

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will fix up the date.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL)—2005-2006

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति जी, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे वर्ष 2005-2006 के लिए प्रस्तुत बजट पर टिप्पणी करने का अवसर दिया है। सबसे पहले तो मैं वित्त मंत्री जी की एक बात की बहुत तारीफ करूँगा कि वे बहुत अच्छे मार्केटिंग आफीसर साबित हुए हैं।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (उत्तरांचल): वित्त मंत्री जी तो हैं नहीं।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: उनके प्रतिनिधि बैठे हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी (पश्चिम बंगाल): सर, क्या ऐसा बोलना चाहिए इस हाऊस में फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर के लिए *...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं, नहीं। वह निकाल दिया है।...(व्यवधान)...

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): सर, मैं सम्मानित सदस्य को बताना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी लोक सभा में हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश): मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है।

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: लेकिन* का आप जिक्र न करें।...(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not in good taste... (*Interruptions*)...
That is not in good taste... (*Interruptions*)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मुझे बहुत प्रसन्नता है कि आप वित्त मंत्री जी का बचाव कर रहे हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: नहीं, बचाव का नहीं है। It is a question of the dignity of the House ...(*Interruptions*)... I don't want it to be a part of the proceedings which is a reflection on the other House... (*Interruptions*)...

*Not recorded.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. I have removed it. (*Interruptions*)... नहीं, आप छोड़िए इसको। उसको निकाल दिया है। ... (व्यवधान)... आप बैठिए।

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Someone said that he had gone for* (*Interruptions*)... If you want to show oneupmanship... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please. I have removed it. (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jibon Roy, please sit down. (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Premachandran, please sit down. (*Interruptions*)... आप बोलिए, जोशी जी।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM): The hon. Minister is in the other House. (*Interruptions*)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: सर, मैं बहुत शांति से बोल रहा हूँ।

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: मैं भी शांति से सुन रहा था। मैंने पेन भी निकाल लिया था ... (व्यवधान)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: उपसभापति जी, मैं वित्त मंत्री जी की इस बात के लिए तारीफ करता हूँ कि वे एक ऐसे विशेषज्ञ हैं चीजों को पेश करने और बाजार के सामने रखने में, कि जहाँ जिस डिब्बे में कुछ नहीं है, उसके अंदर बहुत कुछ है, ऐसा वे दिखा सकते हैं। यह एक बहुत बड़ी कला है, हरेक को यह नहीं आती है। इस मामले में वे बहुत बड़े विशेषज्ञ हैं पहले भी, 6-7 साल पहले भी वे ऐसा कर चुके हैं। इस बार भी उन्होंने यही किया कि जिस डिब्बे में कुछ नहीं है, उसकी पैकेजिंग इतनी खूबसूरत करके रखी कि लोगों को लगा, इसमें बहुत कुछ है। यह बहुत तारीफ की बात है।

उपसभापति जी, जैसे ही शुरू में यह बजट आया, लोगों ने कहा कि यह दूसरा ड्रीम बजट आ गया है। इसके लिए बड़ी प्रशंसा के पुल बांधे गए। टेलीविजन में एक साहब ने पूछा कि आप इसको कितने नंबर देते हैं? तो एक ने कहा कि 8/10, दूसरे ने कहा कि 9/10, और यहाँ तक कि एक साहब ने कहा कि 11/10 नंबर देते हैं। यह हाल था, सेन्सेक्स उछल गया। दूसरे दिन कुछ सेन्सेक्स नीचे उतरा और तीसरे दिन से उस डिब्बे की असलियत लोगों के सामने आनी शुरू हुई और तब फिर लोगों को लगा कि यह ड्रीम बजट नहीं है, यह ड्रम बजट है, जो सिर्फ बजता है और इसमें कोई सार-तत्व नहीं है। हम समझते थे कि वर्ष भर में हमारी इस सरकार के लोगों ने देश की अर्थव्यवस्था की असलियत को समझ कर बहुत कुछ सही तरीके से बजट का प्रबंध किया होगा, लेकिन मुझे बहुत अफसोस है और इस बजट की समीक्षा करते समय मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जिस

*not recorded.

एक बात के लिए बजट की बड़ी प्रतीक्षा थी कि इसमें आम आदमी के लिए कुछ होगा, जो मैं आपको बताऊंगा अंत तक, आप भी इस पर सहमत होंगे कि इसमें आम आदमी के लिए कुछ है ही नहीं।

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे सिर्फ दो बातें कहनी हैं, जो मुझे लगा कि बजट में कुछ ठीक हैं। एक जैडरिक बजट, जो पहली बार किया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ड्यू था, यह होना चाहिए था। आज देश की 50 फीसदी आबादी महिलाओं की है और इनमें बहुत बड़ी संख्या में महिलाएं गांवों में रहती हैं, गरीब हैं, उनकी शिक्षा की, उनकी चिकित्सा की, उनके व्यवसायों की बात होनी चाहिए पूरे तौर पर एक राष्ट्रीय स्तर से विचार होना चाहिए। यह एक पहला कदम है कि हमने महिलाओं के लिए जैडरिक बजट की बात की है। दूसरा, जो शिक्षा में आबंटन बढ़ाया गया है, यद्यपि यह जितना होना चाहिए था उतना नहीं किया गया, लेकिन फिर भी पिछले वर्ष की तुलना में इसमें बढ़ोतरी हुई है और मैं यह आशा करूंगा कि शिक्षा के मामले में वित्त मंत्री जी और भी अधिक साधन जुटाएंगे क्योंकि यह “सर्व शिक्षा अभियान” एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण योजना है, जो हमारी सरकार ने चलाई थी और जो हमने शिक्षा का एक मौलिक अधिकार दिया—हरेक 6 से 14 वर्ष के बच्चे को निःशुल्क और अनिवार्य शिक्षा का, उस संवैधानिक दायित्व की पूर्ति के लिए जितना आवश्यक धन है, वे इसका जरूर प्रबंध करेंगे, ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ।

इसके अलावा जो कुछ मैंने देखा बजट प्रबंधन में, वह मुझे तकलीफ देता है। पहली बात तो यह है कि राजकोषीय घाटा, फिसकल डेफिसिट, अपने स्तर पर ही विद्यमान है, जहां था, वहीं है—कभी 4.5 होता है, कभी 4.4, कभी 4.3 हो जाता है और यह वहीं पर कदमताल कर रहा है। इस राजकोषीय घाटे को घटाना बहुत जरूरी है, लेकिन इस मामले में यह बजट हमें कोई आशा नहीं देता। राजकोषीय घाटा किसलिए बढ़ा, क्यों इतना ज्यादा है? इसका भी एक कारण है कि राजस्व घाटा, रेवेन्यू डेफिसिट, बहुत अधिक है। 95,312 करोड़ रुपए का इस बार राजस्व घाटा है और इसका अर्थ यह है कि पिछले बजट में जो अनुमान किया गया था और उसके आधार पर जितना राजस्व होना चाहिए था, उतना राजस्व प्राप्त नहीं हुआ। ये दो बातों की ओर संकेत करता है - या तो जो अनुमान लगाए गए थे, राजस्व के बारे में, वे गलत थे या राजस्व को वसूल करने की जो प्रणाली है, जो तंत्र है, मशीनरी है, वह ही दक्ष नहीं है, कुशल नहीं है या फिर भ्रष्टाचार है। बहरहाल, जितना अनुमान हम करते हैं, उससे कम अगर वसूली होती है तो यह बड़ी चिंता की बात होती है क्योंकि फिर यह वर्ष भर के जितने भी आपके आयोजन हैं, उनको गड़बड़ा देती है। दूसरी बात देखें कि कुल कर राजस्व प्राप्तियों की स्थिति क्या है। 2004-05 में अनुमान किया गया था 3,17,733 करोड़ रुपए का, लेकिन जिसको संशोधित अनुमान कहा गया है, उसके अनुसार ये प्राप्तियां हुई 3,06,021 करोड़ की। अब जब वास्तविक स्थिति आएगी तो वह इससे भी खराब होगी, बेहतर नहीं होगी। इसका मतलब है कि 11,721 करोड़ की भारी कमी तो दी हुई है उसमें और अगर वास्तविक

स्थिति कुछ और खराब होगी तो हो सकता है कि यह 15,000 करोड़ तक पहुँच जाए, तब यह राजकोषीय घाटा काफी बढ़ जाएगा। दूसरी तरफ मैं देखता हूँ कि 2005-06 के बजट में यह अनुमान किया गया है कि टैक्स रेवेन्यू कर राजस्व में 21 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि होगी। यह एक अवास्तविक अनुमान है। पिछले साल के तजुबों को देखते हुए कि जहाँ हमारे यूनिनयन एक्साइज में, संघीय उत्पाद शुल्क में 7.8 परसेंट की कमी हुई, वहाँ 2005-06 में अचानक 20 या 21 परसेंट की वृद्धि किस आधार पर हो सकती है, इसकी कोई दिशा, हिसाब, आधार या संकेत उसके अंदर नहीं मिलता कि इसको कैसे कर लेंगे। क्या एकदम टैक्स वसूली की इनकी मशीनरी बहुत कुशल हो जाएगी या जो उनके अनुमान हैं, वे अचानक एक साल के अंदर इतने ज्यादा सही हो जाएंगे कि वे जितना कह रहे हैं उतना वसूल कर लेंगे। अगर कर राजस्व में और कमी आई, तब फिर कर और सकल घरेलू उत्पाद की रेश्यो, टैक्स जीडीपी रेश्यो, और कम हो जाएगी। यह एक देखने की बात है और हम इस मामले में वैसे ही बहुत पीछे हैं, बंगला देश से भी पीछे हैं। इसलिए जरूरी यह है कि इस बारे में ध्यान दिया जाए और मैं देख रहा हूँ कि इस बजट में इसको ऐसे रख दिया गया है कि जैसे सब बिल्कुल ठीक-ठाक है और इस कर राजस्व में एकदम 21 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हो जाएगी, यह बिल्कुल अवास्तविक है। बहुत से विशेषज्ञों ने भी इसकी तरफ ध्यान आकर्षित किया है कि यह ठीक नहीं है, यह उचित प्रतीत नहीं होता। इसके नतीजे क्या होंगे? इसका एक नतीजा है कि जो प्लान एक्सपेंडिचर है, योजना व्यय है, उसकी जरा हालत देखें कि यह 2004-05 में 82,529 करोड़ था, जो 2005-06 में एकदम बढ़कर 1,10,386 हो गया। यह कैसे हो गया? जब बजट को हम देखते हैं कि राजस्व कहां से आ रहा है, किधर से आ रहा है, एकदम से इसमें 30,000 करोड़ की वृद्धि होने का क्या मतलब है? यह पैसा कहां से आ गया? यह पैसा किधर से आ गया है? जब आप गौर से बजट का फाइनल प्रिंट देखते हैं, तब पता यह लगता है कि केन्द्रीय योजना सहायता, जो राज्यों को दी गई थी, वह 2004-2005 में 54,858 करोड़ रुपये थी, उसे 2005-2006 में एकदम घटा कर 33,112 करोड़ रुपये कर दिया गया। यानी 21,748 करोड़ रुपये की भारी कटौती कर दी गई। यह सब बजट के हेरफेर से हुआ। जैसा कि कहा जाता है 'there is a lie, there is a white lie, and there are statistics.' इस किस्म के यह सब खेल बजट के आंकड़ों में किए जा रहे हैं कि आपने इधर से घटाया और उधर रख दिया और कह दिया कि हमने योजना व्यय में इसे बढ़ा दिया है।

अब यह भी कहा जा रहा है कि राज्य अपने लिए संसाधन जुटाएं। राज्य अपने लिए संसाधन जुटाएं, यह बहुत अच्छी बात है, जुटने चाहिए। राज्य जितने संसाधन जुटाएंगे, देश उतनी ही तरक्की करेगा और राज्यों की हालत अच्छी होगी, उनके कर्ज कम होंगे, किन्तु यह नहीं बताया गया कि वे पैसा कहां से लाएं, कैसे बढ़ाएं। मैं नहीं जानता कि माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी की, इस बारे में राज्य के वित्त मंत्रियों से या मुख्यमंत्रियों से कोई बात हुई है या नहीं अथवा उन्होंने क्या योजना बनाई है कि वे कहां से पैसा जुटाएंगे। सामान्य तौर पर पैसा जुटाने के दो या तीन रास्ते ही होते हैं कि वे या तो

टैक्सों के द्वारा पैसा इकट्ठा करें या फिर वे उधार लें। उधार भी बाजार से लें, देश से लें, बैंकों से लें या खुले बाजार से लें, इसके अलावा और कोई भी सामान्य रास्ता नजर नहीं आता। अब बाजार से उधार का मुख्य स्रोत वित्तीय संस्थाएं ही हैं और सरकार का स्वयं का राजकोषीय घाटा 1,51,144 करोड़ रुपये है, इसे सरकार कहां से पूरा करेगी। क्या यह भी उधार लेगी? बाजारों से उधार लेगी, बैंकों से उधार लेगी? बैंकों पर उनकी निगाह सबसे पहले जाएगी। बैंक शेड्यूल्ड भी हैं और सरकार का उनके ऊपर दबदबा ज्यादा है। नतीजा यह होगा कि यह सारा पैसा केन्द्रीय सरकार तो बैंकों से ले लेगी किन्तु फिर राज्य सरकारें कहां जाएंगी? उनके लिए क्या रास्ते बचेंगे? उनका राजकोषीय घाटा बढ़ेगा। अभी जो हालात हैं, अगर उन्हें देखें, तो केन्द्र व राज्यों का ऋण भार काफी बढ़ेगा। आज भी केन्द्र और राज्यों पर काफी ऋण भार है, वह सकल घरेलू उत्पाद का लगभग 85 या 86 प्रतिशत है। केन्द्र और राज्यों पर मिलाकर भारी उधार है। ऐसी एक अर्थव्यवस्था में आप राज्यों से यह कह रहे हैं कि आप कहीं से पैसा जुटाइए। राज्यों की स्थिति जो है, उससे सभी परिचित हैं। उनकी स्थिति कैसी बन गई है, वे आकर क्या-क्या मांगते हैं, किस प्रकार करते हैं, इसे सभी जानते हैं। इस सब पर रास्ते क्या निकलें, इस बजट को देख कर यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। कभी-कभी मुझे खतरा लगता है कि यदि हमारा प्रबंधन ठीक नहीं रहा और राजस्व के अन्दर हमने 21 प्रतिशत की जो बड़ी भारी उछाल लगाने की बात की है, भगवान करे वह पूरी भी हो, लेकिन यदि पूरी न हुई तो हमारा फिस्कल डैफिसिट बढ़ जाएगा जिसे आप अभी 4, 4.5 या 5 प्रतिशत के आस पास रखना चाहते हैं जिसे और घटाना चाहते हैं, वह घटेगा नहीं, वह बढ़ जाएगा। यदि राज्यों का भी फिस्कल डैफिसिट बढ़ गया तो कुल मिलाकर देश का, यानी केन्द्र और राज्यों का जो फिस्कल डैफिसिट है, वह 10 प्रतिशत हो जाएगा या 11 प्रतिशत हो जाएगा अथवा कहां जाएगा, मैं नहीं कह सकता, लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि इस मामले में बजट में कहीं कोई सावधानी रखी है, या नहीं रखी है या फिर इसमें क्या किया जाएगा सिवाए इसके कि वायदा कर लिया गया है, एक आशा दिला दी गई है कि हमारे कर राजस्व में 21 प्रतिशत वृद्धि हो जाएगी। यह एक ऐसा गोरखधंधा है, जो बजट के फाइन प्रिंट्स को देखने के बाद सामने आता है। जब तक उन्हें पढ़ा नहीं गया, जो कि हजार या बारह सौ पृष्ठ का होता है, तब तक तो यही लगता है कि यह बहुत ही लुभावना तथा बहुत ही सुन्दर पैकेज है, पता नहीं इसके अंदर क्या रखा होगा। कौन सी चौकलेट होगी, कौन सा केक होगा, कौन सा रसगुल्ला होगा। लेकिन जब उसे खोलते हैं, तब एक कड़वी गोली मिलती है, उसमें कोई खास रस नहीं मिलता। ये बजट की कुछ ऐसी चीजें हैं जिन पर ध्यान देने की बहुत जरूरत है।

एक और बात पर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है, वह है, ब्याज का बढ़ता हुआ बोझ। इंटरस्ट काफी बढ़ रहा है। 2004-05 में ब्याज 1,22,905 करोड़ था, अब 2005-06 में 1,33,945 करोड़ हो गया है, that is, it has gone up from Rs. 1,22,905 crores to Rs. 1,33,945 crores. It means, there is an increase of Rs. 8040 crores. 8040 करोड़ की वृद्धि ब्याज में हो गई है।

ब्याज दरें घटी हुई हैं और ब्याज बढ़ गया। इसका मतलब है कि उधार ज्यादा नहीं है। तो यह बढ़ता हुआ उधार और उधार की अर्थव्यवस्था और वह इस हद तक कि उधार जो जीन्डीपी का 85-86 परसेंट तक कर्जा पैदा कर दे तो यह एक खतरे की बात है और यह उधार आप राजस्व घाटे को पूरा कराने के लिए लेते हैं और शायद इस बार भी, अगर भगवान न करे, राजस्व वसूली पूरी नहीं हुई तो फिर यह उधार और बढ़ेगा, यह ब्याज और बढ़ेगा और यह एक संकट पैदा कर देगा, क्योंकि जब आप बाजार से उधार लेंगे, सरकार उधार लेगी, राज्य सरकारें उधार लेंगी तो बाजार में पैसा बचेगा नहीं और इसलिए जो हमारे उद्योग हैं उनके लिए कठिनाई पैदा होगी, उनको पैसा कहां से मिलेगा? अगर हर साल सरकार बैंकों के ऊपर डाका डालती रहे और पैसा लेती रहे या खुले बाजार से किसी तरह से उठाने की कोई स्कीम चलाकर करती रहे तो जो हमारे उद्योग हैं, वे क्या करेंगे। एक तरफ हम खुले बाजार की बात करते हैं, उनको कहते हैं कि आप अपना उद्योग बढ़ाइए, निवेश करिए। निवेश के लिए बचेगा कहां? यह है सवाल जिसकी तरफ ध्यान देना है और अगर फिर बाजार में पैसे की कमी हो गई तो उद्योगों में पैसे की कमी होगी और उद्योगों का विकास रुकेगा, देश का विकास रुकेगा, ग्रोथ रेट कम होगी, एम्प्लॉयमेंट कम होगा, देश की जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर हमारी प्रतिस्पर्द्धा करने की शक्ति है वह कम होगी। हमें ध्यान देने की जरूरत है कि आज चीन की अर्थव्यवस्था में उनके मेन्यूफैक्चरिंग सैक्टर का बहुत बड़ा योगदान है। भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था में उससे बहुत कम योगदान है चीन की तुलना में। तो चीन हमारा प्रतिस्पर्द्धी है। अगर हम इस मामले में पीछे रहेंगे और उद्योगों के लिए उचित व्यवस्था नहीं करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूं कि अगले साल के बजट में और अधिक कठिनाइयां आएंगी, और अधिक कड़वी गोली हमको शायद पीनी पड़ेगी। तो ये कुछ ऐसे सवाल हैं जो बजट के प्रबंधन के मामले में मुझे तकलीफदेह साबित हो रहे हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि इस मामले में सदन विचार करे और वित्त मंत्री जी बताएं कि वे कैसे करेंगे। हम जितना थोड़ा बहुत बजट को समझ पाए हैं उसके आधार पर जो कठिनाइयां लगती हैं वे यह हैं। अब वित्त मंत्री जी ने बहुत सारे सपने उस बजट के अंदर रखे हैं सपने देखना कोई बुरी बात नहीं है, सपने देखे जाने चाहिए। सपने ऊंचे देखे जाने चाहिए, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। लेकिन वे मुंगेरी लाल के हसीन सपने नहीं होने चाहिए, वे वास्तविक सपने होने चाहिए जिन्हें आप साकार कर सकें, उसको अमल में ला सकें, जिनको आप दिखा सकें कि यह सपना हमने देखा था और आज यह आपके सामने उसको हमने साकार कर दिया है। सबसे ज्यादा हसीन सपने वित्त मंत्री जी ने रोजगार के मामले में दिए गए हैं। उसमें मुझे सदन को स्मरण कराना है कि जब हम लोगों की सरकार थी, तो एक बार यह सवाल उठा था कि विकास और रोजगार में क्या संबंध रहे? क्या बिना रोजगार के विकास होगा या विकास और रोजगार में कोई संबंध रहना चाहिए या रोजगार सहित विकास हो। उस समय डा० एसपी० गुप्ता कमेटी की अध्यक्षता में कुछ निर्णय हुए थे और हमारी सरकार ने उनको स्वीकार किया था और यह तय किया था कि प्रत्येक वर्ष एक करोड़ रोजगार पैदा किए जाएंगे। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है अगर

हमारी नई सरकार भी उस योजना को स्वीकार करती है और योजना की तरफ ध्यान दे रही है और कहती है कि योजना होनी चाहिए, रोजगार जरूरी है, क्योंकि जैसे मैं आगे बताऊंगा कि अगर इसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया गया तो क्या कठिनाइयां हो जाएंगी। लेकिन जो रोजगार सृजन के साथ खिलवाड़ किया गया है, वह बहुत तकलीफदेह है। रोजगार जरूर होना चाहिए, रोजगार के लिए पूरी कोशिश होनी चाहिए, लेकिन रोजगार के साथ मजाक नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। अगर आप देखें कि क्या कहा गया है। पहले यह कहा गया कि एक करोड़ हेक्टेयर अतिरिक्त भूमि को सिंचित करेंगे 5 वर्षों में और प्रति हेक्टेयर व्यक्ति के हिसाब से एक करोड़ नया रोजगार सृजित करेंगे 5 साल में। मानो 5 साल में, इस साल उसमें से कितना होगा इसका कोई हिसाब-किताब नहीं है, न किसी मंत्रालय ने दिया है न वित्त मंत्री जी ने दिया है और न बजट के किसी डॉक्यूमेंट में है कि इस साल क्या होगा। अच्छा अब इसके लिए धन कितना देंगे। अगर एक करोड़ हेक्टेयर की सिंचाई करनी है तो उसके लिए धन का भी प्रावधान होना चाहिए, विशेषज्ञों से पूछा जाए, इंजीनियरों से पूछा जाए और मूलतः यह काम राज्य सरकारें करेंगी। हमने तो यहां से कह दिया कि एक करोड़ हेक्टेयर की सिंचाई होगी। लेकिन सिंचाई करेगा कौन-कौन उस योजना को चलायेगा? उसे तो राज्य सरकारें चलायेंगी। अब छोटी सिंचाई के लिए इन्होंने बजट में 350 करोड़ रुपये रखे हैं और बड़ी सिंचाई के लिए 84 करोड़ रुपये का इंतजाम किया है, लेकिन इसमें से अगर वेतन और अन्य खर्च निकाल दिये जायें, तो मेरा अनुमान है कि केवल 25-30 करोड़ रुपया सिंचाई के लिए बचेगा। इसमें कितने हेक्टेयर की सिंचाई हो पायेगी, कैसे बन पायेगी? क्या लघु सिंचाई योजनाओं से बनायेंगे? इसके लिए धन का इंतजाम बहुत ही कम है और इसके लिए केवल 350 करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है और एक हेक्टेयर की सिंचाई करने के लिए कितनी क्षमता लगेगी? आज कितनी सिंचाई की क्षमता मौजूद है? क्योंकि इसी सदन में कई साल पहले मैं इस सवाल को उठ चुका हूं कि जो सिंचाई की क्षमता सृजित की गई है, जो एवेलेबल है? जो उपलब्ध है, अगर उसी को खेतों तक पहुंचा दिया जाये, तो भी बहुत मात्रा में काम बन सकता है, कम खर्च में ज्यादा रोजगार उपलब्ध हो सकता है और इससे किसानों की आमदनी भी बढ़ सकती है। हमने तो कह दिया कि इसको राज्य सरकारें करेंगी, हमने तो यहां ऐलान कर दिया है कि हम पांच करोड़ हेक्टेयर की सिंचाई करेंगे। एक करोड़ हेक्टेयर की सिंचाई करेंगे। यह तो एक थोथा वायदा है, एक मृग मरीचिका है कि होगा। सिंचाई के मामले में सरकारों का क्या हाल है, राज्य सरकारों का क्या हाल है, उसके बारे में मैं यहां नहीं कहना चाहता हूं, मगर हम सब जानते हैं कि वे किस तरह से चल रही हैं और उनके आज तक क्या परिणाम हुए हैं? इसमें वित्त मंत्री जी एक स्वप्न देख रहे हैं, ख्याली पुलाव पका रहे हैं, जिसको वह सिद्ध नहीं कर सकते हैं, जिसको वह ला नहीं सकते हैं, वे ख्याली पुलाव जरूर पकायें, मगर देश और सदन के सामने ऐसी बात न करें जिससे देश और सदन गुमराह हो।

उपसभापति जी, फिर वित्त मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि खाद्य प्रसंस्करण का, फूड प्रोसेसिंग का विकास इस तरह से हो रहा है कि ढाई लाख रोजगार सृजित होंगे, यानी कितने रोजगार सृजित हुये हैं, इसका जिक्र नहीं किया है मगर होंगे, कैसे होंगे, मैंने इसकी भी बजट में देखभाल की। वर्ष 2005 के बजट का फूड प्रोसेसिंग में अनुमान 110 करोड़ का था, लेकिन उसमें संशोधित अनुमान आया है 85 करोड़ रुपये का और वास्तविक शायद 75 करोड़ रुपये का आयेगा। कौन-सा खाद्य प्रसंस्करण बढ़ाया, किस रफ्तार से वह बढ़ रहा है, इस बजट को देखने से तो लगता है कि फूड प्रोसेसिंग में घट रहा है, उसका उपयोग ही नहीं हुआ है, जो पैसा लगाया गया है, उसका कहीं पर भी उपयोग नहीं किया गया है। यह फिर से एक ऐसा वायदा है कि कर रहे हैं, इस रूप में कर रहे हैं।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया) पीठसीन हुए]

फिर टेक्सटाइल के क्षेत्र में कहा गया है कि पांच वर्ष में 1.2 करोड़ रोजगार सृजन की क्षमता है। क्षमता है, शायद इससे भी ज्यादा हो, मगर इस साल क्या करेंगे? कितना रोजगार टेक्सटाइल क्षेत्र में पैदा होगा? इसका कहीं जिक्र नहीं है। क्षमता है, क्षमता तो देश में बहुत है। देश में इतनी क्षमता है कि सारी दुनिया से ज्यादा पैसे कमाकर दिखा दे। परन्तु हो क्या रहा है? मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि वह कितना बजट आबंटन करेंगे? क्या योजना है? इस मामले में टेक्सटाइल मंत्रालय क्या कह रहा है? या खाली यह लोगों के सामने छलावा है, भुलावा है कि यह होगा। इंतजार करो, यह होगा। यह इंतजार देश के लिए बहुत मुसीबत कर देगा।

फिर कहा गया है कि आईटी क्षेत्र में अगले चार-पांच सालों में 70 लाख लोगों के रोजगार की उम्मीद है। यह भी कोई पक्की बात नहीं है, उम्मीद है। हम उम्मीद करते हैं कि हमारा देश विश्व की महाशक्ति अगले साल बन जाये। हम उम्मीद करते हैं कि अगले साल देश की गरीबी मिट जायेगी। उम्मीदों पर देश नहीं चलता है। उम्मीद रखनी चाहिए, यह बुरी बात नहीं है, लेकिन एक वास्तविक स्तर पर उम्मीद होनी चाहिए जो पूरी हो सके, जिसका कोई ठोस स्वरूप भी दिखाई देता हो। अब चार-पांच सालों में 70 लाख लोगों के रोजगार की उम्मीद है। फिर कहा जा रहा है कि भवन निर्माण के क्षेत्र से भी उम्मीद कर रहे हैं कि लाखों लोगों को रोजगार मिलेगा। कैसे मिलेगा? भवन निर्माण के दाम बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। अब जिस ढंग से भवन निर्माण में विदेशी निवेश की इजाजत दी गई है, तो उससे भवन तो बन जायेंगे, मगर रोजगार बढ़ेगा या नहीं बढ़ेगा, यह कहना मुश्किल है। क्योंकि बहुत सारा काम मशीनों से होता है। फिर उनकी कार्य-प्रणाली अलग है। उनको जैसी स्किलड लेबर चाहिए, वैसे उन्हें अक्सर हमारे देश में नहीं मिलती है, वह उसको पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। इससे क्या होगा? यह जो हाउसिंग क्षेत्र है, इसमें वास्तव में बुनियादी तौर पर रोजगार सृजन करने की क्षमता है और बड़े व्यापक क्षेत्र में करने की क्षमता है, क्योंकि केवल मकान ही नहीं बनता है, उसमें बिजली लगती है, लकड़ी का काम होता है, प्लम्बर लगता है, रंग, पेंट तमाम चीजें लगती हैं, तो

अर्थ-व्यवस्था में इसका बहुत बड़ा योगदान हो सकता है। लेकिन इसकी उम्मीद की जा रही है। इसमें ठोस बात क्या है, कैसे उम्मीद कर रहे हैं? क्या उसके लिए दिया जा रहा है, क्या योजना उसके लिए बनाई जा रही है, आर्थिक योजना क्या है? ये जो विदेशी आएंगे, ये हमारे यहां रोजगार पैदा करने की निगाह से नहीं आएंगे। वे चैरिटी नहीं कर रहे, इस देश के लिए रोजगार उत्पन्न करना उनका लक्ष्य नहीं है, उनका लक्ष्य मुनाफा कमाना है। इसलिए वे रोजगार कितना देंगे और मुनाफा कितना कमाएंगे, यह तो वे लोग आकर ही बताएंगे, लेकिन वे कहते हैं कि उम्मीद है, मैं भी उम्मीद करता हूँ कि देश बहुत जल्दी समृद्ध हो जाएगा लेकिन खाली उम्मीद करने से काम नहीं चलता है। फिर यह कहा गया है कि जिन क्षेत्रों में रोजगार सृजन की क्षमता है, उन पर सरकार पूरा ध्यान देगी। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप जरूर ध्यान दीजिए लेकिन यह भी बताइए कि धन कितना देंगे? ध्यान से चीजें नहीं चलतीं। ध्यान से आत्मा का साक्षात्कार हो जाता है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है, लेकिन जो विकास के काम हैं, वे तो धन से चलते हैं और आप ध्यान पर चले गए हैं। आप धन पर रहिए, आप वित्त मंत्री हैं, आपका काम धन देना है, आप कोई आध्यात्मिक मंत्री नहीं हैं जो ध्यान की तरफ लोगों को ले जा रहे हैं। क्या ध्यान देंगे? आपका काम धन देना है इसलिए हमें बताइए कि आप इस काम के लिए कितना धन देंगे? इसका कोई जवाब नहीं है। महोदय, इसमें एक बात और कही गयी है। एक योजना बनाई गयी है और कहा जाता है कि प्रत्येक परिवार से एक व्यक्ति को साल भर में सौ दिन का रोजगार देंगे – जरूर दीजिए। कोशिश यह होनी चाहिए कि सौ दिन क्यों, दो सौ दिन, तीन सौ दिन, तीन सौ पैंसठ दिन रोजगार मिले, पूर्ण रोजगार मिले। सौ दिन शुरूआत है, बहुत अच्छी बात है लेकिन सौ दिन के लिए धन कहां से आएगा? यह जो योजना बनाई गयी है, इसके दो हिस्से हैं। एक तो अन्न का हिस्सा है और दूसरा धन का हिस्सा है, कैश है। कैश के लिए 65 रुपए प्रतिदिन दिये जाएंगे। अगर आपको एक करोड़ लोगों के लिए रोजगार देने के लिए यह योजना चलानी है – जरा गौर करिए – अगर 25 करोड़ परिवार इस देश में गरीबी की सीमा रेखा के नीचे हैं, बिलो पॉवर्टी लाइन हैं और हरेक परिवार में पांच सदस्य मान लें तो मोटे तौर पर पांच करोड़ लोग ऐसे हैं जिनको आप सौ दिन का रोजगार देना चाहते हैं। 65 रुपए प्रतिदिन के हिसाब से सौ दिन के लिए इन पांच करोड़ लोगों की गिनती कर लीजिए तो मेरे ख्याल से 32,500 करोड़ रुपए की राशि बनेगी – अन्न का हिस्सा अलग है। आपने दिया क्या है? आपने शायद 11 हजार करोड़ दिया है, बाकी कहां से आएगा?

श्री ललितभाई मेहता (गुजरात): अनाज के साथ है।

छा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी: अनाज अलग है। 11 हजार करोड़ रुपए जमा अनाज। कुल 32,500 करोड़ रुपए चाहिए। आप यह कहें कि हम एक करोड़ लोगों के लिए नहीं कर सकते, हम इतने के लिए करेंगे, हमें निश्चित लक्ष्य बताइए कि हम इस साल इतना करेंगे। देश की स्थिति, अर्थ की स्थिति, खजाने में कितना पैसा है, यह सबके सामने खुलकर आना चाहिए। रोजगार का मामला

एक ऐसा मामला है जिसके बारे में हमें बहुत सावधानी के साथ और बड़ी गंभीरता के साथ कदम उठाने हैं। इसमें कोई राजनीतिक पार्टी, हमारी सरकार हो या उनकी सरकार हो, मैं इस प्रश्न को उससे ऊपर उठकर देखना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि रोजगार के मामले में मैं बहुत चिंतित हूँ। इस देश में लगभग 12 करोड़ लोग रोजगार की तलाश में हैं, ऐसा माना जाता है। हो सकता है, दस हों, हो सकता है ग्यारह हों लेकिन चार करोड़ तो पंजीकृत हैं। आपके सरकारी कार्यालयों में जो Employment Exchnages हैं, वहां उनका पंजीकरण है। नतीजा यह है कि इन चार करोड़ लोगों के बारे में तो सबको मालूम ही है। इन चार करोड़ लोगों का क्लासीफिकेशन क्या है, वर्गीकरण क्या है? उनमें डॉक्टर्स हैं, इंजीनियर्स हैं, पीएचडी किए हुए लोग भी हैं, यानी 70 प्रतिशत शिक्षित हैं। 4 करोड़ का 70 प्रतिशत 2 करोड़ 80 लाख होता है। दो करोड़ अस्सी लाख न भी हों, ढाई करोड़ मान लीजिए, सवा दो करोड़ मान लीजिए, दो करोड़ ही मान लीजिए, लेकिन दो करोड़ शिक्षित बेरोजगारों की फौज हमारे देश में खड़ी है और उससे दुगुनी, ढाई गुणा अशिक्षित बेरोजगारों की फौज खड़ी हुई है। यह इस देश की अर्थव्यवस्था के लिए ही नहीं, इस देश के लोकतंत्र के लिए भी खतरा है। ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में जो आज असंतोष सुलग रहा है, उसका आप देखें। इस देश की 70 फीसदी आबादी कृषि क्षेत्र पर निर्भर है। वहां क्या स्थिति है, उसको मैं थोड़ा आगे जाकर आपके सामने रखूंगा। लेकिन यह जो दो करोड़ अस्सी लाख, सवा दो करोड़ या दो करोड़ - जहां भी कहीं आप मानें, ये नौजवान पढ़े लिखे हैं, ये हट्टे-कट्टे हैं, ये राष्ट्र की समृद्धि में योगदान कर सकते हैं और देश को बहुत आगे ले जा सकते हैं लेकिन इनके रोजगार के लिए आप अगर सिर्फ इतना ही कह दें कि हम हर रोजगार उत्पन्न करने वाली योजना पर ध्यान देंगे और यह कहा जाए कि इन योजनाओं के लिए मैं वचन देता हूँ कि पैसा खोजने की कोशिश करूंगा। I promise to find out. यह वित्त मंत्री का भाषण है। यह इसी तरह से है, जैसे पहले नोट पर लिखा रहता था कि I promise to pay on demand. अब वह ऑन डिमांड हट गया है - I promise to pay. खैर वह तो अब भी रिजर्व बैंक की गारंटी है, मगर इनके इस वचन की कौन सी गारंटी है? I promise to find out. इसके पीछे कोई कोलेट्रल नहीं है कि अगर ये गारंटी पूरी नहीं कर सकेंगे तो हम इसके जिम्मेदार होंगे, ऐसा कुछ नहीं है। ऐसे वचन, इस प्रकार की मार्केटिंग, इस प्रकार से रोजगार की योजनाओं को देश के सामने पेश करना, यह रोजगार के साथ खिलवाड़ है। यह मैं सब पार्टियों के लिए कह रहा हूँ - हमारी सरकार हो, इनकी सरकार हो, किसी राज्य में हमारी होगी, किसी राज्य में इनकी होगी, राज्य में वामपंथ की होगी, लेकिन अगर इस बेरोजगारी की समस्या का निदान नहीं हुआ, तो इस देश के लिए भारी संकट आने वाला है, लोकतंत्र के लिए संकट आने वाला है।

कृषि के बारे में कहा गया। इनका जो साझा कार्यक्रम है, उसमें भी कहा गया है कि हम आम आदमी की तरफ ध्यान देंगे। रोजगार उपलब्ध कराएंगे, कृषि को ठीक करेंगे। मैं नहीं समझता कि रोजगार की जो योजनाएं हैं, वे उनके सहयोगी दल वामपंथ को मंजूर हैं या नहीं? उनके नेता कह रहे

हैं कि बजट काफी कुछ दुरुस्त है, कुछ चीजों पर ध्यान दिया गया है, कुछ सरोकारों पर ध्यान दिया गया है। बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि वामपंथ भी अब ध्यान की तरफ आ रहा है। आना चाहिए, ध्यान लगाएं तो अच्छा ही होगा। देश का ध्यान लगाएं तो और भी अच्छा होगा, लेकिन यह कहना कि सब कुछ दुरुस्त है और रोजगार की हालत यह है — यह कौन सी दुरुस्ती है? क्या वे इससे सहमत हैं? क्या रोजगार के बारे में जो बजट में कहा गया है, बहुधा इस पर क्या टिप्पणी हुई है? ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री जीवन राय (पश्चिमी बंगाल): पुरानी व्यवस्थाएं दे रहे हैं।

छा मुरली मनोहर जोशी: कुछ भी होगा, आप इस व्यवस्था के बारे में कहिए, पुरानी तो चली गई, इसकी बात करिए। फिर कृषि के मामले में तो ऐसा है कि अस्सी के दशक में जहां तक मुझे याद आ रहा है, कृषि पर सकल घरेलू उत्पाद का निवेश 3.5 प्रतिशत के करीब होता है। अस्सी से लेकर अब हम 2005 में आ गए, वह तो बढ़ा नहीं, वह भी वहीं कदमताल कर रहा है और यह कहा जा रहा है कि हमें कृषि पर बहुत ध्यान देना है। देना चाहिए, सत्तर फीसदी आबादी उसी पर निर्भर करती है और उसमें भी जो छोटा, मंझोला और मार्जिनल सीमांत किसान है, उसकी संख्या 85 प्रतिशत है। अगर आप कृषि के बारे में बजट में कुछ कहेंगे — इतने किसानों ने आत्महत्या कर ली — उसका बजट में कोई जिक्र नहीं है। कृषि का जो प्रावधान है, वह वही जीडीपी का 3.5 परसेंट है। अब जो कृषि कारोबार की बात कही जा रही है — उसे भी मैंने देखा है — उसका फायदा किसान को नहीं है। आपने कहा “बागबानी मिशन”, आप कह रहे हैं, उसे चलाइए, लेकिन कौन चलाएगा, कैसे चलाएगा? कौन सा किसान राष्ट्रीय बागबानी मिशन चलाएगा, मैं नहीं समझ पाता। उसके लिए कितना आवंटन है, उस आंकड़े में मैं जाना नहीं चाहता, उसको देखकर आपको हंसी आएगी। फिर कहा गया कि कृषि उत्पाद के बाजार का मानकीकरण किया जाए — स्टैंडर्डाइजेशन किया जाए। इसका फायदा किसका है? मार्जिनल किसान को, सीमांत किसान को, छोटे किसान को, जो कुल कृषि आबादी का 80-85 प्रतिशत है? तो आप सिर्फ कुछ बड़े किसानों को फायदा दे रहे हैं, दीजिए, उसमें मुझे आपत्ति नहीं है, जरूर दीजिए। उनको देना भी चाहिए, लेकिन आप चाहते क्या हैं? उत्पादकता को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं या नहीं चाहते हैं? मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से कहना चाहता हूं महोदय, कि इस देश में अनाज की प्रति व्यक्ति उत्पाद, अवेलेबिलिटी और उपलब्धता आज भी उतनी ही है, जितनी कि सन् 1862 में थी—200 किलोग्राम प्रति व्यक्ति प्रति वर्ष। हमारी जनसंख्या बढ़ रही है तो उत्पादन उतना ही बढ़ रहा है कि हम फैमाइन के बिल्कुल नजदीक हैं। हमारा फेमाइन कोड कहता है कि अगर 200 किलोग्राम से घट जाए तो आप अकाल की स्थिति में आ जाते हैं। जस्ट ग्रैसहोल्ड पर हैं, इसलिए यह देखिए कि अनाज का उत्पादन और बढ़ा कि नहीं? मार्जिनल किसानों और छोटे किसानों के लिए आप क्या कर रहे हैं? ज्यादा से ज्यादा आप यही कहते हैं कि फसलों में बदलाव ले आइए। फसलों में बदलाव आना चाहिए, डाइवर्सिफिकेशन का कोई विरोधी नहीं है, अच्छा है, होना ही चाहिए, लेकिन किसान की आमदनी कहां बढ़ रही है, किसान की क्रय शक्ति कहां बढ़ रही

है? यह बहुत बड़ा बाजार है, सत्तर करोड़ लोगों का बाजार है। मेरा अनुरोध है कि वित्त मंत्री जी से कि वे केवल पांच, दस, पंद्रह करोड़ के बाजार की ओर ध्यान न दें। वे सत्तर करोड़ के बाजार की ओर ध्यान दें, यह बड़ा भारी बाजार है। अगर इसकी क्रय शक्ति बढ़ती है, अगर इसकी पर्वेजिंग पावर बढ़ती है, तो देश के उद्योगों में कितना उछाल आएगा, कितना बड़ा मुनाफा हमारे देश के उद्योग कमा सकेंगे, कितने उद्योग खुल सकेंगे? ये सत्तर करोड़, जो इस देश की रीढ़ हैं, आप उस बाजार की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देते, उसकी क्रय शक्ति नहीं बढ़ाते, उसके लिए कोई कारगर उपाय नहीं करते। मैं आप से बहुत विनम्रता से कह रहा हूँ कि जो कृषि क्षेत्र के अंदर, ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के अंदर काफी असंतोष है, पता नहीं वित्त मंत्री जी का गांवों से कितना सम्पर्क है, लेकिन मैं मूलतः गांवों में घूमता रहा हूँ जब भी मैं कहीं घूमता हूँ तो मेरे पास सबसे ज्यादा लोग नौकरी की तलाश में आते हैं, काम की तलाश में आते हैं। किसान प्रदर्शन करते हैं कि साहब, हमारे लिए कुछ नहीं है। आप किसानों की आत्महत्या को देखिए। आप यह देखेंगे कि एक बड़ा व्यापक असंतोष फैल रहा है। जो दीवार पर लिखावट है, आप जरा उसको देखिए, please have a look at the writing on the wall. आज देश एक प्रकार के वोल्केनो पर बैठ हुआ है, ज्वालामुखी पर बैठ हुआ है। ये दो करोड़ अस्सी लाख नौजवान, जो कि बेपढ़े हैं, और ये जो गांव के किसान हैं, अगर कल अशांति के कगार पर चले जाएंगे, तो देश के सारे उद्योग सारा विकास, सारी अर्थव्यवस्था ठप्प हो जाएगी और लोकतंत्र के लिए भारी खतरा हो जाएगा। अगर देश में शांति और सुव्यवस्था नहीं रहेगी, अगर देश में होने वाली हिंसा के रास्तों को नहीं रोका गया तो इस देश के सामने भारी संकट आने वाला है। बजट का मतलब केवल सरकारी आंकड़ों को पेश करना नहीं है, बजट का मतलब है कि देश की सम्पूर्ण अर्थव्यवस्था को, देश के विकास के लिए, देश के लोकतंत्र की रक्षा के लिए, देश के लोगों में रोजगार और विश्वास पैदा करने के लिए, हम क्या करने जा रहे हैं, दिशा क्या है, नीति क्या है? क्या सिर्फ स्टॉक मार्किट, कुछ बड़े टैक्स के लिए रिलीफ, कुछ छोटे टैक्स के लिए रिलीफ, यही मतलब है बजट का अथवा बजट का अर्थ, देश की प्रगति के लिए, दिशा देने का है? वह दिशा कहां है, वह आम आदमी कहां है? यह बजट किसके लिए बन रहा है? किन चीजों को हल करने के लिए यह बजट बन रहा है? मेरे सामने ये सवाल बहुत गहरे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Are you referring to the NDA Government or the UPA Government? I think you are talking about the NDA Government's performance.

☞ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं सब सरकारों की बात कर रहा हूँ। मुझे पता नहीं है कि अभी तक सब...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया): आप जवाब मत दीजिए। आप बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान) ... आप अपनी बात बोलिए।

☞ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि मैं सब सरकारों की बात कर रहा हूँ। मैं

तो देश की बात कर रहा हूँ। किसी को परेशानी है तो मैंने तो सब सरकारों के लिए कहा है। यह किसी की हो, मेरी समस्या हो या आपकी हो, लेकिन यह समस्या केवल इस तरफ या उस तरफ बैठने से हल नहीं होगी। इसके लिए तो रास्ते निकालने पड़ेंगे, विचार करना पड़ेगा कि हम क्या करेंगे? क्योंकि इससे केवल वे ही प्रभावित नहीं होते हैं, मैं भी प्रभावित होता हूँ, इससे सड़क का आदमी प्रभावित होता है, सबके बाल-बच्चे प्रभावित होते हैं। यह कोई सामान्य बात नहीं है। मैंने इसको राजनीतिक दृष्टि से नहीं कहा है। मैंने तो हमेशा कहा है कि यह सारे देश का सवाल है और मैं रोजगार को किसी पार्टी विशेष से जोड़कर नहीं देखता हूँ क्योंकि यह एक व्यापक और बड़ा गंभीर सवाल है। मुझे तकलीफ यह है कि इसकी तरफ बहुत कौजुअल ध्यान दिया गया है, बहुत ऊपरी ध्यान दिया गया है। इसको गहराई से समझने की कोशिश नहीं की गई है। सहकारिता का तो कोई ख्याल ही नहीं है, को-ऑपरेटिव का कोई लाभ हो सकता है, इसके बारे में तो कोई जिक्र ही नहीं है। अब जरा देखिए कि जो टैक्स रिलीफ दिया गया है, उसका क्या हाल है? निजी टैक्स में लोगों को राहत मिली है, यह ठीक बात है और काफी अच्छी राहत मिली है। लेकिन यह भी देखें कि इस राहत का विश्लेषण करने पर नतीजा क्या आता है? मैंने एक गणना की है और वह एप्रोक्सीमेट है। हो सकता है इसमें कुछ संशोधन हो, मैं इससे इन्कार नहीं करता। यह थोड़ी बहुत ऊपर-नीचे भी हो सकती है। लेकिन मैंने इसमें एक बात देखी है कि टैक्स रेट के चेंज का परिणाम, अगर आपकी ढाई लाख की आमदनी है तो भी आपको टैक्स रिलीफ 24480 रुपए का है। यदि तीन लाख की आमदनी है तो भी टैक्स रिलीफ 34680 रुपए का है, पांच लाख रुपए की आमदनी है तो भी टैक्स रिलीफ 34680 रुपए का है यदि साढ़े सात लाख की आमदनी है तो भी यह 34680 रुपए है, लेकिन यह आमदनी दस लाख पहुँचने पर अचानक 62628 रुपए हो जाती है। किसको सबसे ज्यादा टैक्स रिलीफ मिल रहा है, यह टैक्स रिलीफ बड़ी आमदनी वालों को ज्यादा मिल रहा है। आप टैक्स रिलीफ दीजिए, मैं इसके हक में हूँ, हम तो चाहते हैं, लेकिन उसका वितरण एक समान होना चाहिए। आप एक असामान्य वितरण पैदा न करें। फिर आप देखें कि इसका असर सीनियर सिटिजन्स पर कितना पड़ता है, मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें आप भी शामिल हैं, मैं तो हूँ ही, हमें बड़ी तकलीफ है। मेरे जैसे पेंशन-याफ़्त लोगों को, इसमें एक रिलीफ स्टैंडर्ड डिडेक्शन का मिलता था। उसके बाद एक दूसरा रिलीफ और 80 (एल) मिलता था, जो बारह हजार और तीन हजार, कुल पन्द्रह हजार होता था, फिर बीस हजार टैक्स रिबेट मिलता था। वह सब साफ हो गया है? आपने हमारी लिमिट सिर्फ नीचे से ऊपर कर दी है। जब यह देखा गया तो हमने पाया कि जो लाख रुपए की आमदनी वाला सीनियर सिटिजन है, उसकी टैक्स अदायगी बढ़ गई है। उसकी टैक्स अदायगी बढ़ रही है। जिंदगी भर तो उसने टैक्स दिया है, अब आखिरी वक्त तो उसे कुछ रिलीफ मिले। इससे भी

खराब बात यह है कि हमारे यहां एन०एस०सी० वगैरह के लिए जो टैक्स रिलीफ था, वह हटा लिया गया है। उसमें यह कहा गया है कि अब तो यह सब गायब हो गया है। अब यह गायब 3-00 p.m.

हो गया, लेकिन मैंने तीन साल पहले नेशनल सेविंग सर्टिफिकेट्स लिए थे, उस मय उसमें यह वचन था कि इस पर आपको छह साल तक की रियायत मिलेगी, अब आपने अचानक कह दिया कि आपको रियायत नहीं मिलेगी, यह तो ब्रीच ऑफ ट्रस्ट है, यह तो आपने विश्वास हनन किया है, यह ठीक बात नहीं है। कल आप कोई नई स्कीम बनाएंगे, उसमें भी ऐसा ही कर देंगे। क्या आपके निवेश पर किसी का भरोसा रहेगा? अगर आपको बचत बढ़ानी है तो लोगों का भरोसा बचत की स्कीम पर रहना चाहिए। बचत की स्कीम्स के बारे में उन्हें भरोसा रहना चाहिए कि यह ठीक है, खास तौर पर सीनियर सिटिजन्स, जिनके यही एकमात्र रास्ते रहते हैं, जिससे उनकी आमदनी चलती रही, इसलिए इस पर बहुत गहराई से देखने की जरूरत है कि यह हो क्या रहा है 80 (एल) में एन०एस०सी० का जिफ्र था, यह हटा लिया गया। मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा कि जो पुरानी स्कीम्स हैं, क्या उन्हें चलाएंगे? जब तक वे मैच्योर नहीं होतीं तब तक उन पर ब्याज मिलता रहेगा या किसी और ढंग से कम्पेन्सेट करेंगे, क्या करेंगे?

फ्रिंज बेनिफिट के बारे में तो सारा ही देखा ही जा रहा है। इस पर मैंने थोड़ा सा गौर किया तो बड़ी मजेदार बात सामने आई। पहले यह समझा गया कि शायद कार्पोरेट टैक्स घटा दिए गए हैं। पहले कार्पोरेट टैक्स इफैक्टिवली 36.6 के करीब आते थे, अब यह फ्रिंज बेनिफिट, सेस और सरचार्ज लगाकर हमने देखे हैं कि करीब-करीब 38% से 40% तक कुछ हो जाएंगे, लेकिन यह इस पर निर्भर करेगा कि आपके बेनिफिट कौन से माने जाते हैं, कैसे माने जाते हैं। इसका एक नुकसान आम कर्मचारी को हो गया है, जिसकी तरफ ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। एक उद्योगपति अपने कर्मचारियों को बच्चों को पढ़ने के लिए स्कालरशिप देता है। क्या आप चाहते हैं कि यह स्कालरशिप न मिले, वह बैंक से लोन लेकर पढ़ाए? एक कर्मचारी अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाना चाहता है और शांत मन से उद्योग में काम करना चाहता है। एक उद्योगपति अपने कर्मचारियों को वर्डियां देता है या उन्हें कुछ मेडिकल फेसिलिटीज देता है, डिसपेंसरी की सुविधा देता है, डॉक्टर रख देता है, यह उद्योगों की दृष्टि से उचित है, इससे उत्पादकता बढ़ती है, उद्योगों में शांति रहती है, मालिक और कर्मचारियों में भाईचारा रहता है। ये जितनी भी वेलफेयर स्कीम्स हैं, हमें इन्हें प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए, ये देश के उद्योगों के लिए आवश्यक हैं, लेकिन आपने इन्हें हटा दिया है। हटाने से उद्योगपतियों पर जो भार पड़े, न पड़े वह अलग बात है, लेकिन इस बेचारे गरीब कर्मचारी के साथ आप क्यों अन्याय कर रहे हैं? यह मैं नहीं समझ पाया कि इसका क्या अर्थ है? इसका क्या मतलब निकलेगा? हमारी बचत की तरफ ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। इस बजट में ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं है, जिससे देश की बचत दर बढ़े चीन की चालीस प्रतिशत, हमारी बीस या इक्कीस प्रतिशत, किसी जमाने में तीस प्रतिशत होती थी। अब कहते हैं कि हम नई स्कीम लाएंगे। जरूर लाइए, बचत के लिए जितनी भी नई स्कीम्स आएंगी, हम उनका स्वागत करेंगे। हमारे देश में बचत बढ़नी चाहिए, मैं इसका समर्थक हूं और

हमारी पार्टी भी इसकी समर्थक हैं। देश की बचत, सरकार की बचत, उद्योगों की बचत, निजी लोगों की बचत बढ़े, आप इसके लिए नई स्कीम लाएंगे, लेकिन इसका क्या भरोसा है कि इस स्कीम में आप जो ब्याज की दर देंगे और जो इंप्लेशन है, मुद्रा विस्तार, वह नहीं उलट सके, मुद्रा विस्तार ज्यादा हो और ब्याज दर कम हो, क्योंकि अभी जो कोशिश हो रही है वह तो यह हो रही है कि ब्याज दर घटाई जाए। मुद्रा विस्तार आपके हाथ में नहीं है, इसके लिए तो मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि यह तो कठोर प्राइस पर निर्भर करता है। करता है कि नहीं करता है, यह तो एक अलग बात है, परंतु उनका सिद्धांत यह है कि अगर वे प्राइस फ्लेक्चुएट कर दें तो मुद्रा विस्तार बढ़ जाएगा। लेकिन इसका क्या भरोसा है कि एक सीनियर सिटिजन या कोई भी दूसरा सिटिजन, अगर एक लाख रुपया लगाता है, आपने उस पर एक्स प्रतिशत ब्याज दिया और जो आज इंप्लेशन है वह कल बढ़कर एक्स प्लस फाइव हो गया या एक्स प्लस टेन हो गया तो आप क्या करेंगे? उसके तो सारे पैसे का अवमूल्यन हो गया, उसने जितना जमा किया है, उस पर उसे घाटा हो जाएगा। ब्याज भी कम मिलेगा, पैसे की दर भी कम हो जाएगी, मूल्य भी कम हो जाएगा। हम चाहेंगे कि इसका खुलासा होना चाहिए कि किस तरह की बचत योजनाएं होंगी और देश की बचत को किस तरह से प्रोत्साहन दिया जाएगा। यह एक बहुत अहम सवाल है, जिसका इस बजट में कोई उल्लेख नहीं है।

फिर Transaction tax इस नाम पर लगाया गया कि हमें काले धन को रोकना है। अब काला धन कैसे बनता है, इसे वित्त मंत्रालय से अच्छी तरह कोई नहीं जानता। मैं कुछ समय तक पीएनबी का अध्यक्ष था और मैंने देखा है कि काला धन किन स्रोतों से ज्यादा आता है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, वे अधिकांश विभाग उन्हीं के पास हैं, चाहे वह सीमांत शुल्क हो, चाहे ड्यूटी ड्रा-बैक हो, चाहे एक्सपोर्ट इम्पोर्ट हो। ये सब के सब क्षेत्र हैं जिनमें काले धन का निर्माण बड़ी मात्रा में होता है, जहां डबल बिलिंग होती है, हवाला होता है और ये सब तो उन्हीं के विभाग हैं। तो अगर उन्हीं विभागों के कर्मचारियों को वे सुधार लें तो काला धन आसानी से रोका जा सकता है। अगर पूरा नहीं रोका जा सकता तो कुछ तो रोका जा सकता है। आज तो यहां तक कहा जाता है कि हमारे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था का 38 से 40 प्रतिशत तक धन काला धन है। आप इसे निकालिए, किसने मना किया है? लेकिन 10 हजार रुपए, 20 हजार रुपए या 50 हजार रुपए बैंक से निकालने पर टैक्स लगाकर आप काला धन रोकेंगे, इससे ज्यादा हास्यास्पद बात कोई नहीं हो सकती। यह इस बात को दिखाता है कि सिर्फ टैक्स वसूल करना है। अगर आप में हिम्मत है तो कहिए कि हम ट्रांजैक्शन टैक्स लगाना चाहते हैं। आप इसमें काले धन की बात क्यों लाना चाहते हैं? आप साफ-साफ कहिए, उसे सदन मंजूर करेगा। लेकिन यह मार्केटिंग के कौन से तरीके हैं कि आपकी हालत खराब है, आपसे अर्थ-व्यवस्था संभलती नहीं है, आपको पैसा चाहिए और उसे आप तरह-तरह से लोगों से वसूल करना चाहते हैं। महोदय, किसी अखबार में आया है कि आप इसे 50 हजार तक ले जाएंगे, लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि इस से कोई काला धन रुक सकता है। मैं और मेरी पार्टी अगर काला धन रोकने

के ठोस उपाय होंगे तो उसका पूरा समर्थन करेगी। हम चाहते हैं कि काला धन, जो आज देश की राजनीति के लिए, जो देश की सारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था के लिए अभिशाप बना हुआ है, उसे रोका जाना चाहिए। उस बारे में अगर वित्त मंत्री जी की तरफ से कोई ठोस उपाय आएगा तो हम उसको देखेंगे, उसमें मदद करेंगे। लेकिन ऐसा करने की, काले धन को निकालने की, आपकी कोई नीयत नजर नहीं आती है। काला धन तो बनता रहेगा, लेकिन हमारे जैसे आदमी को 10 हजार रुपए निकालने पर टैक्स देना पड़ेगा, तो यह कोई बुद्धिमानी की बात नहीं है। आप काले धन को डटकर निकालिए और उस पैसे को, वसूल कीजिए जो लोगों का बैंकों का उधार पड़ा हुआ है और वसूल नहीं हुआ है वह नहीं करते क्योंकि उधर जाने की हिम्मत नहीं है और आम आदमी के 10 हजार रुपए निकालने पर आप टैक्स लगाते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह काले धन को नहीं निकालने का एक बहाना है, मगर यह काले धन को निकालने का रास्ता नहीं हो सकता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वित्त मंत्री जी का भाषण मेरे पास है जिसके सेक्शन 82, 83 में उन्होंने बैंकों के सुधार के बारे में कुछ बात की थी और यह कहा था कि इस बारे में रिजर्व बैंक कुछ गाइडलाइंस देगा। उन्होंने कहा था कि कुछ तो रिजर्व बैंक अपनी सत्ता से काम कर सकता है और कुछ के लिए कानून बनाने की जरूरत है। महोदय, आज बैंकों में विदेशी निवेश, रिजर्व बैंक अपने आधार पर नहीं कर सकता। उसके लिए कानून बनाने की जरूरत है। महोदय, मेरे सामने 1 मार्च का Business Standard है। उसमें एक खबर है कि "74 per cent FDI in private banks allowed — The Reserve Bank of India (RBI), today made it clear that the 10 per cent cap on voting rights in private banks would be removed and that domestic private banks could be foreign-owned up to 74 per cent. The Central Bank also said that foreign banks would be allowed an increased presence in India in two stages. The first stage starts in March, 2005 and ends in March, 2009. The second starts from April, 2009. They can operate in India as branches, wholly-owned subsidiaries, or as subsidiary with a 74 per cent holding. Now, within quotes, "Appropriate amending legislation will be proposed to the Banking Regulation Act, 1949, to provide that the economic ownership of investors is reflected in the voting rights" paid the RBI release. अगर यह पहले की है तो इसका मतलब है कि 28 तारीख को ही यह खबर निकल गयी होगी।

अब इसे आरबीआई ने बिना वित्त मंत्री के सदन में कानून लाए कैसे रिलीज किया? क्या हमारे वामपंथी लोग इस बात से सहमत हैं?

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: आप अपनी बात कीजिए। आप दक्षिणपंथियों की बात कीजिए।

श्री मुरली मनोहर जोशी: हम आपसे पूछना चाहते हैं?

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: आप हमारी बात छोड़िए, दक्षिणपंथी क्या कहते हैं यह पता लगाइए।

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Right always speaks right.

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: आपका कौन सा मास्क है, वह बताइए?

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: हमारा कोई मास्क नहीं है।

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: वह स्वदेशी जागरण मंच कहाँ गया?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: After April 2009, foreign banks may be permitted to acquire any private bank. During this phase, wholly-owned subsidiaries can list themselves and foreign banks may dilute their holdings to the extent that at least 26 per cent of the paid-up capital is held by a resident Indian. अब यह रिलीज कैसे आए? इनकी नीति अगर ऐसी है तो सदन में लाएं, कानून पास कराएं, लेकिन क्या रिजर्व बैंक इसके लिए अधिकृत है? अब मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस रिलीज की मूल प्रति सदन के पटल पर रखें। वह रिलीज वस्तुतः यह तो अखबार की खबर है। इस रिलीज में आगे और क्या है, यह हमें पता नहीं है। लेकिन जितनी खबर निकली है, वह यह है। जब सरकार की नीति ऐसी है, तो खुल कर आए। सदन में एक कानून लाएं। वे कहते हैं कि हम बैंकिंग एक्ट, 1949 में संशोधन करना चाहते हैं। लाएं न संशोधन! पर उसके पहले ही पिछले दरवाजे से यह किया जाए और एक ऐसा माहौल बना दिया जाए कि यह तो हो गया, इट इज़ एचिव्ड, यह मेरे ख्याल से ठीक नहीं है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो सारा बजट है, इसमें न तो कुछ सुधार पूरे हुए हैं, आप पूरे सुधार की तरफ भी नहीं गए हैं और न ही आपने पूरे तौर पर कर प्रणाली को ठीक किया है, न ही आपने रोजगार की तरफ ध्यान दिया है और आम आदमी की तरफ तो मुझे इसमें कहीं दर्शन हो रहे हैं। आम आदमी, गांव का आदमी, बेरोजगार आदमी, नौजवान जिसकी आँखों में सपने हैं यह वह बूढ़ा, जिसकी आँखों में एक हताशा है। वह गरीब आदमी, जो विकास के अंतिम चरण पर खड़ा है, जिसके चेहरे पर झुर्रियाँ हैं, पाँव में बेवाई है, जिसके सामने एक बड़ा भारी अंधकारमय भविष्य खड़ा है, मुझे उस आम आदमी के दर्शन इस बजट में कहीं नहीं मिले। मुझे खुशी हुई होती अगर यह बजट आम आदमी के लिए वस्तुतः समर्पित होता, लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा कि नाप आम आदमी का और काम बड़े आदमी का, यह बजट की दिशा है। हम इस दिशा से सहमत नहीं हो सकते लेकिन हम इतना जरूर कहेंगे कि अगर ईमानदारी के साथ देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को सुधारने के लिए कोई ठोस पहल, कारगर पहल, जो तर्कसिद्ध हो, वह रखी जाए तो हम और हमारी पार्टी उसके साथ रहेंगे, लेकिन यह 'कुछ नहीं' में सब कुछ का आभास देने की प्रणाली है, यह बन्द होनी चाहिए। इससे देश का विकास नहीं हो सकता। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया): श्री जय राम रमेश जी। You have 30 minutes.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, it is particular privilege to speak on an afternoon where there are more Members on the Opposition Benches than on the Treasury Benches. No doubt, it is an unusual experience for me. I would like to begin by saying— Mr. Arun Shourie is here and he will testify it - that all the great economists of the world including Nobel Laureates have been physicists. Alas, that cannot be said about the Indian physicists, and, for the last one hour that I have listened to the distinguished professor of Physics, all I can say is that any resemblance between what he said and reality is purely coincidental.

Sir, in the next half-an-hour, I am going to put my presentation in three parts. In the first part, I want to take some of the points that Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi presented, and, throw light on what the actual facts are. Secondly, I want to highlight what I consider to be the four or five main positive achievements of the Budget, and, thirdly, contrary to what most expect, I will express three or four big disappointments of mine with the Budget as well.

Sir, let me start with some of the points that Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi mentioned. First he talked about the Sensex. He started off his entire speech by talking about what a depressing impact the Budget had on the Sensex. Sir, it is, by now, an accepted conventional wisdom that it would be wrong to see the Budget from the perspective of the Sensex. Budgets come, Budgets go. The Sensex has logic of its own, and, we all have said, I have said previously from this very place, that the Sensex is not an accurate reflection of the economic state of the nation. Yet, Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi started off his criticism of the Budget by talking about the Sensex. The actual reality is that—I don't want to blather this point because I don't believe that the Sensex is a good barometer of any Budget—if you take last ten years, you will find that the maximum increase of the Sensex has taken place after this Budget. That is not a good thing; the increase in the Sensex by itself is not a good thing, particularly when the entire increase in the Sensex is driven by Foreign Institutional Investors. Since Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi started off his criticism of the Chief Marketing Officer of this Government, as he chose to call the Finance Minister, by drawing

reference to the Sensex, I just want to highlight the fact that the truth is entirely opposite of what he has said. The Sensex has not been depressed. In fact, the Sensex has been unusually, and, in my view, dangerously buoyant.

Second, he welcomed the allocations for education, specifically for the 'SSA', not 'Surender Singh Ahluwalia', but the '*Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan*'. Now, it is true, Sir, that the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* that this Government is following is the flagship programme started by the NDA Government, and there is nothing wrong in acknowledging the fact that the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* was started by Mr. Vajpayee's Government and taken forward by this Government. But let me remind the former Minister for Human Resource Development that the previous Government gazetted a National Mission Authority for the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* in January 2000, and if he was so concerned about the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan*, then how it had happened that for three and a half years, this Mission Authority never met. It was not constituted, and it never met. Giving money for programmes is one thing, but bringing about an organisational innovation is quite another. While it is true that the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* was launched when Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi was at the helm of affairs for three and a half years, and I applaud him for that, but I am sorry to say that the organisational mechanism, the National Mission Authority for the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan*, was not made operational.

Third, Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi talked about the fact that the numbers in this Budget do not give any credence to the claim that this Government believes in plan or development expenditure. Sir, I do not know what document Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi read for preparing his speech, but the document that I have had is the 'Expenditure Budget', blue colour, Volume I, and I can refer to the exact pages. He made a big thing of the fact that the allocations for States and Union Territories have come down. Actually, if you look at this document, on page 46, you will see very clearly that the Central Assistance for State and Union Territory Plans has gone up from Rs. 57,000 crores to Rs. 63,000 crores. Similarly, if you look at page 44, the total Plan Expenditure has gone up quite substantially and not come down as mentioned by Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi. I do not want to get into a game of numbers because as he said there were lies; there were white lies; and there were statistics. Of course, after listening to him, there should be a fourth category. There are lies, white lies, statistics and

Dr. Joshi's numbers. But quite apart from that fact, I think, Sir, if you look at the actual numbers that are there in the Budget, I think, they do not support the claim of the learned Professor that the Plan Expenditure has come down. Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition while speaking on the Motion of Thanks bemoaned the fact that the Budget did not give enough credit to its predecessors, and it appears as if the Budget had started a new chapter on its own, unmindful of what had happened in the past. But what had happened in the past? Now, I would ask you to go to pages 44 and 46 and look at the asterisks and that will explain the point that Dr. Murl Manohar Joshi misinterpreted. Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition said that this Government did not give enough credit to its predecessor Government. Sir, I do not think that in the Budget, there is any indication of the fact that the achievements, that have been recorded in the past irrespective of schemes that had been started earlier, are being negated. But I would like to ask a very simple question. What is this great achievement of the past that we keep hearing about? What is this great economic miracle that was accomplished between 1999 and 2003 that we keep talking about, that we are asked to acknowledge? The fact of the matter is, Sir, that when you look at the last 50 years of India's economic development, almost 45 per cent of the variation in economic growth is accounted for by the Indian monsoon. And it is because of the Indian monsoon that we have had eight per cent rate of growth under the Congress regime and under the NDA regime. So, let us not congratulate ourselves. The capacity of the Indian economy to grow at eight per cent is not conditioned by the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister of the day, but it is conditioned by the weather Gods. If the monsoon is good, you have a good economic rate of growth; if the monsoon is bad, you have a bad economic rate of growth. And the reason why you had the India shining' at 8.4 per cent last year, Sir, which I have applauded, is simply because last year's monsoon was bountiful and the monsoon of the year previously was very deficient and, therefore, you had an eight per cent rate of growth on a very small base. Sir, rather than spending a lot of time over trying to get into an argument on numbers, let me now move on to what I consider to be the major achievements or the major milestones in this Budget, which I feel deserve accolades from all across the political spectrum. Firstly, I think, Sir, that the allocations that have been made, and I know everybody recognises that money is not all, expenditure is not all, we should focus on outcomes and not on outlays. Incidentally, the Finance

Minister did say that we must have better outcomes and not outlays. This is not a phrase of the Finance Minister, but late Mr. L.K. Jha had written about it almost 25 years ago. And for 25 years, we have been grappling with the issue of how to ensure better outcomes rather than only increase outlays. But, nevertheless, having said this, I would still underscore the fact that this Budget has made significant departures from the past, in terms of allocation in four or five critical sectors of the economy, particularly the sectors of Aam Aadmi which Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi has discovered and after discovering, is proceeding to leave. Sir, of the four or five sectors that I think deserve special attention, one is Health and Family Welfare. Alas! the former Minister for Health and Family Welfare has also decided to walk out. But let me point out while she is walking out that the increase in outlay that has taken place this year on health and family welfare has been unprecedented. I would just give you some numbers, these are numbers that are available in the Expenditure Budget Volume II in this Book. I will not mention the colour of this Book...*(Interruptions)*...Sir, on health and family welfare for 2002-03, it was Rs. 7,400 crores for 2003-04, it was Rs. 7,400 crores. Sir, a Government in which India was shining, there was no increase in the allocation for health and family welfare. For 2004-05, the year in which India was shining, allocation for health and family welfare increases to Rs. 8,000 crores. This year, the allocation for health and family welfare goes up from Rs. 8,000 crores to Rs. 10,000 crores.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BALAVANT *alias* BALAPTE) in the Chair]

It is a 25 per cent increase in the allocation for public health which I think nobody can quibble about, but, in our view, where this money is going, how this money should be spent, whether they are getting the maximum returns for this money. But I think all of us recognise that India is a country which has invested very little in public health and this level of expenditure increase in public health is welcome. Similarly, Sir, and this point was acknowledged by Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi, on the two flagship programmes of the elementary education—the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* and the Mid-Day Meal Programme. In both of these programmes, there has been a very significant step up in outlays. In the case of *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan*, it has gone up from Rs. 5,000 crores to Rs. 8,000 crores and in the Mid-day Meal Scheme, it has gone up from Rs. 2,900 crores to

Rs. 3,500 crores. This has been made possible because of the two per cent education cess; which we have all gladly paid; anyway, those of us who pay taxes.

In fact, to my mind, Sir, the most significant part of this Budget is the increase in allocation for child welfare. Sir, we have all seen in the post-Tsunami environment how the most vulnerable sections of our society are children, and if you look at the allocation for child welfare, particularly from the point of view of nutrition programmes, it has gone up from Rs. 2,000 crores to Rs. 3,700 crores; a Rs. 1700 crore increase in the allocation for child welfare. Sir, 40 per cent of births in India are under weight. Sir, we have the largest proportion of births which are under weight, a proportion which is much higher in India than even in Bangladesh, and, I think it is time that we rectified the situation. In this context, Sir, the allocation that has been provided for child welfare, particularly for the Integrated Child Development Services, what is called the ICDS programme, one of the most successful programmes, that has been run for 30 years, is very welcome. So, Sir, the first big idea in the Budget for which it should be welcomed is the fact that in the key sectors of health, education, nutrition, employment and agriculture, in these five basic sectors, there has been a very, very significant step-up in the level of public expenditure. It is important that we have focus on outcomes, it is important that this money is spent properly through Panchayats or through other institutions of local self-governance, but, I think to deny the fact that there has been a very substantial increase in public spending in these *aam aadmi* sectors, as Dr. Joshi called it, in my view is not being fair to this Budget.

Sir, the second reason why this Budget should be welcomed is the focus that it provides on Backward States. Sir, we have heard from many sections of this House that Orissa is backward, Uttar Pradesh is backward, Assam is backward, Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand are backward. Now, Sir, if you look at the allocations that have been made for the Backward States as a result of the recommendations of the Twelfth Finance Commission, on which, unfortunately, we have not had an opportunity to debate in this House—and I hope we will have an opportunity to talk about that some time later—you will find that the recommendations of the Government in the budget that reflects the recommendations of the Twelfth Finance Commission have a very substantial step-up in the allocation for the poorest States. And just to give you one example, Sir, in the past, about 70 per

cent of all the money that went from the Centre to the States was based on population and per capita income, which, incidentally, was also based on population. So, one could say that roughly, 70 per cent of the money that the Centre gave to the States was dependent on population. On the basis of the recommendations of the Twelfth Finance Commission, this Budget is devolving close to 80 per cent of the resources purely on the basis of population. U.P., Bihar, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Orissa and Rajasthan are the States that have actually benefited. In fact, Sir,—I shouldn't be saying this—the State from which I come, Karnataka, the State which I represent, Andhra, the State which I have been married into, Tamil Nadu, have not been given. But I think it is important for us to recognise that the functioning of a Budget, unlike the Railway Budget which is to provide links to every Member's constituency, is to take care of the entire country and to redistribute resources from the richest States to the poorest States, and I am a great believer that in the last 40-50 years, States like Bihar, UP., Orissa, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh have been neglected. I am a great believer that States like Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka and Andhra have got special treatment for a variety of reasons, and I think that this Budget, Sir, begins to tackle the problem of regional disparities in a much more substantive manner that has been the case in the past and, therefore, this, to my mind, is the second reason why this Budget should be welcomed. The third reason, why this Budget should be welcomed, is because of what the hon. President said in his Address, which was later taken up in the Budget under the name "Bharat Nirman". Now, it is not my case that it is this Government that has discovered rural India. It is not my case that it is this Government that has suddenly thought of Bharat Nirman. The previous Governments had also thought about it. In fact, Vajpayee's Government started a very successful, very ambitious and very welcome scheme, the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana. There are many schemes, which were started during Vajpayee's regime, which addressed the problems of rural India in a very substantial manner. But the achievement of this Budget, in my view, is to bring together four or five big elements of rural infrastructure like irrigation, roads, water supply and rural telecommunications, to which I will come a little later, and put them together under the new rubric of Bharat Nirman Programme. There is an increase of Rs. 2,000 crores in the allocation for irrigation; there is an increase of Rs. 2,000 crores in the allocation for water supply; there is a

special programme for rural electrification; there is a special programme for rural telecommunications. I think all these go to make the elements of Bharat Nirman programme. What the Budget has done is to pick up five or six elements of rural infrastructure, being them together, give it a concrete shape and give it adequate funding so that in the next five years or so all of rural India will have the infrastructure which it certainly deserves.

My fourth point on the positive side of the Budget is the special focus it brings to bear on manufacturing. India can't be a world class power, as we all aspire to be, only on the strength of services industry. It is not IT alone, it is not biotechnology or telecommunications alone, that would catapult us into world status. It is manufacturing, the old fashioned manufacturing of steel, textiles, capital goods, jute, agro-processing, leather, handicrafts that are going to provide mass employment, blue-collar employment. Therefore, I think the focus that has been given in this Budget has not come a day soon, and a large number of policy measures that have been initiated or proposed, particularly, for the textile industry, which is the largest industrial employer in the country today, are in the right direction. After agriculture, the handloom industry, as you know, Sir, is the largest employers, in our country even today. I think the incentives and the measures that have been provided for the manufacturing industry, in general, and for the textile industry, in particular, are very welcome.

Finally, the fifth important feature of this Budget is tax reforms. The function of every Budget is to bring forward tax reforms. The fact of the matter is that at the end of 50 years only 75,000 Indians report a taxable income of Rs. 10 lakhs. This is the saddest commentary on the Indian economy. We can be growing at 8 per cent per year. We can be the fourth largest economy in the world. But only 75,000 Indians report a taxable income of more than Rs. 10 lakhs? I am sure, my distinguished lawyer friends, Mr. Arun Jaitley, is one of them. We have to address this problem. Two ways of addressing this problem are to reduce tax rates and make your tax rates reasonable, and make the base as wide as possible. We had a time in this country when tax rate was 97 per cent. We had a great Finance Minister, T.T. Krishnamachari. He was called TTK. His grandson told me that in the family "TTK" stood for "Tax, Tax and Kill". With 97 per cent rate of marginal taxation, we had large scale evasion. Today, we are internationally comparable. In this Budget, our tax rates are internationally comparable. The base has to be made comparable. I think the measures

that have been initiated in this Budget to bring down the tax rates, to increase or restructure the slabs, will provide an incentive, in my view, for the people in the higher tax brackets, higher income groups, to pay more tax. This year is very significant for another reason. This is the first year in which the contribution from direct taxes will exceed the contribution from indirect taxes. This year, 50 per cent of all of Government revenue will come from personal and corporate income tax; whereas, all this while, it has been the excise duty and customs duty that has provided the sulk of the revenue. Sir, excise duty and customs duty is anti-poor. Income tax is the only progressive tax because the more income you have the more tax you pay. But in excise duty and customs duty the poor man pays the same rate of tax as the rich man. For buying a shampoo, buying a soap, buying a bicycle and buying a motorcycle, you pay the same rate of tax. We must go to a situation where more and more of our resources come from direct tax, from personal tax and not from excise duty and customs duty. I think this Budget has made that historic shift and from now on, I think, progressively, more and more resources will be coming from the direct tax front.

Therefore, to summarise on the positives, first is, significant and, in my view, unprecedented increase in allocations for health, for elementary education, for nutrition, for agriculture and for employment; second, the formulation and the financing of the Bharat Nirman rural Infrastructure Programme; third, the focus on increased funding for backward States, backward districts; fourth, special focus on manufacturing, particularly the textile industry and fifth, the tax reforms with the focus on bringing down tax rates and increasing the base of tax payers. These in my view, constitute significant achievements of this Budget.

Where are the disappointments of this Budget, as far as I am concerned? First, quite clearly, is the cash withdrawal tax. Good in principle, bad in practice. The thought was good to provide a trail. But obviously, not many of us go to banks very regularly to withdraw Rs. 10,000. Quite clearly, Sir, from a purely social point of view—it is not a tax; we are not paying the tax—even the notion that while taking out money you are giving something to the bank, in my view, is using a machinegun to shoot a fly. There is some sort of simile like that. The problem is much larger. The problem is much more deep-rooted. The problem of black money is much more deepy

ingrained in our system and we cannot tackle that in this sort of homoeopathic manner, if I may call it with due respect to all users of homoeopathy. Anytime, you withdraw Rs. 10,000, you are going to pay a small tax. There, I would say, I was disappointed in the Budget and I hope that the Finance Minister will make the corrections and come out with a bolder scheme for introducing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BALAVANT *alias* BALAPTE): You are calling machinegun and homoeopathy the same thing!

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, I was just reading it yesterday. This is a very leading magazine of the world called the New York Review of Books. There is a Book Review of a book called the 'Secret Financial Network of Terror'. Some of my friends would be interested in it. Here there is an article on financing of terrorist networks all over the world. There is a paragraph here. I would like to commend this article to the Finance Minister and his colleague, Shri Palaninamickam. I will read just two lines. It says, "Today Hawala is a vast global institution serving millions of people worldwide. Despite the fact that the system is illegal in India, Interpol has estimated that in 1998 the money circulating in India's Hawala system totalled 40 per cent of India's GDP." One can say this a widely exaggerated estimate. I think it is a widely exaggerated estimate. But the fact of the matter is the problem of black money, the problem of money-laundering, the problem of black money becoming white money and coming back as black money is far more serious and there I am entirely in agreement with Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi. If the Finance Ministry or the Finance Minister has major schemes in this regard without sending disincentives to honest tax payers, I am sure, both Houses of Parliament would gladly support him on this. Therefore, sir, on the case withdrawal tax, I was actually disappointed. But there was no frontal, bold attack on the problem of black money.

My second disappointment comes from this Document, which was laid on the Table of the House, along with the Budget-Statements laid before Parliament, as required under the fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act, 2003. Sir, I was very much disappointed that in para 12 on Page 47, it says: "The Budget, 2004-05, had assumed an annual growth of 25 per cent in tax revenue largely relying on liquidation of tax arrears. The expectations have not been fully met. We have to be content

with 20 per cent growth which is still higher than the growth recorded in earlier years." We are well aware of the delays in resolution of tax disputes, build up of arrears and resultant uncertainties, which have been major sources of complications in revenue budgeting. In other word, Sir, the main focus of the Finance Minister in the last year's Budget was on collecting tax arrears. This statement says that has failed. I am also disappointed more because one of the main planks of last year's Budget has been the liquidation of thousands of crores of arrears, thousands of crores of NPAs. Here, I must say, the All India Banks Employees' Association-I am not exactly very popular amongst the All-India Banks Employees; Association for obvious reasons – has done a signal service to the country by coming out with this document which lists out all the Non-performing Assets which are owned by the various people to the various Indian financial institutions. And, you will see, with the greatest of respects, there are certain names here who are leading the lights of Indian politics lives as well ...*(Interruptions)* I don't want to take anybody's name here. All I want to say is that we have to be more serious in collecting tax arrears. We have to be more serious in collecting NPAs. Fifty five thousand crores of rupees of bank money locked up in organised large scale industry as valuable national assets have gone to waste; this could have been used in other vital social sectors.

Sir, my third question—it is not exactly a disappointment—I have on the Budget was on the fringe benefit tax. I am a great supporter of the fringe benefit tax. I know, Mr. Dayanidhi Maran, who has various *avtars*, and in this *avtar* of being a corporate executive—he is dressed like one today—he has serious objections with the fringe benefit tax. But, all over the world, frings benefits are taxed. They are either taxed in the hands of the employees, or, they are taxed in the hands of the employer or they are taxed in a combination thereof. And, I ask myself: Did the Finance Minister introduce the fringe benefit tax in a fit of amnesia? Then, I discovered, in 1992, the Chelliah Committee which formed the basis of the entire tax reforms of our country in the last 15 years, had a chapter on the fringe benefit tax. And they had recommended 14 years ago that India must move towards taxation of fringe benefits because what is happening is that there are non-transparent modes of compensating employees which are escaping the tax net. And it is a very substantial amount of money. Now one can quibble about what fringe benefits are—whether travel should be a fringe benefit; whether official travel should be a fringe benefit; whether

advertising should be a fringe benefit; I think, the concept of a fringe benefit tax is internationally accepted. It has been recommended by the most respected committee, which had been set up 13-14 years ago, which formed the basis of tax reform of not only Dr. Manmohan Singh but also of Shri Yashwant Sinha and Shri Jaswant Singh. Therefore, I would say that while, on the Fringe Benefit issue, the definition of what constitutes a Fringe Benefit could be open to some debate, I would argue that we should stick to and not give up the concept of a Fringe Benefit Tax.

Fourthly, in the Economic Survey, the Finance Minister talked about how this year there would be Rs. 108,000 crores of agricultural credit that would be disbursed; and he took a lot of time in saying that this is one of the greatest achievements of this Government. It is true that this year, 50 lakh new farmers have got agricultural credit. It is true that there has been a 30 per cent increase in the volume of agricultural credit and at long last, Sir, Kisan Credit Card means credit, not just a card—after a very, very long time. But the problem is, if you look at the Economic Survey, at page 69, the composition of this agricultural credit is what gives me a lot of worry. Ten years ago, commercial banks accounted for only 50 per cent of the agricultural credit; the cooperatives, the Regional Rural Banks accounted for the balance 50 per cent. This year, the commercial banks account for two-thirds of the agricultural credit; cooperatives and Regional Rural Banks account only for a third. If this trend continues, in another five years, the cooperatives and the Regional Rural Banks will cease to exist. Commercial Banks, by their very nature, are not oriented towards agricultural credit. The primary focus for agricultural credit has to come from cooperatives and has to come from Regional Rural Banks. I am sorry to say, other than his saying that I have set up a high level committee; this Budget has not done anything to address the structural problems of the agricultural credit, namely, the state of cooperatives, the state of Regional Rural Banks, and to expect that the bulk of the agricultural credit will come from commercial banks, in my view, is clearly unrealistic because of the way our commercial banks are currently structured.

Finally, on the negative side, I would say that Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi has pointed out some anomalies as far as senior citizens are concerned and I have some sympathy with that point of view. The Income-tax Act defines a senior citizen as anybody over the age of 65. The Indian Airlines and the Indian Railways define a senior citizen as anybody over the age of 60. Of course, in political parties, there can be no definition of

what a senior citizen is. You can be 65 and be young and upcoming. So, the point is, as far as the tax incidence on senior citizens is concerned, there is no doubt that there has been a bit of an anomaly and senior citizens, particularly in the income bracket of one and a half to two lakhs of rupees will find their tax incidence actually going up. This problem is not going to be restricted to this year. Indians are living longer. Life expectancy at birth is 64% but life expectancy at 58 is 78, which means an average Indian who lives up to the age of 58 can expect to live, statistically, up to the age of 70. So, the senior citizen problem is going to be a problem that is going to increase over the years. You know, in Railways, already, two years from now there will be more pensioners than employees. And similarly, I am sure, even in Defence, today we are fast moving to a situation where the number of pensioners will outnumber the employees. So, the senior citizens' problem cannot be wished away. We are a young population. There is no doubt that 70 per cent of our population is below the age of 35. But the proportion in the age-group of 60 and above is going to increase. In terms of percentages it will be small but in terms of absolute numbers it will run into a few hundred millions. And, therefore, I would urge the Finance Minister to re-look at some of the restructuring that he has done in such a manner that no adverse impact is made on senior citizens particularly.

Sir, these are my five major 'negatives' or 'disappointments', as far as this Budget is concerned. Sir, on balance, I would summarise now by saying that this Budget is in consonance with the National Common Minimum Programme. This Budget focuses very heavily on social sectors; this Budget focuses very heavily on physical infrastructure and this Budget focuses very heavily on two or three sectors which have been neglected in the past like elementary education, like public health and like child nutrition. Now, it is not my objective to say that the Budget is a magic wand, it is a magic mantra and with a Budget, everything will be milk and honey. The Budget is only one instrument of the Economic Policy. I think the Finance Minister amidst the constraints that have been imposed on him, particularly by the Twelfth Finance Commission which devolved more money to the States — instead of 29.5 per cent of all money going to the States, now 30.5 per cent money is going to the States. So, there is less money available to the Centre, given all the expenditure pressures that have come on him and given this mentality in our country where any proposal for taxation is met instantly by a negative reaction, I think, the Finance Minister has done a very commendable job. It is for these reasons, I believe,

Sir, Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi's arguments do not stand the test of reality. And, this Budget, in my view, is a very significant achievement.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Can you say something about unearthing of black money because everybody is concerned about it? What is your suggestion in this regard? *(Interruptions)* You have not given any suggestion on this. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: When we will discuss about black money, we will discuss all these things. *(interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BALAVANT ALIAS BALAPTE): Now, Shri Chittabrata Majumdar.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, this is his maiden speech.

SHRI CHITTABRATA MAJUMDAR (West Bengal): Sir, actually, I am also in agreement with my friend, Shri Jairam Ramesh who said that this Budget has some positive side and some negative side. Although, I do not agree with all the views expressed by him. However, at the outset, I would like to say that this Budget is quite satisfactory for us because the Finance Minister has stated, "The National Common Minimum Programme, NCMP, mandated the Government to maintain a growth rate of seven to eight per cent a year, to promote investment, to generate employment, to accelerate fiscal consolidation, to ensure a higher fiscal devolution and to focus on agriculture, manufacturing and infrastructure. The NCMP also mandated the Government to provide universal access to education and healthcare and to assure 100 days of employment to one person in each family. It is the commitment of the Finance Minister, and its reflection, to some extent, has also been seen in the outlays given in the Budget For the Ministry of Agriculture, in the year 2004-05, there was an allocation of Rs. 4, 192 crores, which has been raised to Rs. 5, 998 crores. For Rural Development, whereas it was about Rs. 15,998 crores, it has now been raised to almost Rs. 24,480 crores. In the health sector also, the allocations have been increased. Particularly, for the HRD sector, last year, the allocation was Rs. 10, 625 crores. This year, the allocation has been increased to Rs. 19,119 crores. So, this shows that, at least the Government is trying to look after the weaker sections who were not being looked after earlier. I would like to say that even though the outlays have been increased, the increased outlays are too meagre in comparison to the problems being faced by the people, particularly in the rural areas. Apart from this, our

experience is that the flood and soil erosion is a problem in our country, particularly in the Gangetic plains we are being affected severely. I think, irrigation and flood control is an important sector in our country. But for this sector, the allocation is too meagre. It is only Rs. 524 crores. So, naturally, it is contrary to the desire.

About employment generation, I can't agree with Shri Ramesh. In my opinion, the steps taken by the Government and the decisions in the Budget are not in favour of employment generation. Though it has been stated that some Rs. 11,000 crores have been allocated for 'Food For Work' programme in 250 districts. It is nothing but a small amount in relation to joblessness in the rural areas.

De-reservation of 105 more items from the small-scale sector is also creating problem for the small-scale sector, and many small-scale sector units will fall sick and will be closed and many of the workers will be unemployed.

Similarly, on the question of tax revenue, customs duty has been reduced from Rs. 56,250 crores to Rs. 53,182 crores whereas excise duty has been enhanced from Rs. 1,00,720 crores to 1,21,533 crores. That means, the goods which are coming from outside will be cheaper. But the Indian producer will have to pay much more because of the enhancement of excise duty. Naturally, in the name of competition, our industries in all sector will face problems and many of the industries will fall sick and will be closed down. So, this is not the real solution to solve the problem of unemployment.

In both, the public as well as private sectors, sickness is there. Out of about 5,000 cases registered in BIFR, 4,800 are from the private sector, 85 cases are from the Central Public Sector Undertakings and about 118 cases are from the State Public Sector Undertakings. So, my point is: What will be the fate of these industries? Actually, the Budget says nothing about this and a large number of workers are employed with these industries. About 25 lakh are direct employees and, even more than that number is the indirect employees involved with these industries. Strangely, nothing has been said about this problem.

I would like to point out that though 4,800 cases are in the private sector out of 5,000 cases registered in BIFR, even then the tendency is that the public sectors cannot run, so they are to be closed and handed

4.00 P.M.

over to the private employers. But this is the case with private employers also. The private employers are not in a position to run these industries viably. There is no mention of disinvestments of public sector. That is a welcome step. But what is happening is that many Ministers are talking about disinvestments of public sector outside. So, if the Government keeps—at least, in the Budget there is no mention of disinvestments — then it is all right. But if the Government moves otherwise, if disinvestment of public sector goes on, then naturally we have to oppose that. From all these things, it is understood that whereas intention has been expressed but in practice the allocation and steps are not in accordance with that intention. One point is clear that the Government intends to take many programmes and many steps, but they are not in a position to take because of revenue constraints or resource constraints. So, the question of resource mobilisation comes here. On the question of resource mobilisation, it is a fact that the tax-GDP ratio in our country is too low and there is a scope to enhance the tax GDP ratio in our country which may improve our revenue position. Shri Pranab Mukherjee in this House spoke on FRBM Act on 29th July, 2003. Even up to 1989-90 the GDP ratio was 11.6 per cent. Today it has come down by two percentage points, from 11.6 to 9.6 per cent. instead of moving up; it had come down during the NDA regime. During 2004-05, the Budget Estimate of tax-GDP ratio was 10.7 per cent. In the Revised Estimate it came down to 9.84 per cent. The Budget Estimate for 2005-06 it has been proposed to be at 10.5 per cent. The Left Parties have submitted their memorandum to the Finance Minister where they proposed that the tax-GDP ratio should be enhanced to about 11.5 per cent, which is merely at the level of 1989-90. It is not impossible to reach that level. But the Government's proposal in the Budget is only for 10.5 per cent. There is a scope of further increase of one per cent in this ratio. It is not difficult to raise this ratio. Naturally, a question comes how and from whom these taxes or resources will be accumulated. In this connection, the Left parties naturally have certain position. But even the Standing Committee on Finance, in its 14th Report, recommended that the focus of the Government however, has been on widening of the tax base by way of increasing the number of assesseees which in fact may not result in quantum jump in the tax revenue". The Committee recommended that the Government, while making efforts to widen the tax

base, should put specific focus on the high and tax payers so as to increase the tax revenue substantially. This is a unanimous Report where Members from that side were also there and my friend is also a Member there. That is a unanimous recommendation. But I find that in this Budget that recommendation has not been followed. The Finance Minister has tried to enhance the resources from the weaker sections. That means broadening, widening of tax base, from the weaker sections, mainly the salaried people. But the recommendation was that more money can come if the tax is collected from the high-end tax payers. But widening on the high-end tax payers is not there. So, I think that if this recommendation was implemented by the Government, then, the question of resource crunch, resource problem, would not arise at all and it would be possible to take up many other programmes for the people. Now, I come to high end tax payers. The NPA has crossed more than Rs. one lakh crore but nothing has been mentioned in this Budget as to how to recover all these amounts. This is a big amount. This is a source of huge resource. If the Government was serious to collect all these things then the problem of resource crunch would not be there. The second thing is, tax arrears. Now, we pay our electricity bill, we pay our telephone bill. If we have some dispute, after paying the bill, we may raise the dispute. But what about the tax payers? From the trade union at least, we proposed to the Finance Minister twice that in this case also, let the assessed amount be collected from them first and if the tax payers have any dispute, then they may raise this dispute and if their objection is accepted, then refund can be made. In that case, the tax collection arrear will not be there and collection will be much more. The corporate tax collection during 2004-2005 has been revised to Rs. 83,000 crores from budgetary estimate of Rs. 88,436 crores. That means, the upper-sections got the benefit of Rs. 5,436 crores. They are not the common people like salaried-class. The upper-sections are getting the benefit, not the lower sections. Then, Sir, I now like to come to arrears from income-tax, excise duty, corporate tax and customs duty. In these areas also, the tax arrears are increasing. They have increased from Rs. 47,000 crores in 1997-98 to about Rs. 1 lakh crores by 2003-04. So, what steps the Government are thinking to take to recover all these arrears? If the Government could take these steps, many of the programmes, which have been mentioned in the National Common Minimum programme, could be implemented and, as a result, more people could be benefited.

Then, Sir, small savings have also been discouraged. It is another problem. This move will affect the common people. In this connection,

Shri Jairam Ramesh mentioned about the employment generation and labour-intensive industries like jute, tea, handloom textiles, etc. Textiles cover many things. Textiles cover modern mills. Textiles cover power-looms. Textiles cover handlooms. I have not found any scheme in this Budget which can protect the handloom industry. There is no proposal to protect the labour-intensive, tea and jute industries from crisis. I feel, the Government should think, the Finance Minister should think, that if we want to increase the employment or, at least, to protect the employment in these sectors, something has to be done for this sector. Otherwise, more and more people will become unemployed and this would become a problem for us.

The next point I want to place before the Hon. Finance Minister is this. North-Bengal is also weak. When the North-Eastern States are getting certain incentives for investment, North-Bengal should also be covered with this region so that they also can get those incentives to develop certain industries there. Particularly, I have mentioned earlier about irrigation, flood-control and soil erosion. It is a problem in other areas as well. In West Bengal, particularly, it is a very serious problem. Now-and-then the settlements are being disturbed and sometimes submerged in water when there are floods. That is a problem. It also includes agricultural land. It also includes settlements. The amount that has been allocated for this sector has to be increased manifold if we want to combat these problems seriously. I hope the intention of the Government is to fulfil the commitment made in the National Common Minimum Programme.

I request the hon. Finance Minister to consider all these aspects and include these issue in the Budget so that the weaker sections of the society get benefited out of that. Thank you.

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI (West Bengal): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I know I belong to a small party and I don't have a luxury of time. I will try my best to finish it within five to seven minutes. You won't have to ring the bell. I understand that....(*Interruptions*). Well, he has given me 20 more minutes, so I am grateful to him for the permission. His time can be counted. Thank you for your generosity...(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BALAVANT ALIAS BALAPTE): Don't commit about the length.

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: Sir, I am a little bit disappointed, to begin with, with this Budget. And, let me tell you, at the outset, that I am not

going to deliver a political speech on the Budget; I am here to just give you the factual things as they appear. The reason I said that I am disappointed with this Budget is that today, we have at the helm of affairs, a Prime Minister who is a renowned economist, undisputed brain, who can really give so much not only to India but the world at large, as far as his economic background is concerned. The disappointment is for their reputation in Economics because we have a Finance Minister in Mr. Chidambaram, who also enjoys such reputation. I would have understood if somebody, who did not understand Economics, had presented this kind of a Budget. Sir, let me come to the very concept of budgeting. I think, we have moved; it has been more than five decades of independence and there has been presentation of Budget year after year, and there is so much of speculation outside. People are in suspense as to what is going to happen. It is like a Alfred Hitchcock movie. I think, we have to get to move out of that. Normally, the mandate of any elected Government in our country is five years, and I think the time has come where any Government should present a five year total picture that, "Look here, this is what is our vision for the next five years." But, I don't see any of such things here and it is relevant, this five-year period is relevant. We had Shri Jairam Ramesh, who is also an eminent economist. He was part of the Planning Commission. Planning Commission also envisages plan for five years. Sir, if I come to Tenth Five Year Plan, and I was going through the Approach Paper, which envisages an eight per cent GDP, and to have eight per cent GDP, we must normally have somewhere around 10-plus per cent of manufacturing. But, Mr. Finance Minister, in his own admission, rightly so, has said that the GDP growth, as per this Budget, is going to be below seven per cent which, itself, is a great disappointment. Sir, there are two aspects of this Budget. One is the Budget speech and the other aspect is the reality. One can be called dream, which the captains of industry, time and again on television, saw when I was watching. Now there is a new system of marking. The anchor asked, "How many marks do you give to this Budget?" Some said, "Nine". Some said, "Eight". One of them even said, "Twelve." I said, "Twelve out of 10." He said, "Two is for carry forward for next year." When they read the print, the real one, the dream vanished and the nightmare set in. So, that is another part of my disappointment. Sir, as I said in the beginning, I am not here to score a political point; I am on facts and figures. I will straightway go into the facts and figures. Sir, I have mentioned about the Tenth Five Year Plan. Let us talk about capital expenditure, which is the basis of generating and creating jobs and giving a boost to the economy.

Sir, if we look at serial No. 1 of the fact sheet, we come to a significant figure. Sir, I am mentioning from the 'Budget at a Glance' document, and, if you study it, you will find that the planned capital expenditure for 2005-06 is expected to come down. Sir, mark my words, it is going to come down to Rs. 27,515 crores from Rs. 47,714 crores, which means that there is a decrease.

I would like to inform Mr. Jairam Ramesh that in 2003-04, the planned capital expenditure was Rs. 47,714 crores, and, this year it is coming down to Rs. 27,515 crores. Sir, this means that the GDP growth during the next few years, and consequently in the subsequent years, is going to come down, which is going to give rise to unemployment because the entire buoyant economy is going to—I can't say it is going to come to a standstill—retard.

Sir, the next item is the Non-Plan expenditure, and I am on a figure, which with whatever little economics I know, I really don't understand. There is an unusual high increase—one of the highest in so many decades—in the Non-Plan revenue expenditure, and it is estimated at Rs. 3.31 lakh crores for 2005-2006 as compared to Rs. 2.96 lakh crores for 2004-05. It means that you are increasing the Non-Plan revenue expenditure, and you are decreasing the planned capital expenditure. Any student of economics will say that this is never done in an economy, which is supposed to be on the growth path.

Sir, the entire world is looking at India—read the latest edition of 'The Economist'—as another giant like China, but, what worries me is that, and I am afraid, if we have this kind of vision or lack of it, we are just not going to be anywhere near that. We have the potential but it is difficult with this kind of Budget. Sir, the Finance Minister has also mentioned that he has pressed the 'pause' button on the Fiscal Responsibility and the Budget Management Act, namely, FRBM Act, due to the pressure of the Twelfth Finance Commission's recommendations.

Sir, unfortunately, nothing can be farther from the truth. The reason, I say, is that as per the detailed Budget document, the Twelfth Finance Commission's recommendations will translate into an additional fiscal burden of only Rs. 3,000 crores to Rs. 4,000 crores because as much as Rs. 29,000 crores is now going to be borrowed by the States themselves from the market and not being given by the Government of India. It is

Rs. 29,000 crores, could be Rs. 28,000 crores, but whatever it is, it is close to this figure.

Sir, I am making a very crucial point—Mr. Minister can contradict me—that the Twelfth Finance Commission recommended that whatever assistance flows from the Government of India should go as a grant, and not as a loan. So far, the assistance was flowing in the ratio of 70:30. I am talking about the ratio of grant and loan. It is 70:30 by way of loan and grants. The Finance Minister, very cleverly, has decided only to pass on 30 per cent of the total intended assistance as grant, whereas he should have done 70 per cent of that. He has asked the States to borrow 70 per cent which is close to about Rs. 29,000 crores, as per the figures I have, across the country. The States will now have to borrow it from the market. Sir, this will hit the very foundation of our federal structure. Sir, the reason why I am saying this is that there are some smaller States like the North-East States. Where will these go to borrow the money and who is going to give them the money?

Sir, I will tell you the following points, which are going to be against these smaller States. One, the States are not used to market borrowing at this level. Weaker States may get loans at prohibitive costs due to low credit ratings. States will now stand perennially at the gates of the Finance Minister seeking permission under the Constitution to borrow. Ultimately, they will have to take the permission for borrowing from the Central Government. This may lead to imbalances in the growth pattern in the country, which already really exist. The Finance Minister does not undertake the task of helping poor States if they fail to mobilise borrowings. There is no leverage. If a State, let us say North-East State, fails to borrow, what is the Central Government going to do in that case? Sir, there are just three or four points and I am done.

Sir, the tax collection is where the magic lies. The tax collection expected in 2005-06 appears to denote certain magical powers of the Finance Minister. The total tax received, as per the printed book, are slated to jump from Rs. 2,25,000 crores to Rs. 2,73,000 crores denoting a hike of 21 per cent. I do not know from where he is going to collect 21 per cent hike as compared to the previous years. This is 'Budget at a glance', page 1, Serial Nos. 1 & 2. Sir, if we look at specific taxes or corporate taxes and taxes on income, page 1 of the Receipt Budget, the Finance Minister projected an increase of 34 per cent of corporate tax. On one side he says

that he is lowering the tax. On the other side, as per the figures, he is collecting 34 per cent more of the taxes. You can say 'better compliances'; I will come to that. Sir, 34 per cent increase in corporate tax in one single year is nothing but magic, if that ever happens. I would be very happy if that happens. As far as the tax revenue is concerned, it is slated to go up from Rs. 83,000 to Rs. 1,11,000 crore. Sir, taxes on income are seeing a rise of 30 per cent from Rs. 51,000 crore to Rs. 66,000 crore. It means that the total increase in income tax is 34 per cent as compared to last year in terms of GDP. Sir, even China cannot claim such high figures. This is where, I think, some magical touch is there and, to me, it looks like a 'dream budget'. There is also a phrase called "day-dreaming".

Sir, now I come to the fringe benefits. When the day-dreaming of the captains of the industry was over and when they woke up, they said, "Hey, look! What is this fringe benefit?" I was speaking in one of the seminars and there was an expert in taxation. So, the matter is so confused that nobody knows what this 'fringe benefit' is, where does it start and where does it end. So, I literally had to ask a question that please clarify that Madam Hema Malini, who is a great artist and I sit next to her, would that be counted as my 'fringe benefit' and the tax collection will be more?....*(Interruptions)*.... Sir, on the fringe benefit tax, the Finance Minister seems to have blissfully included it. He is a very dear friend of mine and I must tell you that I have lot of respect and regard for him, that is why my agony, if somebody else or some ordinary politician like me would have presented—I hope I will get a chance one day—then I can still understand, but not from Mr. Chidambaram...*(Interruptions)*... I just have two more points. Sir, the Finance Minister has blissfully violated the globally accepted economic principles of not taxing the expenditure as the economy matures—our economy is really on the threshold of maturity. Since expenditure is considered to be a trigger of larger demand leading to more manufacturing, apart from this taxing employees' expenses on stay of hotels which he subsequently has cleared, but still the Income-Tax Officers, I do not know, whether it is clear in their minds or not, expenses on telephone bills, all these things remind you of the colonial mindset of the Inspector Raj.

Sir, now, I come to the withdrawal tax. Much was talked about withdrawal tax. I don't doubt the intention of the hon. Finance Minister. He is genuinely after black-money. But I think he doesn't understand the black

money concept in this country. I don't think it touches the banking system at all. On this also, the hon. Finance Minister has violated the basic fiscal jurisprudence of not taxing the same income twice. Withdrawal tax will lead to this phenomenon. If tracking the cash transaction is the objective, Sir, it is already being done, we all know, through the instrument of PAN, etc. Its implementation will bring larger bureaucratic burden on the system and I daresay that it will also bring corruption. This also reflects, as I mentioned, the Finance Minister is completely innocent about how black money economy operates in this country. Sir, it never touches the banking system. Tomorrow, there could be a thing that if you withdraw a 500-rupee note, then you have to pay 20 per cent; if you withdraw Rs. 10, the you have to pay one per cent. Where are we going, Sir? I am totally disappointed, totally disappointed. There are many methods which Shri Jairam Ramesh would assist him and tell him how to stop black money, not that he has, but he knows how to stop it. Sir, the Finance Minister seems, here I must tell you, I don't want to use the words that he has misled but it appears that what the bureaucratic system has done, he has not realised. Sir, on the issue of 16.9 per cent enhancement of gross budgetary support which he mentioned in his speech that I am going to increase the budgetary support, Mr. Jairam Ramesh, his speech was based on that, that it is going to the rural India, over which I would have been very happy. But this is not true, Sir. He talks about that last year; the Plan support was around Rs. 1,48,000 and odd crores. This year, the Finance Minister claims that it will go up to Rs. 1,73,000 and odd crores. However, here is the catch. The fact is that of this Rs. 1,73,000 crores, States have to arrange Rs. 29,000 crores from the market. Sir, even a student of Class IV can tell you that if you subtract 1,48,000 from 1,73,000, what the difference will be. This only shows that you have really brought down the Budgetary support as compared to the last year. You have not increased it. Sir, I have a great objection to this. You are talking about China; and, you are bringing down your Budgetary support. We talk about *Aam Adami*. I don't want to get into the politics of this. Otherwise, I will be derailed. I won't do that. But the fact is, that you have brought it down, Mr. Minister. You have brought down the Budgetary support by Rs. 4,000 crores as compared to the last year. This clearly implies the decrease in the gross budgetary support of the Government of India...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (Kerala): Of what?

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: The Budgetary support given by the Government to the States. I am talking today on your behalf, on behalf of the States, on behalf of the country I am glad you asked it.

Sir, then we are talking about Defence. I clearly remember;—I didn't have to look at last year's hon. Finance Minister's speech—he mentioned when he was speaking last year, "I am going to enhance the Defence budget this year." He said that he was compelled to increase it from Rs. 65,000 crores to Rs. 77,000 crores. He said, "He was compelled to do it because there was some outstanding bills and it amounted to Rs. 12,000 crores." Nobody had any objection when he did this last year. But what did he do this year? The Finance Minister has not only protected the last year's defence allocation, but he has also given an increase of Rs. 6,000 crores, taking it from Rs. 77,000 crores to Rs. 83,000 crores. This morning we talked about our relations with our neighbours, people-to-people contact, etc. We are very happy that relationships with Pakistan, with China, and all our neighbours are really getting better, better and better. May I ask the hon. Finance Minister: If the relationship is getting better, why do you need such a huge increase in defence expenditure allocation? I totally fail to understand this. This is, definitely, a misleading thing. Either you accept and say, "Yes; we need this for the security of the country. We need this." We don't want to hoodwink the people. I am not trying to say, he has done that. But it amounts to that...*(Interruptions)* No; not Parliament. Nobody can do it. I have no quarrel against anybody. Like, I said in the beginning, I am not here to score a political point. Sir, my next point is this. The NDA Government had started a very good practice. It had begun a new chapter in bringing transparency and accountability in Budgeting by annually publishing what was called as 'Action Taken Report' on Budget Announcements, and delivering the same with Budget volumes. Sir, I am again sad; this has been given a go-by for reasons not known to anyone of us. Maybe, the Finance Minister would like to explain this; maybe, he could have given the ATR on its commitments made in July, 2004 at least. I am sure it can be done...*(Interruptions)* No; it is done periodically, after every three months. They say, "This was our target. This is where we are." And if they have missed the target, they say why they have missed it.

Lastly, I will give you an example. The other day we were in Mumbai in the Hilton Hotel attending one of the Consultative Committees. At the rooftop of the Hilton Hotel, on the 29th floor, which has a panoramic view,

it is all surrounded by glass. So, one could sit there, have a meeting and look at the nature outside. But what did I find there? I found that all the curtains were drawn and we were sitting in the dark room. I asked the authorities, "What is the point of going on the 29th floor where you find that the entire vision is blocked and you have to sit in the dark. We could have held the meeting in the basement as well which would have cost us much less". The moral of this example is, for heaven's sake, open the curtains of your minds; please, be more visionary, rather than just a normal, ordinary accountant trying to balance one figure with another.

SHRI LALIT SURI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me time to express my views on the general budget 2005-2006 presented by the Finance Minister on 28th February 2005. I would not take much time, I have some background from the corporate world. I will just stick to two-three points on the Budget, on which I would like to express my views.

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI) IN THE CHAIR.]

For the last two years, the Indian Economy has been very buoyant. The steps taken by the previous Government as well as the last two budgets have helped the economy to grow. The world is moving at a very fast pace and we have to make sure that we are not left behind. Our GDP in the last two years has been in the range of 7% to 8.5%. To eradicate poverty, which is below the poverty line, our GDP has to grow close to 9%.

In my budget speech last year I had, *inter alia*, stressed the need for world class infrastructure in the country, making agriculture undependable on monsoon, providing filip to manufacturing sector, providing industries loans at internationally compatible rate of interest and the like and giving tourism industry a full infrastructure status.

It is heartening to note that the Finance Minister in this year's budget has ventured in a big way to fulfil the Presidents dream of Bharat Nirman in the coming four years period, by setting the following goals to be achieved: to bring an additional one crore hectares under assured irrigation; to connect all villages that have a population of 1000 (or 500 in hilly/tribal areas) with a road; to construct 60 lakh additional houses for the poor; to provide drinking water to 74,000 habitations that are uncovered; to reach electricity to the remaining 1,25,000 villages and offer electricity connection to 2.3 crore households; and to give telephone connectivity to the remaining 66,822 villages.

However, in the years to come it has to be seen to what extent these ambitious targets will be achieved. The biggest challenge, which the country is facing, is 29% of the population, around 404 million people are below the poverty line. Creation of jobs and employment is of utmost importance to eradicate poverty.

I have always been a firm believer and advocate of liberalization and disinvestments. It is very disheartening to see that the pace of disinvestments has slowed down, and which is detriment to the growth of economy. With Dr. Manmohan Singh, the Prime Minister of the country and the architect of liberalization and disinvestments, along with Mr. P. Chidambaram, the Finance Minister, and Mr. Montek Singh, Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, the country couldn't have asked for more. However, may be due to constraints from their UPA partners they have not been as aggressive as they should have been in this budget to take full advantage of the favourable perception of the world towards India for investment. At times we have to rise above the constraints and to what is good for the country. I hope, during the course of the year more progressive decisions will be taken in the right direction. To attract FDI to the country we have to accelerate the development of infrastructure like highways, ports, airports to international standards. Another deterrent for the Foreign Investment is Labour Reforms and having a one-window clearance to cut down the time wasted in implementing various projects.

The Finance Minister in his speech mentioned that he would give special attention and concessions to those industries, which give maximum employment. Four industries mentioned by him are food processing, IT, manufacturing and textile. What he has overlooked is the tourism sector, which gives the maximum employment. It provides right now 17 million direct employments and 41 million indirect employments. It contributes 5.9 per cent to the GDP. The world tourism contributes 10.6% of the world GDP. It has direct employment of 200 million people. With the present contribution to the GDP taking the world percentage by 2015 India will provide 25 million more jobs. India right now has only 3.3 million tourists as compared to Thailand, which is 12.35 million, Singapore 7.8 million, China 42.0 million, Indonesia 5.3 million, and Dubai 5 million. India has a great growth potential in this sector. Surprisingly there has been no mention of this sector in the budget. India has only 92,000 rooms and requires another 90,000 rooms in the coming 5 years. It requires an investment of over 80,000 crores of rupees.

The tourism industry has not given a full infrastructure status as other industries, that is, ports, airports, highways, information technology and telecommunication, which have been given full status. The industry is deprived of various sections of income tax where money can be reinvested for new projects as well as amalgamations and mergers for the growth of the industry. To build such a huge infrastructure, it requires a lot of capital expenditure. All the industry wants is a level playing field with the infrastructure industries like IT. Tourism is growing and the occupancy is good, but we need huge investment to keep pace with the growth, which will not only provide huge employment but also generate over Rs. 50,000 crores annually in revenue. I would request the hon. Finance Minister to give the Tourism Industry full infrastructure status for a limited period of only 5 years. This will help the tourism industry to build more rooms, which is the need of the hour.

Now coming over to the tax structure for Indian companies, it is good that the level of taxation has been reduced from 35% to 30%. But on the other hand, surcharge has been raised from 2.5% to 10%. This has made the whole exercise futile as the rate of depreciation of plant and machinery has been reduced from 25% to 15%. This would mean that cumulative effect of this along with tax on perquisites will result into a total taxation on the profit varying from one industrial house to another between 39% to 42%. In this context, I would suggest that with 30% rate of taxation, surcharge at the previous rate of 2.5% be retained along with the previous depreciation rate.

Fringe benefits tax is, in reality, on the benefits arising to the employees. It is a covert form of disallowance of otherwise eligible deductible expenditure under the garb of fringe benefits tax. The fringe benefits tax, will be an additional cost, which an assessee is required to bear for doing business in India. The Indian economy is growing globally and large business houses need to incur expenditure for the globalization of their business. But imposing restrictions on the allowability of such expenditure in this form of tax would create an extremely negative impact on the economy and the same would also be deterrent to the growth of economy in general.

The taxation policy should be such that there is a least amount of harassment to a honest tax payer. The very fact that an income tax officer can harass the assessee under the garb of fringe benefits tax, will make

the whole system on this issue an Inspector Raj. It is for this reason that the tax on perquisites has to be re-looked.

With the acceptance of the above amendments, the direct tax collections will go down thereby increasing the deficit of Rs. 1,51,144 crore as stipulated in the budget. However, the increase in profitability by maintaining the depreciation rates as prevailing in the previous years by not reducing them and also maintaining the Surcharge at 2.5% will give enough profitability and taxable revenue which will cover the shortfall in the tax revenue. It would, however, not be difficult for the Government to bridge this gap further in case serious efforts are made to reduce Government spending particularly in the field of contingent expenditure. My suggestions are that the institution of audit should be strengthened so as to make annual audit of all the Ministries, Departments and institutions under the Central Government as mandatory. According to the present arrangements, the Pay & Accounts Officers function under the total of the heads of departments who are Chief Accounting officers. That does not leave much scope for honest and independent functions of the Pay & Accounts Officers. Accordingly, audit of the expenditure of the departments cannot be conducted in an appropriate manner.

It would, therefore, be desirable to evolve a mechanism, which would not impede the functioning of the Pay & Accounts Officers, so far as the audit element is concerned. In addition here are certain areas such as payment of overtime allowance to staff, expenditure on staff cars, telephones and stationery, which can be reduced substantially if proper scrutiny of accounts is conducted. For this purpose, the appointment of officers of proven integrity should be made as controlling officers for staff cars and in charge of internal audit units. These steps, I am sure, would go a long way in reducing contingent expenditure in Government offices. This is in tune with Dr. Manmohan Singh, the Prime Minister of India's directive to various Ministries of the Government of India to take care of audit objections on their working and to take steps to address them.

With these words, Sir, I support the Budget and hope that the hon. Finance Minister will give due consideration to my suggestions.

SHRI R.P. GOENKA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you. I stand here to support this Budget. I have a problem with which I would deal myself. After the eloquent speech of my colleague, Mr. Jairam Ramesh,

my speaking is difficult but I will try. It is a unique Budget. For many years, I have not seen or read a better Budget than this one. This is a 'dream Budget' if you wish to call it, that not a 'drum budget' as mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. Let us examine some of the features which this Budget brings out, I will deal first with the jobs and employment. The Budget will be unique in its impact on the rural sector which is the backbone of the economy. For the first time, the Budget has given such a high priority to employment generating development. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am addressing it to you, not to any other Member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not to the House?

SHRI R.P. GOENKA: To the House, if I address to you, Mr. Gentleman, the Chair would feel bad.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): I am giving full attention, Mr. Goenka, please go ahead.

SHRI R.P. GOENKA: That is his job whether to attack or to support; but I am supporting it. I will quote some of the numbers quoted by Dr. Joshi, that irrigation, to cover one crore hectares and it will create one crore jobs. Then he mentioned about the food processing industry, which will create 2.5 lakh jobs. Thirdly, textile industry will create 1.2 crore jobs. And IT industry will create 70 lakh jobs. Apart from these, there are other sectors like construction, tourism industry which will generate productive jobs to alleviate poverty. It is relevant that Food for Work Programme is rolled into the Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. If this creating of jobs mainly in the rural areas is not for *aam adami*, as mentioned by Dr. Joshi, then what is for *aam adami*?

और इसी के साथ उन्होंने कहा था कि dream करना या उम्मीद रखना सही बात नहीं है। मैं पूछता हूँ, आप उम्मीद नहीं रखेंगे तो आगे कैसे बढ़ेंगे?

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: वह सही बात थी। उम्मीद रखना सही है।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: आगे बढ़ना है तो उम्मीद करनी पड़ेगी। इसलिए आशावान बनिए, निराशावान नहीं।

श्री आरू पी गोयनका: अब देखिए, वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब पहले यहां बैठे थे, उम्मीद करते-करते वहां बैठ गए।

[17 March, 2005]

RAJYA SABHA

5.00 P.M.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): यह वाइस-चेयरमैन का धर्म-संकट है कि वह कुछ नहीं बोल पा रहे हैं।

श्री आर० पी० गोयनका: सर, आपका धर्म-संकट हमारा संकट नहीं है।
...(Interruptions)... Sir, then Mr. Jairam Ramesh mentioned about education and health care. It is basic knowledge that if the country has to progress, we must give adequate education and take care of health of our people so that they can be more creative and they can build a new India. This Budget has given ample proof of that. Sir, the Bharat Nirman programme, as mentioned by our President in his speech a few days ago, is basically for the infrastructure; where the infrastructure is going to the rural areas. The weakness of India is that we have not looked after the rural areas till today. Now we are going to look after. We are being criticised and we are not being liked because we are on the right path. Some of the people do not like us. The real focus, as I was saying, of this Budget is on infrastructure. If I recollect, Rs. 32,000 crores have been assigned to it. Never before, never before! This will speed up both rural and urban areas by bridging the gap that exists today. By the end of next year, every village will have telecom connectivity. Rural electrification has not been left out. In the next five years, we are going to connect 1.25 lakh villages. Sir, may I quote you, Sir? ...(Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): If whatever I have said is parliamentary. ...(Interruptions)...

AN HON. MEMBER: You can say 'previous speaker'.
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: He is from Gujarat. ...(Interruptions)... Mr. Trivedi, one of our colleagues, was very critical of National Highways Development Project. ...(Interruptions)... He is not sitting there. ...(Interruptions)... I would like to inform him that 5172 kms of roads have been four-laned. Investment will now be made on highways and also in North-Eastern Regions which was left unattended for many years and for which Sir, you would be sound also.,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Did Mr. Trivedi speak about highways. I would have to check up the record.

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: You missed the point in the last six years and you missed it even today. You did not mention about North Eastern Region at all. Sir, I get confused with double personalities.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Those who are Trivedis have got three personalities, "three Veds". They live in three different layers.

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: Sir, I don't wish to mention the third one. The time when you come and sit here I will call it Trivedi. The outlays on Highways would be 43 per cent higher than the previous year. It is Rs. 9320 crores. I refer to Dr. Joshi who said that for Agriculture, the Budget has not done justice. This is the way I understood him saying, specially to marginal farmers. Sir, I want to give you, and through you, to others. We are aware that agriculture has been one of the weak points in the economic organisations of the country. Mr. Jairam Ramesh mentioned that if agriculture moves up, we move up. As a result, farmers have not been getting the right price. What to do? We have taken care in this Budget so that they can know and anticipate and do forward trading. The new scheme introduced in the Budget will help organise marketing agricultural produce. Sir, Mr. Jairam Ramesh is my hero in this House.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, Indian agriculture should be free from the vagaries of monsoon and this is point which Jairam Ramesh mentioned. For that we are giving total emphasis on agriculture so that more and more land could be irrigated by different sections of the society. The second thing which we can do for agriculture is to diversify the agricultural produce like floriculture, fruits, vegetables, dairy, poultry, organic farming, etc., so that the farmer can get a higher price for his produce. If this is not forward-looking, Mr. Trivedi, what is forward-looking? At the same time, 35 per cent of our agricultural produce is wasted or unutilised, either not being consumed by human beings or failing to be exported. What we need today is cold storage facilities, transportation by air-conditioned wagons, trucks, etc. And this Budget has done justice on that side.

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: It looks that the intention is 'looking-forward', but the actual figures say that it is 'going backward.' I was quoting only the actual figures. I would be very happy if it goes forward because India is my country too.

[17 March, 2005]

RAJYA SABHA

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: While speaking, you called yourself an economist

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: I did not say that.

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: You did say that.

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: No. I did not say that. I am nowhere near that. But, I would like to be. I only said that I want to learn from Mr. Jairam Ramesh.

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: Okay. You learn from him. You have a good teacher in him.

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: He is a lovely teacher...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: But, please, listen to me...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: He has not presented this Budget. Otherwise, it would have been a much better Budget than what it is. I am positive on that.

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: If a Budget is not for the one year to come, then what is it? Is it one year backward? And, one year ahead is not forward looking?

Then, Sir, our export, at this moment, is 12 per cent. In other words, it is 1.5 per cent of the total world trade. Or, US \$ 75 billion, hopefully, by the end of March. We want to double it in the next five years. This Budget has given some incentives.

The next point is on tax reforms. Our reforms relate to taxes. The hon. Finance Minister has offered a good deal on personal income-tax. Up to the income of Rs. 10 lakhs—it is basically for the common people—he has given relief. Of course, he has also given some relief to the corporate sector. He brought down the tax rate from 35 per cent to 30 per cent. He gave some depreciation benefit, but surcharge has been increased and the net effect would be between 32 and 33 per cent.

We want to provide international standards in our country. We want to have another Shanghai here. How do we do that? Sir, Mumbai is one city where we are going to have facilities of international standard. The R.B.I. is giving incentives for foreign investment. In due course, Mumbai would become another Shanghai.

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI: Why cannot Shanghai copy one of our cities?

SHRI R.P. GOENKA: Sir, they have not to copy. They have to go hundreds of miles further up in their own country. They will find equal villages, equal standard villages, or even worse. So don't go by one Shanghai. (*Interruptions*) No; no, I am going to one city. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. (*Interruptions*) इनको बोलने दीजिए, त्रिवेदी जी, इतने सीनियर मैम्बर हैं।

SHRI R.P. GOENKA: The Finance Minister has rightly underlined what is important is not the outlays as the outcomes, which Late L.K. Jha, the economist, quoted. (*Interruptions*) I find people are getting a little impatient. I would like to end after making two small points. One, the future is full of opportunities and challenges. With a collective force of the partners of the UPA, it should be possible to meet these challenges and make it possible that India becomes a Developed Country by the year 2020. Two days ago, I was reading a book. With our permission, I would like to quote two lines of that book, with one or two alternations to suit the Indian conditions. This is a book on President Chen, who is the President of Taiwan. The amended quote reads like this, "The UPA partners are going ahead with their Common Minimum Programme, leaving the position of day-to-day political issues, while they—means you people—remain fixated on the last elections." Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, I have to inform you that it has been decided that the general discussion on the Budget, 2005-2006, has to be completed by tomorrow, that is, 18th March, 2005. The hon. Minister of Finance will also reply to the debate. We are sitting up to 6'o clock. All those who are present, they will have to speak; otherwise, they will lose their chance. Shri Lalitbhai Mehta, would you like to speak?

SHRI LALITBHAI MEHTA: Tomorrow, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The BAC has decided that the debate has to be completed by tomorrow, thereafter reply has to be given. If all Members say that they will speak tomorrow...(*Interruptions*) You can speak tomorrow if time is available. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LALITBHAI MEHTA: Sir, I came just at 4.30 p.m. I was told that my turn is tomorrow. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is nothing like 'turn'. Till the House sits, we cannot say when the turn will come. All the Members who have given their names, they have to be present here. They should remain prepared. One or two requests can be accommodated. But I see that most of the Members are saying that they will speak tomorrow. And, we have not decided earlier that there would be discussion on Budget on 18th March. Tomorrow happens to be Friday. But the Private Members Business has been shifted. That is how we are completing the discussion on the Budget tomorrow.

SHRI LALITBHAI MEHTA: Sir, I would just like to submit that when I came over here in the House. I enquired from the Secretariat people about my turn, they told me that my turn is tomorrow. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you can speak today. You are ready. You came with....(*Interruptions*)

SHR LALITBHAI MEHTA: Sir, I will speak tomorrow.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to begin my comments with a quotation from the hon. Finance Minister's interview to the media. The words may not be exact, but this is what he generally said. "I do not deliver, it is the States, Ministries, and Departments who do so." I think that is generally correct. I also feel that a discussion of the Budget should not really be like we gave to much money here or we gave so much there. It is a question of which way the country is going.

The big debate today is about development in the two systems of India and China. At the present showing, China is categorised as a nation, a State and a Government where there is no democracy whereas India is a total democracy. Both are trying to advance. Both started, approximately, at the same time. But due to certain reasons, perhaps historical, China is, at present, much ahead of us though people do say that in the long-term India will, possibly, catch up and go beyond it, but that is to be seen.

A Budget, in any case, is a statement for the next year. As Shri R.P. Goenka just now mentioned, here is one of the disconnects that we are faced with on this one day. While in his Budget Speech, the hon. Finance Minister lays out the course of action, that is, the roadmap for the next one year within the scheme of the Five Year Plan, how he is allotting the

moneys for the States, this House, by a lot of private study, can have an accounting of what happened to the money which was allotted last year. You go through the reports of the various Ministries, you go through the various other papers placed on the Table of the House. Even the reports of the Ministries, generally, give accounting in financial terms. They do not give you the actual targets achieved. So, when the Finance Minister says that this year for the highway programme we have allotted so many thousand crores of rupees, in terms of physical targets, what does it translate into? How much has been covered last year, we do not know. So, in that sense, you take this to be an Annual General Meeting of India Incorporated, in which the Board of Directors are the Cabinet, the hon. Finance Minister is the Chief Financial Officer, we the Members of Parliament are the representatives of the shareholders, who are the people of India. So, this is one stage where some mechanism must be devised, where on this one day or over a period, we should know what has happened to our money, which was spent last year. It is as simple as that.

For this year, of course, the Finance Minister has laid out the Budget. The Budget has been generally, very favourably received by all the external indicators. The stock market has gone up. Foreign Institutional Investment is coming in. There is not much Foreign Direct Investment, but Foreign Institutional Investment is coming in. Foreign Exchange reserves are climbing up. These are the concrete indicators, and so far, all the indicators are favourable. But, we do not know, as yet, what the actual effect will be of the moneys that are to be spent allotted for this year, and how much we will be achieving of those targets this year.

Now, the Finance Minister said a very crucial thing, "I do not deliver, it is the States, Ministries and Departments which do so." So, the next issue I would like to place, through you before the House, Sir, is how effective our States are. It is our money. The Twelfth Finance Commission has said that 30 per cent of the Central taxes, I think it is 30.3 per cent, should go to the States. How are they spending it? There is a tendency on the part of States that when funds are allotted to States for certain Central projects, they say that you given us all the Central projects. It is find. There is nothing wrong with it. It is their money, as has been said by Shri Vijayaraghavan. And, it is going back to them. No one is doing any favour. But the fact is, should we not know what accounting is done; what targets have been met? I am afraid that there is some communication gap there

As least, the public do not know whether the money was spent or the targets achieved. So, there should be some method by which we should be able to know that what amounts have been spent on the targets achieved. Sir, the Finance Minister has to work within the resources available. What are the resources available to him? This point has been made and the answer is very simple. They are from taxes. He can widen the tax base as much as he likes to, but there is a limit, because, ultimately, your tax base is restricted, due to political compulsions. I must say, to the salaried class and the corporate class. On the one hand, when you say 70 per cent of our people are engaged in agriculture, and, I think, 25 per cent of our GDP comes from agriculture, such a big section of people, and 25 per cent of our GDP comes from agriculture. It is to say, therefore, that 25 per cent of the GDP, the people who are contributing to it, do not pay taxes. It is as simple as that. You cannot do it, is a different issue because there are political compulsions. But the fact is that every Finance Minister of this country, be it the present one, previous one and future ones, will be placed in an absolutely impossible position and within that he will have to juggle figures as best as he can. Increase a few taxes here, decrease a few taxes there and hope he will get the money. Then, he has to go in for borrowing. The more he borrows, the more is the fiscal deficit, figures of which are given here, I will not go into it. You all have read it, but, I think this is a problem which, perhaps, is insurmountable, to a person, who has an average understanding. Because it is a vicious circle and catch-22 situation, the majority of the people are not paying taxes, the minority of the people are being taxed at various levels, upper level, lower level and middle level. But it is this tax base you are digging deeper and deeper, you cannot widen it. Now, what answer do we find to this? I do not know. The other resource to which he can do something is Non-Performing Assets. There has been, I think Shri Jairam Ramesh has said it, no frontal attack on the Non-Performing Assets. He was kind enough to loan me a copy of the All-India Bank Employees' Association book, and the figures are quite staggering, of course. Can this be taken out of the coils of litigation? Because this very Government has promulgated with retrospect effective, an Ordinance to ensure that money is recovered. I do not see why this Government cannot take similar action to recover these Non-Performing Assets. It is something that occurs to me. If the Government can find ways of doing it, there is almost a thousand crores available for taking up various projects. The other thing, is of crores, black economy, black money, parallel economy, which by some accounts is 40 per cent of our GDP.

Sir, unless the Government takes active steps to whiten this black money and put it into legitimate circulation, the Finance Minister's job will be an impossible one. And, this goes beyond the scope of the Finance Minister into other Departments of our country to see that this is taken out. Here, I would strongly urge, through you, Sir, the House to pay particular attention to what Mr. Jairam Ramesh quoted in that newspaper cutting, 'The Menace of Havala'. It is not only effecting out economy, but, through our economy, it is also effecting our security. It is one of the primary channels for creating black money, for funding anti-national activities. So, the 'Havala' has to be controlled. The Finance Ministry has a large role to play in it. But, there are other Ministries also.

Then, Sir, I say that this Budget and also the previous Budgets are for the poor. Now the problem is, it is very difficult to discover who are the poor. Because we witness numerous debates in this very House on the issue of 'below poverty line', 'above poverty line', and whether we like it or not, the fact of the matter is that poor for whom all these benefits are given have to be categorised, have to be classified, and at the grassroots level, which is why I mentioned the States, determination of who the poor are, is totally influenced by local politics, local caste conditions and other such factors. So, until the Government, which is doing its best to provide resources for uplifting the poor, gets these mechanisms properly established, I am afraid the water will keep pouring into the sand and the sand will absorb any amount of water that you pour into it. The money that you are spending is not really reaching its objective.

Then, Sir, recently, in the Employees' Provident Fund, an interest of nine per cent was agreed to by the Government. It was due to political compulsions; they are there; you can't avoid it. But, then, Sir, may I also demand through you, of the hon. the Finance Minister and the Government that savings of pensioners must be adequately reimbursed? You have created a scheme for senior citizens where you are paying nine per cent interest. On the same analogy—if you can spend money to provide additional one per cent interest to a very powerful political group—will you, as a matter of social justice, provide, at least, one per cent more interest to a group which is larger than all these people but has no political power, i.e., the senior citizens? Will you provide them ten per cent on this? I leave it to the Government to consider this because, I think, if the Government has to have a human face, it must consider all these factors.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to talk on Defence. Defence, Sir, as you know, in the present environment of peace,—peace with Pakistan, talks with China; excellent—is not really a very respectable subject to talk about at present. People try to sweep it under the carpet. They provide money more or less quietly. But the fact of the matter is that war and peace are cyclical features. I have had the honour, Sir,—it is a great honour to wear this country's uniform—to participate in four conflicts—one under the Prime-Ministership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, one under the prime-ministership of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, one under the prime-ministership of Madam Indira Gandhi, and the last one, a proxy war, under the prime-ministership of late Narashimha Rao.

Sir, the first conflict came in the early days of our Independence, in the background of "Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai". Under similar sort of circumstances, when there was peace, the attitude was, why spend on Defence? Of course, in addition, there were certain attitudes towards defence. We were totally unprepared. The Chinese, Sir, with whom we are having peaceful relations, gave us such a slap on the face in 1962 that we have not yet recovered psychologically from its impact, and our dealings with China are still governed by the memories of that slap on the face. It has been a mortal blow to the nation.

After 1962, there was a tremendous hurry to 'buy this', 'get that', and 'get the other'. There would have been a 'Tehelka' then also, I am sure. There could have been a CIG report then also. But they got what they wanted; prices were jacked up. When the next war came within three years, under Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, the nation was a little better prepared. Again, between 1965 and 1971, for six years there was comparative peace; there was tension with Pakistan, but preparations continued. Defence was not given a go-by. In 1971, under the leadership of that incomparable Prime Minister we had, Madam Indira Gandhi, we established history. I think, that one episode of Bangladesh has overcome the trauma of 1962.

Then, the fourth war, under late Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, was not a war; it was a proxy war. People were getting killed, but it was a proxy war. Liberalisation had come. Defence was, again, a dirty word. It was unfashionable; it was almost politically incorrect to mention Defence. You put in your demands, they listened to you, they patted you on your back, 'अच्छा मिलेगा, ठहर जाओ' Nothing came. That carried on and on and on and

we had Kargil. Again, Sir, now the same cycle is repeating. We are at peace; we look forward to a better world and say the twenty-first century would be a century of peace. Yet, let it be so. But, Sir, in times of good health, as we are now, if you don't pay your life insurance, when there is an emergency, God forbid, we would be in trouble.

When we speak on Defence, it is a large budget. But I think, we should not adopt the mentality now that we must cut down on Defence totally. We must maintain an even expenditure and an even balance so that if the next incident occurs—it may not occur for 50 years—let us not be found unprepared.

How can we contribute to this huge Defence budget being spent? We could do one thing, which we should do and are not doing, and that is, to indigenise. We have got plenty of talent, we have got plenty of capability, and if we have to spend this money, let us spend it in the country. That is one thing we should focus on.

Sir, that is all I wish to say for today in this discussion on the Budget. I just put across certain thoughts I had and I hope, some answer will be found to this. Thank you.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा (राजस्थान): उपसभापति जी, वित्त मंत्री जी ने वर्ष 2005-2006 का बजट लोक सभा में पेश किया है। इस बजट की जितनी प्रशंसा की जाए, उतनी कम है, क्योंकि वित्त मंत्री जी ने यह एक अनोखा बजट पेश किया है। यदि हम यह कहें कि यह एक सर्व-संतुष्टिकारी बजट है, तो इसमें कोई अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी। जब यह सेशन प्रारम्भ हुआ तो उस समय देश के राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में, भारत निर्माण का एक नाम दिया था। यह भारत निर्माण करने के लिए वित्त मंत्री जी के अपने फाइनेंस बजट के अंदर जो योजना बनाई है, वह ग्रामीण भारत को एक नया स्वरूप देने के लिए है। यह नया स्वरूप भी ग्राम पंचायतों को मजबूत करने के लिए है तथा इस बजट में इस ओर देखा गया है। वित्त मंत्री जी के ऊपर कई प्रकार के दबाव होंगे, लेकिन वे अपने उदारवाद के रास्ते पर अडिग रहे, उससे हटे नहीं। भारत निर्माण का लक्ष्य यू०पी०ए० गवर्नमेंट का है। भारती निर्माण के इस लक्ष्य में शेष एक करोड़ हेक्टेयर भूमि को सिंचित क्षेत्र के अंदर लाना है। सभी गांवों में, जिनकी आबादी एक हजार है, पहाड़ी और जनजाति क्षेत्रों में पांच सौ है, उन्हें सड़कों से जोड़ना, गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले लोगों के लिए 60 लाख अतिरिक्त घरों का निर्माण करना, पेय जल की सुविधा से वंचित शेष 74,000 बस्तियों को पेयजल मुहैया कराना, शेष 1,25,000 गांवों में बिजली पहुंचाना, 2.3 करोड़ परिवारों को बिजली के कनेक्शन देना, शेष 66,822 गांवों को टेलीफोन की सुविधा प्रदान करना, भारत निर्माण के नाम से यू०पी०ए० गवर्नमेंट

का यह लक्ष्य है। इस बजट की मुख्य विशेषता है कि इसमें गांव में शिक्षा और स्वास्थ्य पर विशेष महत्व दिया गया है। 2005-06 के बजट का अनुमान 172,500 करोड़ रुपए का है, परंतु बजट में 143,497 करोड़ आयोजना व्यय दिखाया गया है। 29,003 करोड़ रुपए की शेष राशि राज्य सरकारों द्वारा भारत वित्त आयोग की सिफारिश के अनुसार सीधे ऋण के रूप में जुटाई जाएगी। इस बजट का घाटा 95,000 करोड़ रुपए का दिखाया गया है। इस बजट में जो आवंटन किया गया है, ग्रामीण विकास योजनाओं पर 18,334 करोड़ रुपए, शिक्षा पर आवंटन 18,337 करोड़ रुपए, जो गरीब किसान को उर्वरक के लिए सब्सिडी दी जाती है, उस सब्सिडी को वापस कायम रखा है, इस पर 16,254 करोड़ की मद होगी। विशेषकर पहली बार स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण पर इतना बड़ा व्यय इस बजट में रखा गया है। इस पर 10,280 करोड़ रुपए हैं। वित्त मंत्री जी ने राष्ट्रीय रोजगार ग्रामीण स्कीम को नया स्वरूप दिया है। रोजगार के क्षेत्र में मंत्री जी ने बहुत अच्छे प्रावधान की कोशिश की है। इसलिए मैं मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं। हर व्यक्ति के सौ दिन के...। उपसभापति महोदय, हर व्यक्ति को 100 दिन के रोजगार की गारंटी का प्रावधान इस योजना के तहत किया गया है। NDA गवर्नमेंट ने एक करोड़ लोगों को रोजगार देने का वायदा किया था, लेकिन वह भी एक आदमी को रोजगार नहीं दे पाई इस स्कीम से, इस नयी योजना से लोगों को 100 दिन के रोजगार की गारंटी का जो वायदा किया गया है, वह अवश्य पूरा होगा। वित्त मंत्री जी ने इस योजना के माध्यम से ग्रामीण लोगों को रोजगार देने का प्रावधान किया है।

उपसभापति महोदय, नवंबर, 2004 में “काम के बदले अनाज योजना”, नामक राष्ट्रीय कार्यक्रम शुरू किया गया था। चालू वित्त में इस पर 4,020 रुपये का व्यय होने का अनुमान है। वर्ष 2005-06 के लिए यह अनुमान 5,400 करोड़ रुपए है। खाद्यान्न के तौर पर 50 लाख मीट्रिक टन अनाज का प्रावधान है। इस तरह कुल मिलाकर इस योजना के ऊपर 11,000 करोड़ रुपए व्यय होने का अनुमान है। सरकार इस कार्यक्रम को राष्ट्रीय रोजगार गारंटी योजना में परिधर्तित करने वाली है।

श्री उपसभापति: मीणा जी, अभी कांग्रेस के 10 स्पीकर्स बाकी हैं। वे आपकी ही पार्टी के हैं, जरा समय का ध्यान रखिए।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: उपसभापति जी, इस स्कीम से करोड़ों गरीब परिवारों को आजीविका प्राप्त होगी।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): इसलिए मैंने डिस्टर्ब नहीं किया।

श्री उपसभापति: बहुत अच्छा किया आपने।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : एक करोड़ का प्रावधान किया, तो क्या एक भी रोजगार नहीं दिया?

श्री उपसभापति: आप बैठिए। आपने डिस्टर्ब नहीं किया, इसके लिए मैंने आपको बधाई दी है और आप बोल रहे हैं।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: उपसभापति महोदय, इस बजट की सबसे बड़ी खासियत यह है कि आगामी वित्त वर्ष में शिक्षा और स्वास्थ्य की मद में सरकारी व्यय बढ़ाया गया है, मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ। सर्व शिक्षा अभियान के लिए वर्ष 2004-05 के मुकाबले करीब 1,700 करोड़ रुपए की बढ़ोतरी की गई है। इसके अलावा प्राथमिक शिक्षा कोष के नाम से एक नयी सहायता का एलान सरकार ने किया है। स्वास्थ्य के लिए AIIMS जैसे 6 नए चिकित्सा संस्थान खोलने का प्रावधान किया गया है। इसी के साथ राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण स्वास्थ्य मिशन के नाम से एक महत्वाकांक्षी कार्यक्रम पेश किया गया है। भारत दुनिया के उन देशों में से है, जहां स्वास्थ्य की मद में सरकारी खर्च बहुत कम होता है और प्राथमिक स्वास्थ्य केन्द्रों पर सबसे कम ध्यान दिया जाता है। इस लिहाज से राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण स्वास्थ्य मिशन, इस बजट की एक सराहनीय पहल है।

उपसभापति महोदय, मैं एक ऐसे राज्य से आता हूँ, जहां पर पीने के पानी का भंयकर संकट रहता है। इस बजट में पेयजल योजना के लिए पिछले साल के 3,330 करोड़ रुपए के मुकाबले, 4,750 करोड़ रुपए की व्यवस्था की गई है। यह राजस्थान और गुजरात जैसे राज्यों के लिए अच्छी खुशखबरी है। पीने के पानी के अभाव से जूझ रहे इन राज्यों में राजीव गांधी पेयजल मिशन के तहत, प्राथमिकता के आधार पर पानी पहुंचाया जाएगा। इसलिए इस बजट में चालू वित्तीय वर्ष की तुलना में इसे बढ़ाया गया है। इससे 31355 गाँवों को पेयजल योजना में जोड़ा गया है। पहले राजस्थान, गुजरात और दूसरे राज्य, जैसे - आन्ध्र प्रदेश, कर्नाटक, पश्चिम बंगाल, कई गाँवों के अन्दर करीब 2.96 लाख गाँवों के अन्दर 2.96 लाख गाँवों में पेयजल की गुणवत्ता को सुधारने पर जोर दिया जाएगा। आशा है कि राजस्थान जैसे राज्य में इस योजना के पूर्ण होने पर पीने के पानी का संकट मिट जाएगा।

दूसरी बात सर्व शिक्षा अभियान के तहत सभी बच्चों को बुनियादी शिक्षा मिले, इसलिए 2004-05 के बजट की बजाय इस बजट में बढ़ोतरी की गई है। 2004-05 के बजट में 3057 करोड़ रुपए का आवंटन किया गया था, इस वर्ष 1700 करोड़ रुपए की बढ़ोतरी की गई है, और 4754 करोड़ रुपए का अनुमान किया गया है। इसलिए आज गाँवों में शिक्षा का जो अभाव था, इस बजट से लगता है कि वह पूरा होगा और गाँवों के लोगों में शिक्षा के प्रचार-प्रसार के लिए इस बजट के अन्दर वित्त मंत्री जी ने ध्यान दिया है। साथ ही बच्चों को मिड-डे, मध्याह्न भोजन स्कीम, एक अच्छी स्कीम सरकार ने चलाई। इस स्कीम के तहत 11 करोड़ बच्चे शामिल किए गए हैं। 2004-05 के आवंटन में 1675 करोड़ रुपया था, इसे बढ़ा कर 2005-06 के लिए 3010 करोड़ रुपया किया गया है, इसकी बढ़ोतरी 1345 करोड़ रुपया है।

उपसभापति महोदय, भारत एक कृषि-प्रधान देश है। यहाँ टू-थर्ड मेजोरिटी से ज्यादा लोग कृषि पर आधारित हैं। कृषि के ऊपर इस बजट के अन्दर मैं मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि कृषि की ओर, जनसंख्या के आधार को देखते हुए जितना बजट रखना चाहिए, जितना एलोकेशन करना चाहिए, उतना आप नहीं रख पाए हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Meenaji, please conclude. One more speaker is there. Prof. Soz is waiting.

मैं बहुत जल्द खत्म करने की कोशिश करूँगा। बागवानी मिशन के ऊपर कृषि के अन्दर आपने 630 करोड़ रुपए का प्रावधान किया। पिछले बजट की बजाय इस पर विशेष ध्यान दिया गया है।

मैं दलित और आदिवासी की बात पर आता हूँ। उपसभापति महोदय, मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि पूरे बजट का अनुमान 172500 करोड़ रुपया है, उसमें शैड्यूलड कास्ट, शैड्यूलड ट्राइब की इस देश के अन्दर जनसंख्या 25 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा है, इसके बाद भी उनकी विभिन्न स्कीमों में आपने 6000 करोड़ रुपया खर्च करने का प्रावधान किया है, यह बहुत कम है। यह 6 हजार करोड़ रुपए बहुत कम है। वित्त मंत्री जी हम जानते हैं कि इस देश के शैड्यूलड कास्ट, शैड्यूलड ट्राइब के लोगों के साथ आपकी भावनाएं जुड़ी हैं। आप उनको चाहते हैं, लेकिन इस बजट के अंदर उनकी स्कीमों को देखते हुए प्रावधान बहुत कम है। इस प्रावधान को बढ़ाया जाए।

आपने एक नयी स्कीम शैड्यूलड कास्ट, शैड्यूलड ट्राइब के छात्रों के लिए राजीव गांधी फेलोशिप के नाम से प्रारंभ की है। आपने कहा है कि सरकार अनुसूचित जाति, जनजाति के छात्रों के लिए राजीव गांधी राष्ट्रीय फेलोशिप शुरू करेगी। महोदय, वर्ष 2005-06 के बजट भाषण में वित्त मंत्री जी ने यह घोषणा की है। उन्होंने बताया है कि अनुसूचित जाति, जनजाति के छात्रों के लिए देश के चुनिंदा विश्वविद्यालयों में एमएफिल/पीएचडी पाठ्यक्रम को पूरा करने के लिए राजीव गांधी राष्ट्रीय फेलोशिप शुरू की जाएगी। विश्व विद्यालय अनुदान आयोग ऐसे छात्रों को वर्ष 2005-06 से हर साल 2 हजार फेलोशिप प्रदान करने के लिए निधि उपलब्ध कराएगा। केन्द्रीय योजना के तहत अनुसूचित जाति, जनजाति के छात्रों के लिए चल रही तीन छात्रवृत्ति योजनाओं को सरकार जारी रखेगी। महोदय, अतिरिक्त प्रोत्साहन के रूप में एक नयी योजना का प्रस्ताव रखा गया है जिसके अंतर्गत उत्कृष्ट संस्थाओं की सूची अधिसूचित की जाएगी। जो अनुसूचित जाति, जनजाति का छात्र उन संस्थाओं में प्रवेश पाएगा, उसको छात्रवृत्ति प्रदान की जाएगी। इस योजना को शैड्यूलड कास्ट, शैड्यूलड ट्राइब के लिए प्रारंभ करने पर मैं वित्त मंत्री जी को बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि ऐसी योजनाओं से शैड्यूलड कास्ट, शैड्यूलड ट्राइब का गरीब छात्र अपना शिक्षण शुल्क, रहन-सहन का खर्च और पुस्तकों व कम्प्यूटर खर्च की आवश्यकताओं को पूरा कर

पाएगा। आपने अपने बजट भाषण में कहा है कि इस योजना के लिए 6,253 करोड़ रुपए का आवंटन किया जाएगा।

वित्त मंत्री जी ने अपने बजट भाषण में गरीबी उन्मूलन के लिए अंत्योदय योजना प्रारंभ की है।

श्री उपसभापति: अब सारी योजनाओं पर आप ही बोल देंगे, दूसरों को भी बोलने दीजिए।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: अंत्योदय योजना में 2 करोड़ परिवारों को लाभान्वित करने के पिछले साल के लक्ष्य को बढ़ाकर इस बजट में 2.5 करोड़ किया गया है। ऐसा गरीब लोगों को गरीबी से छुटकारा देने के लिए किया गया है। वित्त मंत्री जी यह गरीबों को गरीबी रेखा से ऊपर उठाने की आपकी अच्छी सोच को दर्शाता है। इससे गरीबों को लाभ देने वाले इस बजट को पढ़ने के बाद इसकी बुराई करने वाले भी शर्मिदा हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: आपने 10 मिनट के बजाय 25 मिनट ले लिए। अब आप कंकलूड कीजिए। You are encroaching upon the time of other members of your party.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: सर, दो मिनट और चाहूंगा।

श्री उपसभापति: मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, मगर आप दूसरों के टाइम का भी खयाल रखें।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: महोदय, अब मैं वित्त मंत्री से कुछ क्लैरिफिकेशंस पूछकर अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा। मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे मेरे इन सवालों का उत्तर अपने जवाब में शामिल करें। मेरा पहला question यह है कि आप ने tax exemption limit को बढ़ाकर 1 लाख कर दिया है। अब question यह पैदा होता है कि वे कौनसी savings schemes हैं जिनमें निवेश करने पर हमें कर छूट का लाभ मिलेगा? क्या अब हमें बैंकों और अन्य जगहों पर जमा राशि को अपनी income में जोड़ना होगा। यदि इस तरह से हम पर अतिरिक्त टैक्स बनता है तो क्या हमें उसे चुकाना होगा? एक तो यह बात स्पष्ट कर दें। एक तो यह स्पष्ट कर दें... (व्यवधान)... दूसरा मेरा यह क्वेश्चन और भी है कि बैंकों में एक दिन में दस हजार से ज्यादा रकम निकालने पर 0.1 प्रतिशत टैक्स लगेगा। सर, मैं इस बात को ओपोज करता हूँ। आपको इसे विद्वाँ करना चाहिए, क्योंकि यह गलत है। इससे एटीएम, ड्राफ्ट और एफडी/आरडी के ट्रीटमेंट पर क्या होगा? बीयरर चैक को कैश कराने की स्थिति में क्या होगा? तो इससे कई भ्रान्तियाँ पैदा होती हैं। कहीं आप टैक्स लगा रहे हैं, लेकिन कई लोग पैसा जमा करते हैं और उनसे टैक्स नहीं मिल रहा है। इसलिए आप इसको विद्वाँ कर लें, तो अच्छा होगा।(व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति: मीणा जी, यह आपको पहले कहना था(व्यवधान)

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: सर दो मिनट ... (व्यवधान) कर्मचारियों को दी जाने वाली सुविधाओं पर 30 प्रतिशत का फ्रिंज बेनिफिट टैक्स लगाया है(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then again, he will speak for another half an hour tomorrow ..(*Interruptions*).... that I will not do it.(*Interruptions*)...

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: बस खत्म करूंगा सर....(*व्यवधान*)...सर, मेरा लास्ट प्वायंट है। आजकल नकली नोट पाकिस्तान, नेपाल और मुम्बई से बड़ें पैमाने पर देश के अन्दर आ रहे हैं। वित्त मंत्री जी, इसको रोकने के संबंध में आपका क्या विचार है, आपकी क्या योजनाएँ हैं? साथ ही, आधुनिक टेक्नोलॉजी से बने हुए प्लास्टिक के नोट विश्व में चलते हैं। क्या आप भी भारत में चलाएंगे? इसका जवाब आप अपने भाषण में दें। इसी के साथ जो सर्व-संतुष्टि बजट है, इसका मैं तहे दिल से समर्थन करता हूँ। जय हिन्द।

श्री उपसभापति: आप कितना समय लेंगे, मिस्टर सोज़....(*व्यवधान*)

† प्रो॰ सैफुद्दीन सोज़ (जम्मू और कश्मीर): 15 मिनट, सर!....(*व्यवधान*)

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: ۱۵ منٹ، سر۔ مداخلت

श्री उपसभापति: 15 मिनट नहीं....(*व्यवधान*)... 10 minutes. Mr. Saif-ud-din Soz, only 10 minutes.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: In fact, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will take only ten minutes. I am actually acceding to the request of my colleague that I must speak... (*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You straightaway come to the point, don't repeat whatever is said.... (*Interruptions*)...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I devote those ten minutes to Jammu and Kashmir, but about the Budget, whatever my friend Mr. Meena was speaking, I support it. It is a good Budget; it is poor people's Budget. This Budget has focussed attention on rural sector and agriculture, I welcome this Budget... (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, to you and to this House including Mr. Jairam Ramesh...(*Interruptions*)... If you don't want me to have cap on my head.... (*Interruptions*)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बोलिए। आपके 10 मिनट इसमें चले जाएंगे।

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Anyway, Sir, I appreciate the Budget of the hon. Finance Minister who will reply to the debate on Budget that he

† Transliteration of Urdu Script.

6.00 P.M.

and his colleagues are turning their attention to Kashmir, more sincerely with a sense of responsibility. I want to tell this august House that for the first time after 15 years of militancy, and I want Mr. Jairam Ramesh to give pointed attention to what I say, as an economist, in his own right. I want to tell this august House that in 15 years, for the first time, economic factor has become very relevant in Kashmir. In the morning, in the Question Hour, there was a hue and cry over the same issue. I must say, I see a changed vision even among extremists. A majority of the people in Jammu and Kashmir now feel that violence, as an instrument for settling political issues, must be given up. And, people are returning to a life of peace and dignity. And it is the general feeling of the people that Jammu and Kashmir has acceded to India irrevocably. And, now, I feel, economic factor is very important. Therefore, I want the hon. Finance Minister to turn his attention to the State of Jammu and Kashmir and select areas for very vigorous doze of development so that that State marks a take-off. It is a rich State. It has so many resources, which should be tapped. This can be done if proper investments are there. If we do development in a State in a lopsided manner, not doing everything in every sector, that State will continue to remain a backward State. So, before I say what those sectors are, I want to express my gratitude to the hon. Prime Minister for having constituted a Council, an Advisory Council on Economic Affairs, for him. That Council will help the hon. Prime Minister. I saw it in the Press; a very competent Economist, Dr. C. Rangarajan, has been made the Chairman of the Council. There will be a Task Force also. That Council will look after all the States. But I would appeal to that Council—I have met the Chairman also—that the State of Jammu and Kashmir must receive a pointed attention as, I must say, economic factor has become very important today.

So, having said this, I would now bring those six factors to the notice of the hon. Minister of State for Finance. The first is power generation. Most of the time that State lives in darkness. I will not go into the details; wherever I feel I have to say something, I will say. Our waters are running wastefully to Pakistan. We have capacity to produce 20,000 MW of electricity. But as of now, we just have 600 MW of electricity. Why I say, 'pointed attention' to these sectors is, we need electricity for the rest of India.

The second sector is development of infrastructure. Give us good roads and give us good rail. We don't have an all-weather road there. And, you saw what happened in Kashmir recently. The Jawahar Tunnel between

Jammu and Srinagar was closed for a month at a stretch. There was no air service, and the train does not move. I said it earlier in a discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address that rail development was not taking place. Today also, I wanted to say certain things to Laluji. But it was at the fag end of the day; he had closed his speech. I want to raise this question through you, to the Government of India, that for more than 25 years, we have not moved rail from Jammu to Udhampur. Now, for eight months, they are waiting for inauguration of that train. The railway line between Jammu and Udhampur should be opened. But the rail should go to Kashmir. Kashmir should not be allowed to live in isolation. Emotional integration with Kashmir is there. But I say, physical measures should be taken to integrate that State fully, and it cannot happen if you don't give a rail link to Kashmir. And, I am sorry to say that we are not doing many things that we could do. We don't give vigorous attention to this problem. It was the commitment of the Governments of Mr. Deve Gowda and Mr. Gujaral that they would start a train from Udhampur to Qazigund, then, to Baramulla. Plaques were laid. Foundation stones are there. And, in fact, one of the two former Prime Ministers had told me that I was making him commit a mistake, and that he might not live up to my expectations; it needed a lot of funds. I had suggested, "You just consider whether you want Kashmir on the railway map or not". So, those foundation stones are there. The rail does not move. Do you know what they wanted to do? Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is not a question for the Railway Ministry because the Railways will give Rs. 100 crores or Rs. 200 crores, but then, in our lifetime, no railway line will not go to Kashmir at all. I had put a question to Mr. Nitish Kumar. He had said, "By 2007, we shall take the train to Kashmir". I made an observation that he could not make it even by 2015, and that he was misleading this House. This is on record. He took ten minutes to answer my question. But it was just, what we call in Urdu, *herapheri*. He did not come to the point. I raise the point for the Finance Minister of India. You should have rail development in Kashmir through a corporation, as you did in Goa, the Konkan Railways, where you had a corporation there and you gave that corporation Rs. 5,000 crores, Rs. 6,000 crores to start its business; then, they built it. (*Interruptions*) So, you should have a corporation, say, the Kashmir Rail Development Corporation. And, determine in consultation with economists, including Mr. Jairam Ramesh, including Dr. C. Rangarajan. Whatever money is required, give that money out of the General Budget. And, in one go, that money should be available to the corporation. Otherwise, price escalations will eat up the funds you

are providing. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are another three points, I think.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: There is a sort of—I will not call it a mischief—not proper thinking. I am leaving this question open to the whole House, cutting across party lines. They are developing a railway line within the Valley, between Qazigund and Baramulla. This is not acceptable. (*Interruptions*) I am talking about infrastructure. (*Interruptions*) You can become enlightened because you have an economist on your right side. (*Interruptions*) So, Sir, roads should be there because we do not have all-weather roads. Road development or rail development cannot happen in compartments. It must be a part of the General Budget, through a philosophy of budgeting. So, this was my second point. I have to cover four points. But, I will....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. (*Interruptions*) He has promised the Chair that he will not take more than ten minutes. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: All right, I will take one minute for each point. (*Interruptions*) Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, the third sector is horticulture. Every time, within the Government of India, within the Government led by Shri Mufti Mohammed Sayeed, or, even by Dr. Farooq Abdullah earlier, there was a misconception. I have been a student of economics. There was a misconception. Every morning and evening they say, "Tourism". I have calculated and I find that only one per cent of the population directly depends on tourism. God has given us Gulmarg, Pahalgam and all other places. (*Interruptions*) The third factor for development is horticulture. We produce one of the best apples in the world. Seventy per cent of population in Kashmir is associated with horticulture. And, horticulture should be taken up for a vigorous development. (*Interruptions*) That is a part of that. Sir, my fourth point is about the electronic industries. I will not be springing a surprise in the House by saying that we have no electronic industry in Kashmir. We had the HMT, which had been closed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: ITI closed. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Therefore, in Kashmir, we can have electronic industries or computer-related industries. So, such type of industries should be set up in Kashmir.

Sir, my fifth point is about conservation of lakes and waterways. It is a very pressing need there. We have the Asia's largest lake i.e. Wular Lake which is a sweet water lake in Kashmir. It occupied an area of 200

square kilometres. Now, today, it has shrunk to just 24 square kilometres. In the year 1997, Rs 297 crores were earmarked, for the Dal Lake. A part of the amount was released, but the project, as a whole, has not been implemented. Sir, the Wular Lake and the Dal Lake do not belong to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. These are our national assets. This is our national heritage. So, my request is, for the development and conservation of waterways and lakes some provision should be made in the Budget.

Sir, my last point is about the handicrafts. It is important sector handicraft. We produce the best of carpets in the world. Our woollen carpets have no parallel in the world. But, it is dwindling. We produce carpets made of silk. Kashmir has monopoly over *shawls*. Wood-carving and wood-based industries are in a shambles today. During the Mughal time, during the Maharaja's time, in Kashmir, the ceiling in wooden pieces, which is called *Khatambandh*, that industry is going to be closed down because there is no encouragement for it. So, if you want to help the economy of Kashmir, then, you think of encouraging the handicraft. In this way, we shall be earning foreign exchange for the whole country. The basic timber required for wood carving and so many other materials are produced by us. In Sweden, what they produce from timber serves the whole of Europe. We can be far better than Sweden. We have not lost our jungles. So, attention should be paid to this aspect. Therefore, I was just requesting the hon. Finance Minister who has to reply tomorrow...

DR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: By my watch, you have taken five minutes, not two minutes.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: He must select these areas for vigorous development of Kashmir because these sectors are important for Kashmir. In this way, we shall not only retrieve Kashmir but also serve our youths who will get employment. As far as political factors are concerned, we need not to go into it because, as I said, the economic factors are very important for Kashmir. I hope, I have the support of the whole house on this issue. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the General Budget will continue tomorrow. The House is adjourned till 11.00 A.M. on 18th March, 2005.

The House then adjourned at thirteen minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday the 18th March, 2005.