production plays a very important role. Since in the last two years we have not had good crops, the expectation is that this year there will be good crop, and in case that comes about, I am sure the inflation will be well contained.

Something I would like to mention about capital market. Some Members have spoken about it. I would be frank and would like to state did it appear

to me that the private sector has been completely evicted from the capital market. And this is owing to the reason that as far as bonds are concerned where the public sector has been permitted to issue tax-free bonds in the last year this proposal was made, whereby as far as private sector is concerned, they have been denied this privilege. The other day I read a statement attributed to SCOPE who criticised some of the observations made by some of the leaders in the private sector and they said that the private sector has got the advantage of issuing convertible debentures. This is not a valid argument. After all, the only thing we are pleading is equal treatment. As far as convertible debentures are concerned, the public sector cannot have it for the simple reason that as far as equity shares are concerned, they have all got to be with the Government and not with anyone as far as the citizen is concerned. I would also like to mention why should we really think in terms of private sector and public sector? As far as private sector is concerned, a very honourable position has been given to it so far as the development of the country is concerned. My plea would be that once you give a certain task to the private sector, it becomes the responsibility of the Government and it should become the concern not only of the Government but also of Parliament that whatever genuine difficulties the private sector has, those difficulties are overcome. In fact we should start thinking not in terms of private sector and public sector but in terms of national sector.

Then a few words regarding the cement industry for the simple reason that this industry is going towards sickness and unless something is done, the majority of the factories in the country will become sick. Some concession has been granted to those factories which have started after 1.4.86. Assuming that such factories are of 1 million tonne capacity each, they will be deriving a benefit of something like Rs. 8 crores per year or so. This is a good thing and we fully support it, we welcome it. But I would like to mention that the entire cement industry is going towards sickness and passing

through a period of crisis. What about those factories which have not been included for this bounty which has been announced by the Prime Minister? Why no concession to others? Barring these factories which have started after 1.4.1986, the balance of the industry could be divided into two categories. One is those factories which were in production upto 1st January 1982; the second category is of those factories which went into production on or after 1st January 1982. It is the second category—which means factories which went into production on or after 1st January 1982—which is the worst hit. The reason is this: we have clubbed together these factories where span is four years. Whenever the span is so long, what happens is that the factory which goes into production in the first year does always get an advantage over a factory which goes into production in the fourth year, because by that time the cost of production rises. The cost of production in fact is rising every year. Recently in reply to a question put by me, Shri Arunachalam said on 2nd March—it was an Unstarred Question—that in the year 1983-84—i.e. second year of the four year span—the cost of production of cement rose from Rs. 417 to Rs. 496—Rs. 79 per tonne or 18.9 per cent. You can imagine what the condition will be of a factory which went into production after 1st April 1985. My submission will be that just like the fertiliser industry where the span is only 3 years and not 4 years, I would suggest that the cut-off period should be taken one year earlier, which means that from 1.4.86, the cut-off period should be made 1.4.85. The Seventh Five Year Plan also started from 1.4.85. From that angle also in case we take the cut-off period as 1.4.85, we will be treating a factory which went into production on or after 1st April 1985, when the Seventh Plan was ushered in, on the same par as a factory that went into production on 1.4.1986.

Let us examine from another angle also. The cost of erection of a factory which went into production in 1985-86 or one which went into production after

1.4.86, is not much different. The cost of the project for a factory which went into production on or after 1st April 1986 will be perhaps higher by about Rs. 10 crores. But against Rs. 10 crores is a higher cost. What they are going to achieve is Rs. 8 crores per year of additional profit and conversely it would mean the factory which went into production on or after 1.4.85 would be a gainer as far as the total cost of erection is concerned, by about Rs. 10 crores. But against that it will be losing, every year, Rs. 8 crores as far as profit is concerned. So I would suggest, let the case of the cement industry be examined again. That is very briefly about 115J.

This is regarding 30 per cent of the book profits being put to tax. I would like to mention a few anomalies which are there and which, I hope, will receive the attention of the Prime Minister. One is the unabsorbed depreciation. Many of the honourable Members may be aware that the Government of India does permit two types of depreciation, one for the shareholders in order to give them dividend and the other for income tax purposes so that, there is more cash generated in the hands of the factory. Now my submission will be that from the book profit unabsorbed depreciation should be reduced. My second submission will be that it is quite possible that the factory might be having carry forward losses. Suppose a factory has carry forward losses of, say, Rs. 5 crores and, after that, as a result of modernizing it may start earning money. Income tax law permits that in case the factory starts earning money, then it will not be required to pay tax till the time that the profit it earns is set off against that loss. But under this proposal that is put forward, it would mean that even if a company has a heavy carry forward of loss and in case it makes any profit in one year, it will have to pay tax for that year irrespective of the carry forward loss. My third submission will be that in the case of factories which do not pay dividend, let there be no such tax under this section. My fourth submission will be, in any case let 30 per cent be reduced to 20 per cent.

[Shri Krishna Kumar Birla]

Sir, I would like to remind that the honourable Prime Minister, in his speech, has said that "The phenomenon of so-called 'zero-tax' highly profitable companies deserves attention." But, actually surgery has been applied in respect of all the companies whether they are highly profitable or they are just sick companies.

One section regarding which a number of Members have spoken is 194E. This is about tax deducted at source and the proposal is to deduct tax in respect of fees for professional services, royalty, fees for technical services, rent, commission, brokerage, payment for goods supplied to Government or any local authority or any corporation or body i.e. any company. I would like to mention that this, in my opinion, is an ill-conceived section—this 194E. There will be two repercussions. Firstly, the paper work involved will be very exhaustive. This is a fact which may kindly be examined again. Secondly, as far as the deduction at source is concerned, one of my friends had just mentioned that it will be Rs. 1,500 crores. This is not so. The tax refund will come after four years and the fear is that it would mean Rs. 10,000 crores will be blocked as far as tax proposals are concerned. So, my submission will be that either you abolish it altogether, or, in the case of those people who have got permanent income tax numbers, kindly grant them exemption so that companies are not required to deduct the tax as far as they are concerned.

Sir, customs duty on project imports, on the face of it, looks all right, but I would like to make a special plea as far as fertilizer industry is concerned. The proposal is to increase it from zero per cent to 15 per cent for the simple reason that fertilizer is one of the industries where the Government is required to pay high subsidy. So, Sir, in case the project cost is very high, then, the subsidy amount will also increase, and for that reason it require further consideration. My last point is this. The budget on the whole in my opinion, is good. But,

Sir, I would also like to mention side by side that it had aroused high expectations as far as the people are concerned, people in all sectors, people in industry or private citizens. Why, Sir? There is no logic. Sometimes things are done without logic. There is no logic. But the psychology was such that in the year in which the Prime Minister is acting as the charioteer driving the chariot of the Finance Ministry everyone expected that something unexpectedly good might be there for everyone. As a result of that, probably, the common man was expecting that the tax-exemption limit would be increased to Rs. 25,000, that there would be reduction in personal tax. People were hoping that the gift tax would be abolished. In fact, it is not necessary to have it after abolishing the estate duty. The corporate sector was hoping that the investment allowance would be revised and that the corporate tax would be reduced. I want that this message should be conveyed to the Prime Minister.

With these few words, I support the Budget. And, Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that India will enter the 21st century with vigour and confidence.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री रोशन लाल (हिमाचल प्रदेश) :
बाइस चैयरमैन साहब, मैं 1987-88 का जो बजट हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने पेश किया है उसकी पूरी जोर से तारीफ करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह बजट कौमी ग्रामदल और अकराजान के खर्च के तखमिने का एक खाका है जिसमें हमारे वक्त के केन्द्रों और ग्राम के फल्लाह-ब-बहुद के कौमी सतह के तकाजों को पुरा करता है। इस बजट में बहुत सी चीज ऐसी रखी गई हैं जो कि ग्रामदल की बहतरी के लिए हैं और उससे उनकी रिलीफ मिलता है, इसलिये बजट मतवाजन है। कुछ लोगों ने इसका मजाक उड़ाया। प्राइम मिनिस्टर की तकरीर का जो उन्होंने रफरेंस कोट किया और 29 साल पहले जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर की तकरीर के लफज कहे थे, मुझे उनकी इस बात के ऊपर

हैरानी और हमी आई कि रंगी को हम नारंगी कहें वने दूध से खोया, चलती को हम गाड़ी कहें देख कबीरा रोया। अपोजिशन ने अपनी जिदगी में कभी भी अच्छी चीज को अच्छा नहीं कहा, उसके उल्टा कहा। रंगी को नारंगी कहा और चलती को गाड़ी कह रहे हैं उसको खड़ी करके। हम कितना ही अच्छा बजट पेश क्यों न करें वे नुक्ताचीनी ज़रूर करेंगे।

20-नुक्ता प्रोग्राम, एन्टी पावर्टी प्रोग्राम जिसके लिये हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने इस साल के बजट में 2 हजार करोड़ रुपये रखा है। लेकिन कुछ लफ्ज जिनको उन्होंने पंडित नेहरू की तकरीर से लिया उस पर नुक्ताचीनी की और उसका हवाला दिया। दरअसल एक माजी की कहावत है या हक कत है कि माजी में इन लोगों में पसमादा जातियां आज भी जो हैं उनकी बेहतरी और फलदाह-व-बहुवृद्ध के लिये रखा गया है तो माजी में अखराकी मुवासी और सकापति केन्द्रों और आईनी केन्द्रों से इनको महकम रखा गया और अब जब हमने आईन में उनको गारंटी दी इस बात की, हमारी आईन-इस बात का गवाह है और शहादत इस बात की है कि हर फर्दीबसर को यक़्सा हकूक होंगे तो उसको जब हमने देखा कि तीस साल हो गये अभी तक गरीबी की रेखा से लोग ऊपर नहीं उठे हैं बल्कि इस के बावजूद नीचे उतरते जा रहे थे। नरोरा में मोहतरमा मरहूम इन्दिरा जी ने मुल्क के माहिरीन से एक जायजा लिया उस वक़्त गरीबी हटाओ का प्रोग्राम पहले से ही चल रहा था उसके जेरे असर उन्होंने 20 नुक्ता प्रोग्राम रखा ताकि वो गरीब लोग जो पसमादा जातियों और तबकों के लोग हैं जिनको मुतलेकुलअनान रजत पसंद लोगों ने ऊपर नहीं उठने दिया और उनको दबाए रखा उनका शोषण करते रहे चुनाचे उनके लिए उन्होंने यह प्रोग्राम रखा था। पिछली पांचवीं और छठी योजना में मैंने भी उसको मीनीटर किया, मुझे उस कमेटी में काम करने का मौका मिला था। मैंने देखा कि गालिबन 2 करोड़ लोग इस वक़्त गरीबी की सतह से ऊपर उठाये जा चुके हैं। यह इस हिसाब से देखा गया कि उनका रहन-सहन का तरीका क्या है। और इसको गवर्नमेंट ने या पार्टियों ने उसके मुताबिक देखा और यह पाया कि उनके जीवन में

काफी इन्कलाब आया है। अगर यह कहा जाए कि इनको कुछ नहीं देना तो यह सिर्फ उन लोगों का मजाक उड़ाना ही है और उनको आगे नहीं बढ़ने देना है। क्योंकि मिस्टर जसवंत सिंह जो कि अभी बोल रहे थे वो एक प्रिसली स्टेट के रहने वाले हैं। जहां-जहां प्रिसली स्टेट के रहने वाले थे, जहां-जहां प्रिसली स्टेट्स हिन्दुस्तान में रही वहां लोगों का शोषण होता रहा और वहां गरीब जातियों को पूरी तरह से गुलाम बनाया गया और इनके साथ हमेशा यही हुआ। वह उनको उठने नहीं देते। यह उनके दकियानूसी ख्यालात हैं और इन्हीं दकियानूसी ख्यालात के जेरे असर वह नहीं चाहते कि वो लोग आगे निकलें। उन्होंने इसके इलावा कुछ डिफेंस अखराजान का भी जिक्र किया। आम तौर पर हमें गवर्नमेंट पर पूरा एतमाद है डिफेंस अखराजात जितने हो रहे हैं वह सही हैं। आम तौर पर इस अम्बार पर बहस नहीं की जाती है, यह अम्बार हमेशा डिफेंस के खर्चिया होते हैं। यह हर जगह, हर स्टेट और हर गवर्नमेंट में ऐसा होता है। बजट में कुछ रकम तो दी जाती है लेकिन उनके खर्च के ऊपर नुक्ताचीनी कम की जाती है। हमारे मुल्क के हालात का तकाजा था और दौरे हजारों का तकाजा था कि जब मुल्क के ऊपर साम्राजी ताकत किसी पड़ोसी देश में हथियारों के अम्बार लगा रही हों, खतरा दरपेश हो हमारी सालमियत को, हमारे बका को खतरा परपेश हो तो कोई ऐसी वजह जवाब नहीं कि हम अपने मुल्क को महफूज रखने के लिए तैयारी न करें। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी सरकार ने जो भी इकदामात उठाये हैं इस देश के लिए या डिफेंस के अखराजात के लिए वो हक बजानिब हैं और इसके लिए हम अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को भी बढ़ाई देते हैं तथा सरकार को भी बढ़ाई देते हैं इसके इलावा एजुकेशन की नयी पालिसी लागू की गई है। एजुकेशन सब से बेसिक चीज है। इसके लिए हम अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर के बड़े मशकूर हैं। आज तक तीन चार हजार साल से पसमादा जातें पसमादा तबके और दूसरे क्वायली लोग हमेशा पीछे रहे। इसकी वजह यह थी कि इस बेसिक चीज की किसी ने तशखीश नहीं की। यह पहली तशखीश है कि उनको बुनियादी तालीम

[श्री रोशन लाल]

के जरिये से ऊपर उठाना ताकि ग्राम जनता को जो कांस्टीट्यूशन में जो गारंटी दी गई है वह सहूलियत उनको मिल सके। कांस्टीट्यूशन में गारंटी दी गई है जिसका नसलऐब यह था कि हर फरदी बंशर को एकसा हकूक मिलेंगे, एक ऐसी सलतनत के कयामी अमल के लिए चला दी जहां बिला लिहाज मजहबोमिललत, अकीदा और ख्यालात जात-पात रंगोनसल एकसा हकूक होंगे, उसकी वजह से पंडित जी ने जो कहा था या इन्दिरा जी ने जो नारे लगाए थे उसकी तकमील में उसको पूरा करने के लिए अब की दफा राजीव गांधी ने खास एजुकेशन पालिसी को चेंज करने की कोशिश की ताकि जो इटेलक्चुअल बच्चे जो बाहर और देहात में तथा दूरदराज के इलाकों में रहते हैं उनकी इस समाज में बराबरी में आने का तालीम हासिल करने का मौका मिले। हम जब देखते हैं नौकरियों में भी अभी तक वो पीछे हैं, हर लिहाज से पीछे हैं। अभी तक बड़े घरों के चश्मो-चिराग जिनकी तादाद 15 परसेंट है वो मुल्क की 85 परसेंट जनता पर जो देहात में दूर-दराज इलाकों में रहती है उन पर रूल कर रहे हैं। गरीब तबकों के लोगों को आगे आने का मौका नहीं है, न सर्विस में आने का और न किसी और जगह पर आने का मौका है। इसलिए एजुकेशन पालिसी पर जो बड़ा ध्यान दिया गया है उसके लिए मैं उनको मुबारकवाद देता हूं। यह एक जायज दानिशमंदाना और हकीकत पसंदाना कदम उन्होंने उठाया है। इस तालीम में, एजुकेशन पालिसी में।

टेक्सेज का जिम्मा आया बहुत सारे मेम्बरन इस हाउस में बोले हैं। कोई एप्रीकलचर क्लास की नुमाइंदगी की वकालत करता है। कोई इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स की वकालत करता है लेकिन हकीकत यह है कि ये बड़े आदमी बड़े होटलों में जाते हैं या सिंगापुर स्विटजरलैंड या बाहर के देशों में अपनी फैमिलीज को भेजते हैं शापिंग करने के लिए या बड़े बड़े होटलों में ठहरकर अपनी बौलत का मजाहरा करते हैं, यह उनके लिए है ताकि वे टेक्स दें और गरीब उससे कुछ रिक्लैम हासिल कर सकें

क्योंकि हमने जो अपने बजट में 5666 करोड़ का डिफिसिट दिखाया है वह आगे न बढ़ने पाये सिर्फ जो टेक्स 514 करोड़ का लगा है उसको ही पूरा किया जाये और इन्हीं लोगों से लिया जाये। तो मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर के टेक्सेज के इकदामान हैं ये भी हकवजानिब हैं और एक सही कदम उठाया गया है।

हाउसिंग की एक स्कीम आई है। इसके अंदर 10 लाख या एक मिलियन मकान बनाने हैं। उसके लिए एक इक्विटी कपिटल बैंक की तरह से बैंक खोला जायेगा। इसमें कुछ इंदिरा विकास योजना भी है जिसमें कुछ रुपया इकट्ठा किया जायगा ताकि वे गरीब लोग जिनके लिए हमने आजादी की जद्दोजहद के दौरान में रोटी कपड़ा और मकान का वायदा किया था और जिनको अभी तक 40 साल में नहीं दे सके हैं तो उनके लिए मकान बना सकें। बहुत अच्छी योजना है, बड़ी अच्छी तजवीज है। लेकिन इसके पीछे भी, माझी में भी पिछले पांच साला प्लान में और इस साल भी गरीब लोगों के लिए मकान के लिए कुछ रकम मखसूस की जाती रही है। पहले प्राइवर्ट होता रहा है मैं सरकार से कहूंगा कि इस तरफ भी जरूर तवज्जह दें कि रुपया एक हेड में दूसरे हेड में डाइवर्ट नहों। फिर महज एक कमरा बना दिया। आज तक हमारा देखने में आया है या हमारे तजबों में है या हमने जो मानीटैरिंग की है उसमें हम देखते हैं कि 9/12 फुट का एक कमरा बना दिया और जो गरीबों को दे दिया। यह सोशललिज्म नहीं है यह तो एक बंद अखलाकी तौर पर सोशललिज्म जरूर है। अपने बच्चों को अपनी जनरेशन को बदइखलाक बनाना है। एक कमरे में चाहे उनकी जवान बंटी हो, बहू हो, जवान बाप हो, मां हो या कोई उनके रिश्तदार आये, बारिश हो तो उसी में सोयें, उसी में खाना बनाएं उसी में जानवर की तरह बंद कर दिये जाते हैं और जो जो कुछ हो उनके बच्चे देखते हैं, सारी हरकतें देखते हैं फिर वे आकर समाज के दूसरे बच्चों को खराब करते हैं। स्कूलों में कालेजों में या खेत के मैदानों में जहां कहीं जाते हैं तो उनकी हर कही चीज निराली होती है, सुनने वाली होती है। तो ऐसा सोशललिज्म न लाये।

उन मकानों को बनाने के बाद न केवल उनके बच्चे बल्कि आने वाली जनरेशन भी बरबाद होती है। इस तरह के मकान बनाने हैं तो कम से कम दो कमरे के हों, एक किचन हो, एक बाथरूम भी उनके लिए बना दिया जाये। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि सोशलिज्म हम लाये हम सेक्यूलर पालिसी को कम्पाब बन ए तो ये एक कमरे के मकान किसी गरीब को नहीं दें। मैं देखता हूँ कि ट्राइवल इलाके में ... (व्यवधान) ... (समय की घंटी) खत्म करता हूँ। मुझे ट्राइवल इलाके में जाने का इतिहास हुआ है। ट्राइवल की जिदगी अच्छी थी। एक मकान में किसी हरिजन को बंद कर दिया किसी ट्राइवल को बंद कर दिया सारी फेमिली उसमें रहे लेकिन जब उसमें किसी की सादी हो जाती है तो वह झारिडियों में जाकर घास फूस की झोपड़ी बना लेता है, मेरिड कपल वहाँ जाकर सोते थे यह नहीं कि उसी में पैरेंट सोयें। लेकिन अब तो यह हालत हो गया है कि ट्राइवल जमीन किसी को देते नहीं हैं, किसी और प्राइवेट जगह पर कोई आदमी मकान नहीं बना सकता है उसे उसी मकान में रहकर अपना गुजारा करना पड़ता है।

[उपसभापति महोदय पीठासीन हुई]

यह देखते हुए मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ निहायत अदब के साथ कि सरकार अगर कोई ऐसी पालिसी बना रही है मकानों के लिए तो मकान ऐसे तरीके से बनाये, चाह एट ए टाइम 10 लाख मकान नहीं थोड़ से मकान ही बनाय लेकिन ऐसे मकान बनाय कि जिनमें य सारी फर्सिलिटीज हों और उनको इन्सानियत का दर्जा हैवान न बनाय। क्योंकि इससे उनके बच्चों के अखलाक तो खराब होत ही है दूसरी जगहों पर उसका बुरा असर पड़ता है। है। इस लिए उस पर खास तवज्जह द। जहाँ तक 20 पॉइंटस प्रोग्राम का जिक्र है, आज तक जितन बड़े प्रोग्राम आये गरीबों को गरीबी की सतह से ऊपर उठान के लिए मैंने भी उनकी तारीफ की है लेकिन उस रूप्य का बहुत ज्यादा मिस यूज होता है और खासकर जो आई० आर० डी० में एन० आर० ई० पी० और आर० एल० ई० जी० पी० में होता है। खासकर इसलिए कि जिस रकम की जो

सब्सिडी मिलती है या जो रकम ब्लाक डवलपमेंट में जाती है उसका मिसयूज होता है।

इसलिए, डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहब, आपकी मारफत मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब्सिडी सिस्टम अबालिष्ठा कर दिया जाय अगर आप गरीबों को कोई रियायत देना चाहत हैं, तो उनका विवाउट इंट्रस्ट रूपया दीजिए, ताकि वह उस रूपये का इस्तेमाल भी सही तरीके से करेगा और उसका हिसाब होगा। अगर आप सब्सिडी देते हैं, तो वह तो बीच में ही पाईपलाइन में ही खत्म हो जाती है जाते-जाते, क्योंकि जो रिथल आदमी है, जो निफियारी है, उसको रूपया नहीं पहुंचता। वह बीच में ही खत्म हो जाता है। यह मैंने प्लानिंग में एक दफा कहा था कि इसे कागिनजबल आफेंस बना दिया जाए। मैं अब भी सरकार से कहता हूँ कि अगर आप इस करप्शन को दूर करना चाहत हैं और इस रूपय को चाहते हैं कि सही तरीके से उसका इस्तेमाल हो, तो जब तक आप सजा न देंगे, चाहे वह आपका ग्राम संपंच है, चाहे आपका ग्राम सेवक है, चाहे आपका बी० डी० ओ० है, चाहे आपका कोई और पीलिटिक्स आदमी है, जो गरमीजुदगी आदमी की फ़ारश करता है कि इसको बनिफिट मिले, उसको कागिनजबल आफेंस बनायें, उसको सजा दी जाए ताकि उस रूपय का मिस यूज न हों।

इस सरकार में मुझे आज नहीं, आजादों के बाद 35 साल में मुझे असम्भवतियों में रहने का और पोलियामेंट में आने का मौका मिला है। मैं देखते हैं कि हर साल बजट बनता रहा और वह पसमादा जातियों और पसमादा बच्चों की रियायत के लिए, उनकी ताल के लिए और जो मुमकिन था, वह देने के लिए बनता रहा, लेकिन वह हमेशा मिस यूज होता रहा। तो पहल-पहल तो प्लान और विभाग में, किसी और पॉइंट्स में खर्च होता रहा रूपया, लेकिन थोड़ दिनों में जब इसको तयफ काफी हो गई—अब भी यह मिस-यूज होता है, अभी भी इक्सप्लानेशन है दस या पन्द्र फीसदी आदमी जेनूइन हैं, जिनको मिला है, बाकी रूपया इधर उधर चला जाता है।

[श्री रोशन लाल]

मैं आपस निहायत अदब के साथ अज्रज करता हूँ कि यह जो रूपया आप 20-पाइंट प्रोग्राम के लिए देते, इसकी मारनिटिंग के लिए सही सिस्टम हो। मैंने देखा है कि कोई प्रफसर, जो जिला के अरसर था दूसर होत हैं, वह कभी मीक पर नहीं जात, यह कभी गांव में नहीं जात, वह कभी मारनिटिंग ही नहीं करतइ सिवाय इसके कि एक ब्लाक डवलपमेंट आफिसर, एक ग्राम सेवक, एक सरपंच या दूसर आदमी जो उसके बलाल हैं देने वाल आपलनवाल, वही हो जाते हैं। बहुत सारे कसेज एस मिले हैं। अपने आइड्यार 300 पी०में जानवर दिये। लोगों ने वही खीद और वही बच दिये, उनके जो टग लगाये गये, वही टग उतार दिये। ऐसे-ऐसे इक्वलाइजेशन हैं हरिजनों के नाम से, गरीबों के नाम से। इसलिए इसको स्टा करने के लिए मैं ज़रूर चाहता हूँ कि आप इस तरफ त्वज्जो दें। मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि और इस बजट की पुरजोर ताईद करता हूँ।

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support Budget which has been presented by the Prime Minister. As usual, the debate on the Budget, if we term it like that, has generated a lot of interest and heat. There has been appreciation as well as criticism of the Budget. Unfortunately we find on the part of the Opposition a continuation of the same spirit which has always motivated them, that is, always to criticise because of the subject we approach which they have and it is indeed unfortunate that till this day we have yet to come across a Member on the other side who finds something laudable in the Budget, something good in the proposals or the policies of the Government. The Budget has been called faceless, directionless and some members on the other side have gone to the extent of using harsh words against the person of the Prime Minister to which I take a very strong objection. I feel sad that those who have used such words are unfortunately not present in the House. But that shows how subjective their approach is, how incorrect they are and that the only purpose in criticising is to mislead the

people. I find in this Budget a realistic, a pragmatic, approach on the part of the Prime Minister and the Government, an honest appraisal of the nation's economy. It reflects also a sincere desire to alleviate poverty. The focus is back on the underprivileged class in the society and that is where the direction is. The Prime Minister himself has clearly outlined the objectives as well as the directions. But there are friends who are quite upset and ask why the poor people or the middle class is notified and why no new taxes have been levied is now, this is bothering our friends on the other side. Some have said that there is no courage to take hard decisions in spite of the resources crunch and in spite of the crisis which the economy is facing. Now, had the taxes been levied, criticism would have been otherwise that the poor people have been crushed and that the Government is not concerned about the poor. Now, why taxes have been levied is also a subject matter for criticism. In fact, making of the Budget appears to be very difficult exercise because whatever the Finance Minister does, and in this case it is the Prime Minister—the Opposition has to criticise and there is no other way in which the Budget can be spared.

Madam Deputy Chairman, if we look at the Budget which has been discussed in details during the last two days by the esteemed members of this House, we will see that there has been a correct emphasis on those programmes which directly affect our people living in the rural areas, the landless people and the unemployed youth and that is what is required and that has exactly been done. I won't go into the details of the proposals which are there in the Budget.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Why? You were in very high spirits on the President's Address.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Don't worry I will be in high spirits very soon.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I know the reason.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Madam, Deputy Chairman, this Budget is a continuation of the policies which have been

Discussion

framed, a continuation of the Long-Term Fiscal Policy which has given very good results and a continuation of the reiteration of our commitment to the concept of socialism. Very rightly, Madam, both agriculture and industry have been given their due importance as both are important for the development and for the overall growth of the economy of the country. The policies which we have followed in the field of agriculture have led us to state that we have attained self-sufficiency and that our granaries are full. India is perhaps the only developing country which is no more required to beg from other as far foodgrains are concerned and, in the present Budget too, there are proposals which will give a further impetus to agricultural growth and industrial growth. Industrial growth is estimated at 8 per cent and it is a very remarkable achievement. If we look at what has been happening in other countries, particularly the developing countries, India has made definitely this significant achievement in face of heavy odds of which the entire nation has to be proud. Our economy is in a very sound state of health. There are friends who will disagree. Now, how do we determine whether the health of the economy is good or bad? It is by the growth of the economy, industrial growth, food stocks production, foreign exchange reserves, etc. And, Madam, as the Prime Minister has very rightly said, in all these fields, the situation is quite comfortable and quite satisfactory. And we can safely say that the economy has been very well managed. Now when we find the accusation that the Government has opened the floodgates for imports, we have given a go-bye to the policy of self-reliance the right attention has not been paid to the balance of trade situation, however facts are otherwise. The alarm this year is unjustified and unwarranted. Last year we had a situation where the Government itself was concerned, particularly regarding the balance of trade, and the Government did take steps a Cabinet Committee was set up. And today we find that our exports have gone up by 17 per cent whereas imports have increased by only 2 per cent. Well it is roughly 2. And the trade deficit has decreased by Rs. 1000 crores. So when the trade deficit is decreasing, the criticism or the alarm, parti-

cularly to mislead people. That is unjustified. That is what I wanted to mention.

There has also been a very unfortunate reference—that is what I would like to term it—to the Prime Minister, quoting from Pt. Nerhu's speech. He is reiterating the commitment of the Government and the Congress to the concept of Socialism. There are many friends who have asked what is the definition of Socialism. In this very House, repeatedly this question has been asked. And this question has been addressed to the person of the Prime Minister also. The commitment of the Congress to Socialism cannot be called in question by those who do not know what the sufferings of the poor are who have never been identified with the cause of the poor, who have to some extent by their actions or wherever they have got the opportunity to govern, been spreading poverty. They have no right or *locus standi* to question the Congress commitment or the commitment of this Government to Socialism. It dates back, if I may mention to those days when we were still fighting for our independence, and the policies adopted by the Government since independence have resulted in those socio-economic reforms which are leading us towards providing social and economic justice to the people. That is exactly what we believe in. The concept of Socialism in which we believe, is the Indian concept, that is Nerhu's concept. That is what has been referred to by the Prime Minister. We are not supposed to be guided by a doctrine or a definition of Socialism in which some other friends believe, which is not at all conducive to our system, our atmosphere, our society. And if there is an ideological difference, they need not ignore or overlook the steps taken by the Government towards Socialism.

I may refer now specifically in this Budget to the increased emphasis on the poverty alleviation programme and to the rural development programme. The total outlay for the rural development, if I am correct, is Rs. 2050 crores, whereas the total in the Sixth Plan outlay for rural development is Rs. 3600 crores. It shows the speed with which the Government is implementing rural development programmes and its commitment to the

[Shri Anand Sharma]

cause of the poor people. Similarly, in case of unemployment today it was referred to that unless and until the unemployment problem is tackled it is going to result in a very serious situation. But if we look at the schemes, what do we find? Every year we find more allocation for those proposals which are aimed at generating employment both rural employment as well as urban employment. This year too, for the Rural Employment programme the allocation of Rs. 480 crores will itself generate 273 million man-days. If that is not laudable and if that is not a clear approach or a clear direction, then I do not know how to describe the reactions from the other side.

The Government proposal regarding the housing bank or the Indira Avas Yojna has been referred to in detail. This is a commendable step in a year which is being observed as the Year for Housing by the United Nations. In fact, it may give a lead to the other developing countries where similar problems exist and where too people are shelterless.

Madam, Deputy Chairman, I would like to refer to the allocation for education. Some friends have said that modernisation is being ignored and that education has not been given its due. Let us look at the facts. The Prime Minister made a commitment two years ago that we will have a new education policy. I would not like to go into the details of that policy. Education is of great importance for the removal of ignorance, poverty and unemployment and to prepare the nation for those requirements, which are the requirements of modern technology and science or the requirements for the 21st century. This commitment is there in the new education policy and there is an allocation of 800 crores in this budget. Is this not a good step or a good decision on the part of the Government? I was quite amazed when our friends on the other side, I think Mr. Jaswant Singh also, referred to how to we prepare the nation for the 21st century. The Prime Minister has referred to it. But it is alleged that we were not prepared. I would like to remind the hon. Members

that in this very House, on various occasions there have been very critical references to the policy of the Government. What was the reaction of these parties whenever the Prime Minister started reminding the nation to be prepared for the 21st century? They used to mock. I am very happy that today, while participating in this budget debate, they are themselves accepting what they had been criticising in the past. It is an admission that the policy is correct and our approach is correct. This is something which you cannot achieve overnight. Nobody can deny that in our country modernisation is going on at a fairly good pace. Nobody can belittle the achievements which this nation has made in the field of industry or agriculture. Doing that will be an insult not to the Government, but an insult to our labourers, to our workers who have toiled hard and who have given their sweat and blood to make this achievement possible. Anybody going in for this type of criticism is in fact trying to shatter the will power and self-confidence of the nation. Whenever this approach is adopted. Whenever the will power is shattered particularly in the case of the younger generation where a very dark picture of the country is presented. It is difficult for that nation to meet the challenges, it becomes difficult for the society to march forward. And I will urge our friends on the other side to be realistic and objective in their criticism.

Madam, Deputy Chairman, the deficit which is there in the Budget has been discussed in detail. There are contradictory views of the experts whether it will lead to inflation or not. Today in the morning, our esteemed colleague, Mr. L. K. Jha, had very convincingly argued that it will not have an inflationary trend. And if we look at the proposals, the commitment of the Prime Minister who deserves to be complimented for pegging it down to the minimum possible level, if we look at the figure of Rs. 5,688 crores—it is a big figure—if you look at the previous year where there was a jump in the deficit than what was anticipated or what was proposed in the Budget itself, you find that it was again because of certain unforeseen circumstances, whether an increase in the

Defence expenditure or the money spent for purchasing foodgrains or the implementation of the various recommendation of the Pay Commission and so on. But this year there has been a clear commitment that it will not be allowed to increase. And if they are not satisfied by the commitment, the very fact that no taxes have been levied on goods of mass consumption and the MODVAT has been continued, rather in fact enlarged to cover more items should show that these will certainly help in containing the prices. But there are certain areas where expenditure or increase in out-lays becomes unavoidable. I may specifically mention Defence. In the morning, Mr. Jaswant Singh was giving the statistics as to what exactly is the percentage of GNP which will be spent on Defence and what portion of the total outlay will, in fact, be spent on that. I was wondering whose case he was arguing, whether the case of India or the case of those who are, in fact, presenting a distorted picture, a wrong picture of the happenings in the sub-continent. If you have to find an answer as to why there has been an increase in expenditure in Defence, why a further increase is proposed, we need not look into the statistics between 1978 and 1980 and 1986. You have to look at the defence budget of Pakistan, you have to look at the defence budget of other countries. You have to find the reasons there. You have to look at the fact that billions of dollars of arms assistance is being given to a country which is on the verge of producing a nuclear weapon. There are certain issues which are beyond controversy and the nation's security is our such issue. The Government has very rightly decided to enhance the plan outlay for defence. And, in fact....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Non-plan expenditure.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Yes, non-plan expenditure; I stand corrected. And, in fact, I find no justification for criticism. Here, I would like to rather urge upon the Government to take into consideration the activities across the border, the pumping of the sophisticated weapons, and to review the nuclear policy because the

security of our country is the most important thing for all of us. To conclude

I will once again say that the 5.00 P.M. approach has been realistic and keeping in view the requirements the criticism is not only unwarranted but subjective, motivated and political. With these words, I strongly support the Budget. Thank you.

SHRI KISHOR MEHTA (Gujarat): Madam, I don't know; perhaps, this will be my last speech on Budget and that is why I want to pour my heart before this august House. Madam, Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has described this Budget as a budget for the poor. What a fallacy? I come from the region which is situated at the extreme west-end of the country on the border of Pakistan. Many of the Government officers and Ministers even do not know the geography of my region and almost all of you know it as a Rann of Kutch; apart from its social, economic and political evolution, it is criminally neglected. It is a beautiful region of entrance of all the cultures. I won't take your time talking or acquainting you about all these aspects.

Madam, it is at present undergoing the most horrible experience of third continuous year of drought. I would like to ask our Prime Minister and the present Congress Government whether they are in know of the situation prevailing there or not. Are the poor people of Kutch being helped or exploited under the guise of relief measures? It was declared a scarcity area as back as the 9th November, 1986. But in spite of this late declaration, no relief work was started before the 20th November, 1986. Almost all the relief works in Kutch are going on under rural development programmes for which this Government boasts so loudly. Hereby I want to challenge this Government and demand an independent inquiry for the corruption, irregularity and exploitation of the poor people going their as labourers. With all the responsibility at my command I want to tell this august House that to be on the safe side at least 50 to 60 per cent of the money for IRDP to supply cattle, i.e., cows, buffaloes, camels, goats etc. and

[Shri Kishor Mehta]

other items for poor people to come up above the poverty line, is being misappropriated by the Government officers and Congress (I) workers. As per the rules of the NREP, a labourer working under this project must get at least minimum wages as prescribed under the Minimum Wages Act. I want to ask the Government whether even a single labourer working under this programme in Kutch gets his wages, even half of the minimum wages? Under the NREP rules the wages must be paid at least once a week. I shall ask the Minister whether any labourer has ever got his wages before four weeks? Even no tools are supplied to these poor labourers with which they can do sufficient work. No first-aid box is kept at the relief works to help the labourers in case of an accident as per famine rules. I have visited some relief works personally and as I stated above, I want to assert that all this is true. I want to challenge the Government and want to tell this august House that if I am proved wrong on independent inquiry, I am prepared to face flogging in Chandni-Chowk, after taking off my clothes even. I do not want anybody to be flogged if I am right.

Madam, I want that Kutch should be saved from the present tyrannical rule and should be relieved of its present Government of Gujarat which is corrupt. Let me tell you that if Mr. Clean does not remove this dirt, he won't remain clean. Kutch should be administered as a separate central territory or a State. I ask the Government on the floor of this august House whether the Government is accepting this or not. It should come out categorically. Not a single drinking water scheme is completed totally for supplying water to the villages envisaged. I demand an enquiry into all the drinking water schemes executed till today. I demand an enquiry into the wood development schemes and all types of social or forest schemes. Under the guise of helping poor people, only Congress(I) people and their favourite government servants are helped and on the contrary, poor people are exploited in their most miser-

able days. This is not the only reason why I ask for separate Statehood for Kutch but there are other reasons. The most important reason is the attitude and the behaviour of any Gujarat Government of any party towards Kutch. Kutch was not treated as a part of Gujarat but was always treated as a colony so be exploited by taking away crores of rupees by way of minerals and other raw materials, and by way of heavy taxation. On the floor of this august House, on 31st August, 1976, the then Minister of State for Home Affairs, Shri Om Mehta, said:

"Sir, the Government had seen the pros and cons, consulted all concerned, whether it is Planning Commission or others and have taken a decision that for Kutch, there will be a Kutch Development Board and this has been done when President's Rule has been there. So, there will be Development Board for the Kutch district, so that it can see to its development and have the people's participation also."

Same proclamation was made in Lok Sabha by the then Home Minister, Shri Brahmanand Reddy on 1st September 1976. Not only that, the President passed an order on 28th February 1977 which I quote-

"This Order may be called the State of Gujarat (Special Responsibility of Governor for Kutch) Order, 1977. It shall come into force at once. The Governor of Gujarat shall have special responsibility for the establishment of a Development Board for Kutch and for the other matters referred to in clause (2) of Article 371 of the Constitution in respect of that area"

And last, but not the least, the Governor of Gujarat State while inaugurating the Assembly Budget Session of 1977, announced in his speech that he had received the order from the President of India that Kutch had been given the Development Board and Gujarat Government had to constitute this Board at their earliest.

Discussion

Now, Sir, it was the then Gujarat Government which insisted that this order should be revoked and the new President revoked the Order of the former President before it was implemented on the 17th February 1978. I quote:

"The State of Gújarat (Special Responsibility of Governor of Gujarat for Kutch) Order, 1977 is hereby repealed."

Madam, I want to ask two questions. If region of a State gets its Constitutional right for its development only and the Government of that State instead of helping that region in its developmental process, gets that order revoked, why that region should be kept then as a part of that State? Will anybody here tell me of such incident in political history of any country at any time where the State Government itself instead of fulfilling its Constitutional obligations towards its regions denies and even withdraws the Constitutional right—not preferential or even obligatory? We speak of respect of President of India. Will anybody tell me any instance of any time that an order of one President is revoked by another following President before that order is even implemented? Where is the respect of the order of the President? This requires to be examined. One thing is sure that Kutch, a minority region cannot and should not be left at the mercy of negative majority Government of Gujarat State. Nothing justifies more than this behaviour of the Gujarat Government that Kutch should be kept out as a separate State, as it was just after Independence. This is the only way by which justice can be done. The Boundary Government's responsibility and for that the development of Kutch is the Central Government's responsibility and for that a development board should be constituted. You talk of poor people and backward areas. Here is a case of the most backward area; backward economically, socially and politically, which needs to be given its Constitutional right and justice. The demand is for its development only and it is not for any

power or for the good of any single individual.

Madam, Kutch has the longest coastline among all districts in India. Forty per cent of the total salt production comes from Kutch. But there is not a single salt-based industry; nor have any fisheries or any type of mineral industry come up. Kutch is the only district in Gujarat where you get various minerals in huge quantities and superior quality. But not a single mineral-based industry has come up in the last four decades since Independence. Huge quantities of lignite and even coal are found only in Kutch in the whole western part of India but not a single thermal power station has come up so far though such a one has been promised for long. It receives its power supply from a distance of 1,000 kms. I do not understand the reason for this criminal negligence of the backward border area of Kutch by the Gujarat Government. I would like to know here and now, how far the Central Government will allow this type of tyrannical administration to go on at the cost of the poor people of Kutch. I would appeal to our young Prime Minister, who talks of poor people, who talks of going into the Twenty-first Century, to consider earnestly the request of this region where not even drinking water is available. Thank you.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO
(Jammu and Kashmir): Madam, the hon. Minister may kindly take note of what the hon. Member has said about the backward region of Kutch. He should bring it to the notice of the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Madam Deputy Chairman, thank you for having given me this opportunity to speak on the General Budget. Madam, the General Budget for the year 1987-88 presented by our hon. Prime Minister as the Finance Minister of the country has come as a boon for the middle-class

[Shri V. Narayanswamy]

and the poorer sections of the society, it has brought, it has received, more brickbats than bouquets from the upper-class people whose high hopes were dashed.

Madam, on the whole, it is a poor man's Budget. In the Budget, the Prime Minister has allocated Rs. 1,500 crores for agriculture. In spite of the failure of the monsoon for the last three consecutive years, we have been able to produce 150 million tonnes of foodgrains. This is because of the improved technology used in agriculture. There is a steady improvement in the application of modern methods in agriculture. The Prime Minister has rightly congratulated the farmers on their efforts in maintaining the tempo of agricultural production in spite of the failure of monsoon for the last three years.

For research and development, a sum of Rs. 82 crores has been allocated in the Budget. In this connection, I would like to point out that research made in the various research institutes is not reaching the farmers at the right moment. There is a time-lag before the invention reaches the agriculturists. Inventions are made in the various agricultural universities. They are not quickly absorbed in the field and the farmers are not educated on the subject very quickly. To my mind development has not taken place to the extent we desired because of lack of co-ordination between the Agriculture Ministry and the various educational and research centres. In this connection, I would like to give two suggestions. The one is, private firms which are engaged in the agricultural research, should be given concessions, they should be given benefits and they should be allowed to do the inventions. The Government should see that the technology which is developed in the laboratories should reach the farmers as quickly as possible so that we could get more produce by using modern methods.

Now I come to the defence expenditure. Our Prime Minister has announced the budget allocation of Rs. 12,512 in this year for the defence spending. In the last year it was 10,194 crore of

rupees. A lot of criticism has come in. Since there is an increase in the defence budget to the tune of Rs. 2,310 crores, the opposition Members have said that the Government's planning is defective, that more thrust is given to the defence budget. Madam, our hon. Member, Shri Anand Sharma, while speaking, has outlined why the defence budget had been increased. He just touched the point and went to the other subject, but I would like to devote more time on that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Leaving it to you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I would like to devote more time on that, because the defence budget can be seen from two angles. Firstly, whether this increase in the defence allocation is required and, secondly, what our neighbouring countries are doing in this field. Naturally, all the Members from opposition would agree with me when I say that the allocation for defence should be increased keeping in view the threat posed by the neighbouring countries towards India. When we see the budget allocation by foreign countries, including Pakistan and China, they will agree with me that the defence allocation made by our country is not more as compared to those countries. Madam, I would like to give the figures. In 1981 a survey was conducted by the United Nations which revealed that the USSR spent 175 billion dollars for defence purposes whereas the U.S. spent 115 billion dollars. So, the USSR budget allocation for defence was 40 per cent more than that of the U.S. budget allocation for defence. Then, the defence allocation for India in the year 1980-81 was Rs. 3,800 crores, in 1981-82 it was Rs. 4,200 crores and in 1982-83 it was Rs. 5,971 crores. When India spent in the year 1983 eight dollars per capita on defence budget, Pakistan spent 21.2 dollars per capita in the same year 1983. In the year 1984 the defence expenditure of Pakistan was Rs. 30,375 million, that is 20 per cent increase in the budget allocation made by Pakistan. Then, Madam, from the year 1978 to 1981 it was found out that the world military expenditure was 1600 billion dollars per year. That is equivalent to one million dollar spent every minute in 1971 for defence throughout the

world. This is because of the arms race and the experiments made in space. For economic reasons and to give military help to the developing countries, the developed countries have created more arms for the purpose of controlling them. The comparative figures of Defence budget in India on the basis of Gross Domestic Product are: 6.4 per cent in 1982, 7 per cent in 1984, and it has gone down to 3.3 per cent in 1986-87. But there has been a 10 per cent increase every year in the defence expenditure of China and USSR.

Even on the question of army: population ratio, we find that in India there is an armyman for 748 population, whereas in Pakistan it is one armyman for 183 population. In China it is 1: 299 population. For 175 million population India has only 1 million army. But for its 95 million population Pakistan has nearly half a million army. Considering all these aspects, it is very clear that the increase in defence allocation of about Rs. 2,500 crores is negligible. We have seen that in 1971 Pakistan acquired arms and ammunition from USA worth 3.2 billion dollars and for the period commencing from 1986 till 1991 they are going in for arms aid from USA to the tune of 4.2 billion dollars. They are asking for a waiver of Symington law and negotiating for supply of AWACS. They are also now creating capability for manufacturing nuclear weapons. That being the case, we are well justified in increasing our defence budget for all these reasons.

Now I come to the topic of subsidies. Under subsidies a sum of Rs. 4780 crores has been allocated. In this food subsidy accounts for Rs. 2000 crores, then Rs. 1910 crores goes to fertiliser subsidy and Rs. 870 crores is export subsidy. The two subsidies—food subsidy and subsidy on export items—cannot be curbed, but about Rs. 2000 crores which you are going to spend on subsidy for fertilisers can be curbed by implementing two suggestions. One is, Government can rationalise the fertiliser prices so that the burden may not be felt by the agriculturists. Secondly, they can go in for an alternative solution:

of categorising the farmres as small farmers, marginal farmers and big landlords. They can continue the subsidy for the small and marginal farmers and to away with it for those big landlords who are getting benefits to the tune of Rs. 1000 crores. Because subsidy is given to the agriculturists for the purpose of getting more yield, that subsidy should go to the small and marginal farmers and not to the big landlords, because otherwise the big landlords will become richer and the small and marginal farmers will not be able to develop. Therefore the Government can think of reducing the subsidy for big landlords which is really a burden on the Government.

Then coming to deficit financing, a lot of criticism has come from the hon. Members from the other side that Government should have contained this deficit. But our Prime Minister in his Budget speech has categorically stated that subsidies, implementation of Fourth Pay Commission's recommendations and Rs. 1200 crores for Food Corporation of India loans due to the banks are the main reasons for this deficit budgeting. Madam, no country in the world has got a surplus budget. Whether it is a capitalist country or socialist country, no country has got any surplus budget. I would like to state that if any country is based on a surplus budget, then that country is running an inefficient Government because a Government should spend money for Plan and non-Plan purposes. So, deficit budgeting is a must. But the Government has to contain inflation and price control should be there. Honourable Member, Mr. L. K. Jha, has said that the problem of unemployment is posing a threat and that should be given priority. By deficit budgeting it can be contained and the problem of unemployment can be solved. Therefore, it is only for the development in various fields that deficit budgeting has been introduced.

Madam, in the field of tax proposals the Government has taken care to see that the consumers are not affected and they do not feel the burden and several concessions have been given for soaps, plastic items, sarees and other items. But the Government has given more

[Shri V. Narayanaswamy]

thrust on the long-term fiscal policy and MODVAT schemes. The capital goods industry is getting more benefits because it is a core sector and, therefore, the Government felt the need that the capital goods industry should be given the benefit. But while applying the MODVAT scheme, the benefits which the industry is getting should be passed on to the consumers. Of course, by introducing the scheme companies are getting benefits, but the Government has to ensure that the benefits are passed on to the consumers also who are taking the items for their own use.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sum up.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I am only giving suggestions for tax proposals. I will take only three minutes more.

Then, the depreciations which is allowable by the Government is a double-edged weapon because, when depreciation is allowed, the company is getting the benefit. It will modernize the industry and it will get the inflow of funds. But there will be a slump in the benefit which will be given to the shareholders and they will not be getting the benefit. Therefore, after two years there should be monitoring by the Government in the field of capital investment.

Then coming to another aspect, profit on book value, now several companies have been brought under the scheme. Section 80 (VVA) has been abolished and section 115J has been introduced. In this, under the Income-tax Act, these companies which are using the scheme have been assessing the tax on a written-down method, on the straight-line method. By this, I would like to say that the assessment which is made on the book profit when the amount is collected, this will have an adverse effect on the depreciation value. Therefore, this should be taken care of by the Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much... *(Interruption)*.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Only one minute. I have not taken much time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You only mention what is your suggestion.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I am giving the suggestions; I am not elaborating.

The Government servants expected that they will be given exemption up to Rs. 25,000 for income ratio, but that has not been given. I would like to suggest that at least the case of Government servants who have been given the higher scales of pay under the Fourth Pay Commission's recommendations should be considered for the purpose of income limit because, as the honourable Member, Mr. Maran has suggested, what is given by the right hand is being taken away by the left hand. Madam, I would like to say that tax should be imposed on agricultural income. I would like to say that agriculturists also should be categorised.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: There is no income at all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is already a tax on agricultural income.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: The big landlords who are getting benefits from the Government should also be taxed as in the case of industries and other sectors.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Those who possess large holdings, suffer a lot.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: With all these suggestions, Madam, I would like to say that the Budget presented by our Prime Minister, which has been very much criticised by the Opposition without any concrete proposals, is a very good budget. It is for the poor and middle classes, and it is taxing the rich.

With these words, I conclude now, Madam.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, for the third day we are sitting and discussing the Budget. It is very unfortunate that our hon. Prime Minister could not

spare even five minutes to come and listen to the debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He knows everything of what is going on here.

SHRI M. N. JACOB: The Prime Minister was here.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: If he is occupied with so much work, he could have given this portfolio to somebody else.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He knows what is happening here.

CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I take this opportunity of supporting the Budget proposals for the year 1987-88 presented before this House.

It is undeniable that the nation is passing through a very critical period of internal and international tensions. Terrorism which was seldom known to this country, has infiltrated into our frontiers in an organised manner with ostensible support from unfriendly elements outside. This has strained very much the finances of our developing economy. We cannot also ignore the threat to our developing economy. We cannot also ignore the threat to our western frontiers and nuclear menace which has been over shadowing us. The increase in the defence outlay is, therefore, unavoidable both on account of the need of updating and modernising our arsenal. Modern warfare and sophisticated defence techniques outpace one another at a very rapid speed. The increase in the defence expenditure has also been necessitated by the recommendations of the Fourth Pay Commission. We have, therefore, to take it in its proper perspective.

The overall deficit of about Rs. 6,000 crores is quite in consonance with the urgencies of a developing economy. It is for the people of this country to offset this deficit by hard work, passion for productivity and overall call of duty in the interest of the nation. History is witness to the fact that after the Second World War, the battle-ravaged countries rebuilt themselves from the rubble and ruins of war, countries which were strangled by thousands of war planes and ra-

vaged by armoured tanks, rose like a sphinx at a rapid pace immediately after the war, and there are examples where not a single sign of a bullet is now discernible where it was nothing but gunfire all round. I am sure that the patriotic people of India will appreciate this delicate position and pledge themselves to the difficult task ahead.

There is no doubt that the price front is a alarming, and there is a vicious circle of varying price index after the new wages have been announced. Prices and wages are chasing each other and all the planning of economists goes away in no time. It may be conceded that international market mechanisms are also influencing local prices also, but unfortunately the role of unscrupulous profiteers and traders is also no mean. The Government has taken strong measures to initiate the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 and it will not be long before perceptible results will be in the offing. These results are not a one-sided business. Only very enlightened and vigilant public opinion can help the Government in enforcing the same.

It was for the first time in the history of free India that the problems of pensioners, that is the senior citizens of the country, were entrusted to the Pay Commission. Its recommendations have been received and are receiving close consideration by the Central Government Family pension in this country got its origin from 1964. It is a welfare measure for widows and orphans. It was only recently that pre-1964 family pensioners who got nothing previously have been entitled to receive pension. It goes to the credit of our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi that a minimum of Rs. 375/- for these unhappy souls has been provided in the Budget. It is an unprecedented measure. In certain cases, widows in their seventies, eighties, who were unable to hear and see, could not believe what has been sanctioned to them. It is a revolutionary social welfare measure.

There is a perceptible grouse and murmur that in the face of rocketing prices the limit of exemption for personal income tax has not been upraised. The Prime

[Chowdhary Ram Sewak]

Minister had hardly any option in the matter particularly when the Government is committed to a long-term tax policy for maintaining stability in the economy. Such a step will affect only a marginal percentage of salary earners, but the general tax-payer will not be affected. The modifications and concessions in duties and levies on popular items of need are also welcome.

The most congratulatory aspect of the entire Budget is that the Prime Minister was courageous enough not to resort to any cheap gimmicks or populist measures. He had the courage of conviction to call a spade, not to ignore realities and long-term objectives, which in itself is a commendable achievement. The overall health of the economy is sound; the Railways have given an excellent performance; the power sector is turning around and the public sector is also giving a better account of itself. Let us hope that the future will be brighter for all of us.

SHRIMATI OMEM MOYONG DEORI (Arunachal Pradesh): I support the Budget proposals for 1987-88. I am grateful to you, Madam Chairperson, for giving me an opportunity to place my views on this Budget before this august House. At the very outset I would like to congratulate our dynamic Prime Minister for presenting an imaginative and progressive Budget which is bound to place our economy on a still better footing ensuring our speedy march towards our ultimate goal of realising a higher standard of living for people.

Many of our esteemed colleagues have supported the Budget. Of course, a few have criticised it very bitterly. Sometimes healthy criticism is welcome. There has been sweet and sour reactions to the Budget. I may very clearly say that the Budget is very good. I say it is good, because it is for the poor people, for the common people and it is mostly for the welfare of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe people. Madam, you are aware that majority of our people are very poor and backward. Most of our scheduled castes and scheduled tribes are still below the poverty

line. We need more economic development and better educational facilities.

Madam, the basic need of a common man is roti, Kapada aur makan and a person cannot think of education or development if he or she does not have enough to eat, clothes to cover their bodies and a small house to live. So these are the basic needs and specially for our common people we must have these facilities. Very fortunately, we have all these three items provided for in this budget.

Madam, I come from a remote State, namely, Arunachal Pradesh. I am grateful to the Prime Minister and to this august House for conferring a Statehood on Arunachal Pradesh. Along with the rest of the country we have been making steady progress in various fields of development. I am confident that the new budget will not only ensure the continuity of progress, but will also help the people in stepping up the pace of development. In the first budget presented by the Prime Minister, he has made efforts to meet the requirements of various sectors of our society. The bulk of our people live in rural India. It is therefore, necessary, that programmes which help them get priority. Greater emphasis has been rightly placed on the anti-poverty programmes like the IRDP, NREP and RLEGP. Likewise greater priority is being given to the 20-point programme. The Prime Minister who has toured the country extensively is fully aware of the problems facing the rural mass and has sharpened the focus on poverty alleviation. The appointment of a National Commission on Rural Labour is a most welcome step as agricultural labourers are most prone to exploitation.

A massive effort has been directed to implement the new education policy. This is in tune with the Government commitment to give right direction and purpose to education which will enable the socially and economically weaker sections to fight poverty and realise equality. Its aim is to achieve excellence in all fields of education. I am confident that the programmes being implemented under a new scheme will lay due emphasis on the schemes designed to secure the well-

fare of women and ensure their right place in the society.

Housing is one sector which needs attention. It is heartening to note that high priority is being given to the basic need. Due emphasis is being given on housing for the economically weaker sections. Provisions have been made for housing loans for the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes under the Indira Awaas Yojana. Setting up of a new National Housing Bank to promote housing institutions shows the Government's concern for the housing development programmes.

I once again congratulate the Prime Minister for presenting a dynamic and progressive budget at a time when the country is facing heavy odds. I am confident that the new budget will not only ensure continuity of progress, but will also help the people in stopping up the pace of development.

I wholeheartedly support the budget.
Thank you.

SHRI Y. GOPALSAMY: Madam, are you going to adjourn now?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At 6 O'clock.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We can continue tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Rameshwar Thakur.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR (Bihar): Madam, I congratulate the Prime Minister for his historic budget speech and for his progressive and pragmatic proposals contained in the budget for 1987-88. The budget reflects the philosophy, direction and determination of the Leader and the Government to fulfil aspirations of the people. A closer objective look at the Budget clearly indicates that it provides for sound base for promotion of income, savings, investments, growth and development of our economy in the pursuit of broader national objectives and collection and allocation of resources according to our

cherished national priorities. It contains positive thrust to stabilise and consolidate the major, fiscal reforms undertaken under the long term fiscal policy of the new Government. Some well-informed Opposition Leaders, however, have chosen to criticise the Budget as directionless, anti-growth, inflation-oriented, pro-rich and against the poor and common man and also privatisation of the public sector, lowering the employment opportunities and minimising allocations to States as well as enlarging large deficits and so on. I would refer particularly to the speeches made by my learned friends, Professor Nirmal Chatterjee, Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy, and this morning by Shri Jaswant Singh. It is surprising. The direction has to be searched after going through the speeches and the documents. The direction of the nation is contained in the Directive Principles of the Constitution which the Government have followed consistently all through. The directive is contained in the long terms policy and the planned economy, initiated by our first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The policy direction is clear from the Industrial Policy Resolutions of 1948, 1956 and thereafter the policy direction is very clear in the plan-document itself when we have taken the basic decision to have growth, modernisation, self-reliance and anti-poverty programmes. The basic goal is socialism, particularly democratic socialism which was chosen and about which many hon. Members have made some criticism. In fact, they wanted to know the definition of socialism. Madam Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister has given this definition. At two places, the objectives have been very clearly stated. One is in para 4. "He has very clearly said that our principal objectives are the elimination of poverty and the building of a strong modern, self-reliant independent economy" and again in paragraph 44, he has said: "I am committed to planning for socialism in India, socialism which fits in with our genius but nevertheless socialism in its basic meaning of removing disparities and providing equality of opportunity. This is the yardstick by which I want to judge all policies and programmes."

[Shri Rameshwar Thakur]

It is not a question of defining socialism today and understanding socialism today. This in principle was adopted long back. The Avadi Congress in 1955, took the first decision about socialism. Thereafter, it became socialistic pattern of society. This was slightly modified in Amritsar Congress and made socialistic society and finally, in January, 1964, we took the final decision on socialism at the Bhubneshwar Congress where the democratic socialism has been adopted. Since then, there has been no change in our definition and the other Members who are asking for the definition should search their hearts... (*Inter-ruption*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Conveniently, you forgot socialism for some years.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: I can tell you since 1964 never has there been any change in any resolution, in any policy,...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: There was not even a single mention of it in the previous Budget Speeches. Only this year it has been mentioned. It did not find a place in the previous Budget Speeches.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: No, you are mistaken. If you want I can give you references. It has been done seriously in all the plans. Our Seventh Plan is the best document. Annual Plan is part of the Seventh Plan. It is very clearly stated in the Seventh Plan. There has never been any deviation in the direction of this Government. You have to see things not by definition alone but by the results that we have achieved; we have to judge by what we have done and what we have not done. Mr. Sinha was very keen to know this morning; he made very critical remarks, very unexpected from a man of his experience and stature. I am surprised how he made such remarks. If the direction was lost, if there was deviation, he should know,

it was during the years 1977-78. The first deviation was, Plan was abandoned. A rolling Plan came into being in 1978-79. What happened in those days? I would like to give you specific examples. It is no use simply criticising our policies and programmes. Let us judge ourselves by our performances. In 1979-80 food-grain production was 109 million tonnes; that was raised to 153 million tonnes in 1984-85. In the case of industrial output it was 1.4 per cent in 1979-80. It rose to 9 per cent in the year 1984-85. In the year 1984-85. In the case of crude oil it was 11.7 million tonnes in 1979-80. We have gone to 30 million tonnes in 1984-85. In coal from 103 million tonnes we rose to 150 million tonnes in 1984-85. In electricity from 112 billion KWH units we rose to 164 billion KWH units. NGP rose from 3.5 per cent to 5 per cent. All this, in spite of the rise in population and many other factors. Therefore, I say we should judge the direction by the actual policy, actual Plan, actual performance, all of which is obvious and clear from the facts and figures which cannot be disputed. Therefore, the Prime Minister has given us the real thrust about making the poverty eradication as a major factor in our planning process, particularly in this year's Plan.

Then there is criticism that possibly we were trying to nurture the middle class and the upper class during the earlier years; therefore, this year we have come down to help the poorer sections. I have stated earlier and I would like to state again, Plan after Plan our desire has been to bring more and more people above the poverty line. In the Budget of 1984-85, then of 1985-86 and in the next year's Budget we have given due importance to anti-poverty programmes and for rural development programmes. We have provided for Rs. 2050 crores this year. We made such provision not only this year; even in the last year the provision was Rs. 1800 crores. It has only been further augmented this year. We have this year tried to cover other things also. Therefore, it is not fair to say that there has been a change in the direction; it is not a right conclusion

Discussion

based on facts and figures. There has been no change whatsoever in our direction. There is, of course, a greater provision this year and a much greater emphasis but it is because of our desire to fulfil our commitments contained in our election manifesto of 1980, again of 1984. We have to see that those commitments are fulfilled, that we stand up to the expectations of the people, and towards that end the party and the Government have a responsibility. Madam, when the Seventh Plan was being framed and introduced, the same kind of criticism was there and it was said that the resource constraint was there and therefore, it would not be possible to achieve the targets fixed. But in less than two years' time, the investment by the Centre has gone up by 40 per cent and in the year 1987-88, it will go up to 63 per cent. Is it a mean achievement? It is any deviation? Is it not the fulfilment of targets by the people who are framing the plans about which serious doubts were expressed? Is it not a fact that with all the resource constraint, 96 per cent of the outlay is being met by internal resources only? Therefore, I would say that provisions have been made and they have been made not merely with reference to monetary terms. We know the allocation made in the Budget for 1987-88. 273 million mandays are planned to be created through the NREP. But they say that there is no provision for employment at all. There is a specific provision here for the creation of 273 million man-days through the NREP for which a provision of Rs. 480 crores has been made in this year's Budget. Similarly, the allocation for the RLEGP has been raised to Rs. 275 crores to create 256 million mandays of employment next year. Is not this a programme for creation of employment? Therefore, I would say that it is no use simply criticising for the sake of criticism. Their criticism must be backed by facts and figures and also by constructive and alternative suggestions and proposals. Of course, it is the right of the Opposition and it is the privilege of the Opposition to criticise the Government. But they must also give in plain

words what the weaknesses are and what the shortfalls are by giving facts and figures and they must also give in plain words their proposals, alternative proposals, for the removal of these weaknesses and shortfalls and for improvement. Now, take the case of foodgrains. People say many things about the food stocks. Now what has been done? One million tonnes of foodgrains in the previous year and two million tonnes of foodgrains this year have been given as grant to the States for the NREP and for the RLEGP which have created an employment of 128 million man-days and the idea is to give much more and in the Budget proposal itself the Prime Minister has said that this year this will continue in a bigger way. Therefore, this is the kind of thrust, the right thrust, that is there in the policy framework which we are having.

Now, Madam, I have got some suggestions to make. We have got not only many programmes, but we have also made provisions for many things. The States have been asked to monitor the programmes. But there are certain weaknesses in the implementation in many states. Therefore, it is essential to do one thing and this is the basic philosophy of planning also. Unless the people, the beneficiaries, are associated actively with the planning process, in the implementation of the programmes, the plan cannot be as beneficial as we want it to be. In planning, Madam, it is not the material resources alone which matter, it is also the human resources which are equally important. So, in the rural areas where many programmes are to be implemented the beneficiaries of all kinds of programmes must be directly involved, the local population must be involved, the local beneficiaries, the local bodies like the panchayats, the local MLAs and the local MPs and even the local party workers should be involved and also the teachers and the students and the common people should be involved in the implementation of these programmes and their participation should be there and the implementation should not be left to the Government alone because that will not serve the purpose.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, I think he can continue tomorrow.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: Madam, about price rise, I would like to mention one particular point. Madam, it is a matter of great satisfaction that after the Budget, about which many people said, many Members also said, many leaders also said, that it was inflationary, the prices have not risen. Even the first-day reaction was that it was inflationary in character. Every year it has been so. But this year, luckily, it is not so and we must congratulate the Prime Minister because there has been

no increase at all in the prices. Now they are saying that the deficit is there and in future the price will rise; There has been no price rise. This is a commendable thing and, therefore, we should accept it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned now and will meet tomorrow at 11-00 A.M. Mr. Rameshwar Thakur will continue his speech tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at six of the Clock, till eleven of the Clock, on Thursday, the 12th March, 1987.