

श्री उपसभापति: जी।

श्री हरेन्द्र सिंह मलिक: मान्यवर, उन्हें पैसा दिलवा दें।

श्री उपसभापति: वह तो सरकार उनके नोटिस में लाए।

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 2005-2006 - Contd.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, 25 Members are yet to speak. So, I request you that you should confine to the time allotted to your respective parties. Only the time allotted will be allowed. No further time will be allowed. We have to conclude the discussion and the reply today. Mr. C. Ramachandraiah. Your party has 15 minutes. You have to conclude within 15 minutes.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): We can dispense with the lunch hour, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Even after dispensing with the lunch hour, it would be difficult. So, please confine to the time allotted.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity to make some observations on the Union Budget, 2005-06. I was not much disappointed by the Budget because I did not expect more than that has been presented in the Budget proposals. I am more concerned about the very important issues and I will discuss only those issues. Fiscal consolidation is the need of the hour and it is highly imperative at this juncture. Looking at the proposals and observing the scenario that is prevailing in the country and the climate that is going to prevail in the next two or three years, I feel, fiscal consolidation and maintenance of fiscal discipline have become much more important. The Government of India has done a very convenient thing. Based on the recommendations of the Twelfth Finance Commission, it has transferred the responsibility of raising the resources to the States themselves, thus increasing the fiscal deficit of the States. So, what I am trying to say is that the fiscal deficit of the country, as a consolidated one, has to be taken into consideration while you deal with the economy of the country. Just cleaning your books of accounts won't serve the purpose. Every year you have been transferring Rs. 26,000 crores to 29,000 crores of rupees to the States as loan and grants. Now, you have fixed the responsibility of the States. You know the financial precariousness of the States. Sir, the greatest disappointment I have is, I thought the Finance Minister might announce about the transfer

of Central schemes to the States. This was not done. Sir, I need some clarification from the Finance Minister as to what exactly is the quantified amount that is required to meet all the commitments made to the nation, for which no provisions have been made in the Budget. And, how are you going to raise all those resources? You have not made any mention about disinvestments in the Budget, which neither our friends want...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): We also do not want this.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Then, the very purpose of creating the National Disinvestment Fund does not arise. It is better to abolish it. So, my apprehension is that the Finance Minister might indulge in a heavy dose of taxation in future. But, yesterday, I went through his speech which he made in the Lok Sabha; he has assured the nation that he would make a very stable taxation policy. If that is the case, Mr. Minister, how are you going to raise resources? You are not going to indulge in a heavy dose of taxation, as you have promised that a stable taxation policy will be maintained. And, you are not going to disinvest. If at all anything is disinvested, it will be transferred and kept in a separate account called the National Disinvestment Fund. So, it is a very good policy because you are disposing of the family jewellery, and that should not be used for reduction of fiscal deficits. A very good policy, indeed; let it not be thrown hotch-potch into the joint family of the Consolidated Fund of India and spent for unproductive purposes. But can you assure us that you are not going to indulge in disinvestment? Then, how are you going to mop up the resources? That is the greatest question which needs some clarification. And, there is no possibility of reducing the expenditure. Expenditure in a developing economy should have been more compared to the prevailing level that is there in this country. And, you cannot roll back the promises you have made, that is, reduce the expenditure. That is not desirable also. And the only alternative is, you have to create an atmosphere where there should be spurt in revenue. And how will the revenue be derived? Again you assured the nation that it is not going to be by way of taxes. You have said, it would be a stable taxation. So the only alternative left in the country is to increase the overall growth rate. But yesterday he was very emphatic; he said, "Unless there is investment, there is no growth." Very good; it is correct. Unless there is growth, there is no equity, which, till today, no planner of this country has ever contemplated. So, unless there is investment, there is no growth. But where is the atmosphere for investment? He said, "so

many hectares of land"— I don't remember the correct figure— "will be brought under irrigation." How are you going to do that just by Rs. 4000 crores or Rs. 5,000 crores? How can you complete various projects in the States with this meagre amount? Each State may get an average of Rs. 200 crores. Will this be sufficient to complete the irrigation projects? How are you going to create irrigation facilities? and, you say, "It is a State subject. I am only a facilitator, and I will provide the ideas"; as if there is dearth of ideas in the country. As if there are very weak fellows who are ruling the States, they don't have brain at all. Yesterday, I heard the Finance Minister saying, "we will provide the idea. The States have to implement it." I respectfully submit that there are equally good brains in the States, which are ruling the States.

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu): They are brighter.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I cannot say that they are more bright compared to Mr. Chidambaram; but there are equally good brains, and I am proud that Mr. Jairam Ramesh is from my State. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI N. JOTHI: Mr. Chidambaram has got a godown of brains. He can distribute from there. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: So, unless there is an overall growth, the Government would not be in a position to mop up the required resources.

SHRI MURLI DEORA (Maharashtra): He will convey your suggestion to the Finance Minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM): There are some cases of diversion of Central funds by the States.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Yes, yes. I will come to that point. Thank you for reminding me. Have you made a substantial provision for the contingencies which the States are facing? Have you made a cushion in the provision of the funds for the States to face any contingencies? You give the suggestion and we have to implement it there. It is we who will face the people there, not the people sitting here in the Government. So, what I want to say is, you have not made a substantial provision for that. You are retaining more than 70 per cent of the revenue. Only 30 per cent is being devolved to the States. It is ultimately the States' responsibility to eradicate poverty in the States, and formulate schemes which are suitable to the people. They always knock at the doors of the Government of India

as beggars in order to get more funds. And you accuse the States that they are diverting the funds. When there is a famine, you mean to say that we should allow our people to die with thirstiness. In case of a drought, you want us that we should allow our people to die out of starvation. I am telling you that if at all we have diverted the funds, we are fully justified in that. We are fully justified because, after all, the entire funds of the Government are to keep the people happy, to keep the people surviving.

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM: You can also include Tsunami. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Yes, yes. Whatever it is, it is a national calamity. Very conveniently, he has said it in a beautiful language. Ultimately, the language is not going to deliver the goods. I am telling you that it is nothing but an extension of a joint family budget. And the Finance Minister says that he will pass the burden. Can you expect that the State Governments will do it? You impose the responsibility; you preach the financial discipline, financial consolidation without the cooperation of the States, where more than 50 per cent of expenditure is being borne by the States more than 60 per cent revenue is coming from the States. *(Interruptions)*. It might be five per cent this way or that way. But, a major portion is coming from the States. My friend is not accepting it. I am not an expert on it, as I am not fully equipped with the figures. But, I am giving the overall picture. *(Interruptions)* If such is the case, without taking into consideration the financial precariousness of the States, the problems that are being faced by the States, can you do fiscal consolidation?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have five minutes more. I am reminding you.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, he is speaking very well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is speaking very well, I know. I want him to consolidate whatever he wants to say in the next five minutes.

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, he is giving very good suggestions to the Government.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: This state of affairs is the net result of the ruling of the successive Governments. I am not blaming a particular Government. I can't expect miracles within nine months, though Mr. Chidambaram has claimed that on the National Highways they have provided more lanes. But, he forgot to say about 45 years of Congress rule.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): There should be an increase in the allocation of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is why I reminded him about the time. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. JOTHI: The Opposition should be given more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, I am very thankful to the hon. Finance Minister because he has brought the FRBM Act into operation. But, in the very first year, we failed to implement it, and we are throwing the blame on the Twelfth Finance Commission, as we had thrown the blame on the Fifth Pay Commission earlier. It is true that these are all the contingencies which arise. But these are the contingencies in the States also. You have to keep on remembering it. That is what I am trying to say. When you are making a proposal or a Budget formulation, you have to take into consideration all these contingencies and make provisions for it. Only then it will be a sound Budget, a pragmatic Budget.

We are supposed to bring down by 0.5 per cent in the revenue and 0.3 per cent in the fiscal deficit, for this year. Ultimately, we are maintaining the same 2.7 per cent in the revenue deficit and 4.3 per cent in the fiscal deficit; this is as per the Revised Estimates of 2004-05. We are maintaining the same because we are maintaining the pass button. I do admit there are constraints. I don't blame. But, at the same time, you don't blame the States. The States are equally facing fiscal problems.

Sir, the national fiscal deficit should have been more by 0.7 per cent just because you have transferred the responsibilities of mobilising loans from the market, to the States. You could be able to reduce it by 0.7 per cent.

Sir, I can give you the figures: 39 per cent of the combined revenue receipts and 56 per cent of the combined expenditure is from the States. This figure I took from the Economic Survey. So, you should consider this as absolutely impossible for you to maintain the fiscal consolidation of the country unless you operate the financial discipline closely in tandem with the States. Yesterday, the Finance Minister has made a very significant remark on Bharat Nirman. What is Bharat Nirman? It is the aggregate of so many schemes. In that connection only, Sir, he said, "We will provide

that, the States have to implement it " What is this Bharat Nirman? I think, yesterday he built up a case as if States fail to implement. You provide the funds and we can ensure that every scheme, that is being planned by the Government of India, will be implemented in its spirit and action. But you provide funds. *(Interruptions)* We are not the type of people who can argue very conveniently.

Sir, the capital formation in agriculture has gone down considerably. It is at 1.92 per cent of the GDP in the 90s and 1.28 per cent in 2000. No Government has initiated any concrete measures for the capital formation, Sir, I tell you, the Finance Minister has said that he is encouraging private investment. You may get private investment in the power sector; you may get private investment in the road sector. But till now, can you quote me one single case where any State Government could mobilise private investment in the irrigation sector? In spite of our best efforts we have failed, because of obvious reasons. Maybe, the rate of return is low or long gestation period, or whatever it may be

Sir, I make an advice to the Government. The banks are flooded with deposits. There are millions of tonnes of foodgrains rotting up in the godowns. The economy is in a very buoyant mood. Mr. Chidambaram is very lucky that he received a very good legacy. 6.9 per cent growth is very organic in nature, I tell you. It is very organic in nature *(Interruptions)* Shining—he himself has accepted. If I may be permitted to explain, I will show the document.

डा० अलादी पी० राजकुमार: सर, अच्छे suggestions दे रहे हैं, दो मिनट का समय और दे दें।

श्री उपसभापति: वैसे भी अच्छा बोलते हैं।

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: That is the case in the godowns. You go in for mega irrigation projects which the States are not in a position to build. Yesterday the Finance Minister was telling that we require under Bharat Nirman commitment Rs. 67,000 crores for building irrigation projects and while Rs. 50,000 crores are available the remaining Rs. 17,000 crores he has to mobilise. For your kind information, you kindly send a letter to our Chief Minister and in every meeting he would say that he is going to build Rs. 60,000 crores worth of irrigation projects even in four years. ...*(Interruptions)*... In every single meeting he will say this. ...*(Interruptions)*... If Andhra Pradesh alone requires Rs. 60,000 crores, how ...*(Interruptions)*... You are a very big man. You can do that. ...*(Interruptions)*... You yourself

can complete all the projects. ...*(Interruptions)*... You yourself can complete all the projects. I have full confidence in you and our Chief Minister ...*(Interruptions)*... What I am trying to say is that if Andhra Pradesh alone requires Rs. 60,000 crores, how will the nation be able to do it with Rs. 67,000 crores?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah, I cannot extend your time ...*(Interruptions)*... You have already taken three minutes more than your allotted time ...*(Interruptions)*... You are also pleading.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I will conclude ...*(Interruptions)*... Now, I come to the National Agricultural Insurance Scheme. I have been expecting much from this scheme. But they said that *status quo* will remain. We have been interacting with them. Sir, there was no robust insurance scheme in this country. That is the reason why thousands of farming community people are committing suicide, thousands of people are dying out of hunger. Sir, I want to quote what the Finance Minister and the President of India have stated in their speeches. The Finance Minister stated, "This Budget, is an attempt to lay down a path in which growth and equity will reinforce each other and build a new India." The President of India said, "The UPA's vital contribution to the Nation has been the return of the polity to mainstream political values of pluralism, inclusiveness,..."—I do not know to what extent we have been included—secularism and economic growth with equity and social justice." Does that equity exist in this country when 40 per cent of our rural masses are undernourished, when 25 per cent of the urban masses are undernourished, when there is high percentage of malnutrition, when there is only 30 per cent literacy and when 250 million people living below poverty line?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah ...*(Interruptions)*... *(Time bell)*

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Thousands of people are committing suicide. What is the equity that we have achieved in this country over a period of time? So, let us not arrogate ourselves to things, which we have not achieved. Let us divert constructive efforts to achieve the objectives, which were enshrined in the Constitution. Yesterday, the Finance Minister was telling the very purpose of having the taxation is for two purposes, one is resources and the second saving. The vital point he has forgotten and which I want to remind him ...*(Time-bell)* It is mainly to remove the economic inequalities in this country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you look towards me? ...*(Interruptions)*... I will not be able to ask him ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, it has been enshrined in the Directive Principles of the Constitution that the Government has to thrive for eradicating inequalities, which should be the prime motto of taxation in this country. It may be an instrument to mobilise resources, but the vital point we are forgetting and that I wanted to remind our hon. Minister ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next speaker ...*(Interruptions)*... *(Time-bell)* please conclude.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I am concluding. You create conducive atmosphere for savings. Savings alone will get you investments. Wherever the private sector is unwilling to invest, kindly do it from the Government funds and wherever private sector is prepared, you invite them. At the same time, Sir, we have achieved growth. But it is jobless growth ...*(Interruptions)*... You create more jobs....*(Interruptions)*... It is because my mouth is dying up. ...*(Interruptions)*... What I am trying to say is that you try to create equity by creating more jobs in this country. More than 25 crore youth are there in this country. They can cater to the needs of so many services in the entire globe. You train them; you motivate them ...*(Time-bell)* With these remarks, I support the Budget proposals. Thank you.

श्री उपसभापति: श्री ललितभाई मेहता। समय का ध्यान रखिए, आपकी पार्टी के 38 मिनट बचे हैं और 3 स्पीकर हैं।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता (गुजरात): उपसभापति जी, यू पीए सरकार का यह वर्ष 2005-2006 का बजट आम आदमी का बजट, गांव का बजट, कृषि का बजट, गरीबों का बजट, ऐसा बताया जा रहा है, लेकिन इस बजट की दिशा क्या है? यह बजट प्रस्तुत होने के पहले जो स्टॉक मार्केट में मार्केट कैपिटलाइजेशन रिपोर्ट हुआ था, फाइनेन्सियल एक्सप्रेस से, उसमें यह था कि 25 फरवरी, 2005 को मार्केट कैपिटलाइजेशन 16,94,953 करोड़ रुपये था और बजट प्रस्तुत होने के बाद 4 मार्च, 2005 को मार्केट कैपिटलाइजेशन 17,65,098 करोड़ रुपये हो गया। इसका मतलब यह है कि बजट के प्रस्ताव के कारण जो इन्वेस्टर्स हैं, उनको फायदा हुआ और कोई इन्वेस्टर्स गांव के नहीं होते, इन्वेस्टर्स गरीब नहीं होते, इन्वेस्टर्स कृषक नहीं होते। कितना फायदा हुआ? यह हुआ 70,145 करोड़ रुपये का इन्वेस्टर्स को, और जिन बैंकों ने इसमें निवेश किया स्टॉक मार्केट में, उन बैंकों को इन कर-प्रस्तावों के कारण 11,143 करोड़ रुपये का फायदा हुआ।

उपसभापति महोदय, बजट की दिशा क्या है? बजट की दिशा का दूसरा एक मापदंड है कि कुल खर्च हमारा जो है, वह जीडीपी को ध्यान में रखते हुए बढ़ना चाहिए। विकासशील अर्थतंत्र में अगर हम खर्च नहीं बढ़ा पाते तो हमें यह समझना चाहिए कि विकास की दिशा क्या रहेगी? सर, In 1999, the GDP-total expenditure ratio was 15.23 per cent. In 2000, it was 15.88 per cent; in 2001 it was 15.88 per cent; in 2002, it increased to 16.77 per cent; in 2003, it further increased to 17.21 per cent but in the UPA's regime, last year, the GDP total expenditure ratio came down and that is 16.35 per cent and this year after presenting this Budget the estimated GDP expenditure ratio will be 14.63 per cent. This shows the direction of the Budget.

उपसभापति महोदय, वित्त मंत्री जी ने तो चारों ओर हमला कर दिया पूरे अर्थतंत्र में, पूरे देश में नव-निर्माण करने के लिए एक भारत-निर्माण का नारा दे दिया। जो मैनेजमेंट के गुरु हैं पीटर ड्रुकर, वे कहते हैं—अगर आपने कुछ सही दिशा में काम करना है तो आपको एक या दो ऐसे कुछ ओब्जेक्टिव्स को ध्यान में रखते हुए काम करना चाहिए, लेकिन उसको भी आगे ले जाना है तो उसके लिए कंसोलिडेटेड एफर्ट्स चाहिए, उसकी मानीटरिंग चाहिए, उसमें फॉलो-अप एट वेरिएस लेवल होनी चाहिए। मैं यु० पी० ए० सरकार के जो यहां पर सभी पदाधिकारी बैठे हैं, उनको याद दिलाना चाहूंगा कि आपके ही जो पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री राजीव गांधी जी थे, उन्होंने कहा था कि हम यहां से एक रुपया भेजते हैं, जिसमें से 15 पैसे गांव तक पहुंचते हैं, 85 पैसे बीच में कहीं गायब हो जाते हैं। कहां जाते हैं ये पैसे? क्या आपने सोशल सेक्टर में यह इन्वेस्टमेंट बढ़ाया है, सोशल सेक्टर का आउट-ले बढ़ाया है? देखिए, खुद वित्त मंत्री जी ने अपने आप में यह कबूल किया है कि—Outlays does not necessarily mean the outcome. और हम इसका अनुभव कर रहे हैं कि ब्यूरोक्रेट्स, पोलिटिशियंस और वहां पर बैठे हुए लोगों का जो अनहोली मुठब है, उसके कारण पैसा सही वक्त पर, सही लोगों तक नहीं पहुंचता है। फिर ऐसे इन्वेस्टमेंट, ऐसे आउट-ले बढ़ाने की क्या आवश्यकता है? आप पैसे कुंए में क्यों डाल रहे हैं? मुझे लगता है कि इस दिशा में आपको विचार करना चाहिए। रोजगार निर्माण की बात कही गई, पांच सालों में रोजगार निर्माण की बात कही गई, लेकिन 4,08,00,000 लोग, जो अभी शहरी क्षेत्रों में बेरोजगार हैं, उनके लिए क्या प्रावधान है? 1,25,00,000 बच्चे, 5 से 14 साल की उम्र के, आज हमारे आर्थिक तंत्र में बाल मजदूर के रूप में काम कर रहे हैं, उन बच्चों के लिए इस बजट में कहीं पर कोई प्रावधान मुझे नहीं दिखता है।

उपसभापति जी, हमारे पिछले दस साल का जो आर्थिक विकास रहा उसमें जी०डी०पी० एंक्वरेज 6 प्रतिशत बढ़ी है, लेकिन एम्प्लॉयमेंट 1.07 परसेंट बढ़ा है। परिस्थिति यह है कि गांधी में 183 दिन के लिए जिसको काम मिलता था, वह एम्प्लॉयमेंट के दायरे में आ जाता था और 1996 में, जो सीमांत है, उसका प्रतिशत 4.3 था, वह 2003 में बढ़कर 10.9 प्रतिशत हो गया। यानी 183 दिन से भी कम

काम करने वाले गांव के लोगों की तादाद बढ़ती ही गई। गांवों में रोजगार के अवसर सृजित करने के लिए हमारे यहां एक एस्प्री गुप्ता कमेटी बनी थी, मोंटेक सिंह कमेटी भी बनी थी और उन्होंने यह सुझाव दिया था कि इस देश में 10.70 मिलियन हैक्टर्स लैंड जो वेस्ट लैंड है, उसका उपयोग यदि सही मायने में आप करते हैं तो आप 15 लाख लोगों को रोजगार दे सकते हैं, लेकिन इसके लिए 13,000 करोड़ रुपये का इन्वेस्टमेंट इस वेस्ट लैंड के डेवलपमेंट के लिए आपने करना है। लेकिन आप कहां इन्वेस्टमेंट कर रहे हैं? बजट में आपने प्रावधान किया है, 14,040 करोड़ रुपए you are giving to public sector by way of capital and another Rs. 3,544 crores towards loan for public sector undertakings. We all know about the fate of the public sector undertakings, the status of the public sector undertakings and the fruits that they are giving to us. तो मुझे लगता है कि अगर आपने रोजगार के अवसर सृजित करने हैं तो ऐसी सिफारिश को ध्यान में रखते हुए आपको आगे बढ़ना पड़ेगा।

कृषि के क्षेत्र की बात कही जा रही है। आज कृषि बिल्कुल भी लाभकारी नहीं रही है। बैंकों के ऋण का आंकड़ा हमें यह बताता है कि 1990 में बैंकों द्वारा दिया गया ऋण 16.5 प्रतिशत था, 1996 में 12.4 प्रतिशत था, जो 2003 में गिरकर 10.6 प्रतिशत हो गया, जो अपने आप में यह साबित करता है कि कृषि लाभकारी नहीं रही। अगर यह लाभकारी होती, किसान अपना ऋण चुका सकते, ब्याज चुका सकते तो बैंक उन्हें ज्यादा ऋण देने के लिए तैयार रहते, लेकिन यह हुआ नहीं और इसके कारण आज कृषि के क्षेत्र में आप एक और ऋण बढ़ाने की बात कर रहे हैं और इसी के तहत 10वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना का जो टारगेट रखा गया था, वह 7,36,750 करोड़ रुपये का था, पांच साल में कृषकों को 7,36,750 करोड़ रुपये का ऋण देने का लक्ष्य हमने रखा था, लेकिन इस साल के बजट को यदि आप ध्यान में रखें और इस साल तक जो ऋण दिया गया, इकनॉमिक सर्वे में जो आंकड़े दिए गए हैं, वह 2,43,477 करोड़ रुपये का ऋण 2005 तक दिया गया। अभी दो साल बचे हैं, दो वर्ष में आप 4,93,273 करोड़ रुपये का ऋण देने की बात कैसे सोच सकते हैं? कृषि संबंधी स्टैंडिंग कमेटी के द्वारा जो सिफारिश दी गई है, वह यह है कि आप एक लाख, डेढ़ लाख अथवा दो लाख, जो भी ऋण किसान को चाहिए, उसे वह ऋण कम ब्याज दर पर उपलब्ध करवाया जाए। ऋण चाहे अधिक न भी हो किन्तु ब्याज दर अवश्य कम हो। यदि उसे नौ प्रतिशत की दर से ऋण मिलता है, तो उसका लाभकारी मूल्य प्राप्त करने में उसे सहायता मिल सकती है।

आप देखिए कि हॉर्टिकल्चर के लिए आपने 680 करोड़ रुपये का प्रावधान कर दिया है। हॉर्टिकल्चर, अर्थात् फल व सब्जियों का हमारे देश में जो उत्पादन होता है, उसमें एक वर्ष में 60,000 करोड़ रुपये के फल व सब्जियां नष्ट हो जाती हैं। हमारे पास उनके रख-रखाव की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है और आप फल व सब्जियों का उत्पादन बढ़ाने की बात कर रहे हैं। यदि वास्तव में उसमें अभिवृद्धि करने की बात आप सोचते, तो आज 148 मिलियन टन का फल व सब्जियों का

जो हमारा उत्पादन है, वह बढ़ कर 268 मिलियन टन तक जा सकता है। प्रति व्यक्ति आवश्यकता को ध्यान में रखा जाना चाहिए, किन्तु आज जो हमारी प्रति व्यक्ति आवश्यकता है, उसे हम पूरा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं और दूसरी ओर फल व सब्जियां नष्ट हो रही हैं।

आज हमारे देश में तीन करोड़ आठ लाख हैक्टेयर भूमि ऐसी है, जिसे कृषि के दायरे में लाया जा सकता है, किन्तु आप उसे कृषि के दायरे में नहीं ला रहे हैं, उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ा रहे हैं।

फूड सेक्योरिटी का प्रश्न भी आज हमारे सामने खड़ा हुआ है। 1980 में प्रति व्यक्ति 180 किलोग्राम फूड उपलब्ध था, किन्तु आज 2004 में घट कर वह 150 किलोग्राम रह गया है। हमारी बढ़ती हुई आबादी को देखते हुए, हमें कृषि के दायरे में और अधिक भूमि को लाना होगा, लेकिन पिछले दस वर्ष का अनुभव यह बताता है कि 1.05 करोड़ हैक्टेयर कृषि योग्य भूमि, अन्य उद्योगों के लगने के कारण कम हो गई है। आज हमें इस बात की ओर भी ध्यान देना होगा।

एक और बात की ओर हमें ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है, आज जो कैमिकल फर्टिलाइज़र्स हैं, पैस्टीसाइड्स या इन्सेक्टिसाइड्स हैं, इन सबके कारण भूमि की उर्वरा शक्ति कम होती जा रही है, उसे बचाने के लिए हमें जैविक खाद व जैविक खेती की ओर जाना होगा। देश में हमारे पास जो पशुधन उपलब्ध है, यदि उसे ध्यान में रखा जाए तो हमें उससे 440 करोड़ मीट्रिक टन बायो-फर्टिलाइज़र उपलब्ध हो सकता है। हमारे देश में 15 करोड़ हैक्टेयर भूमि पर हमें कितने फर्टिलाइज़र की आवश्यकता है? एक हैक्टेयर पर 10 टन अर्थात् कुल मिलाकर 150 करोड़ टन। 440 करोड़ टन खाद की उत्पादन क्षमता हमारे पास होने के बावजूद भी हम इसका उपयोग नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। इस पर जो उत्पादन लागत आती है, वह कैमिकल फर्टिलाइज़र की आधे से भी कम है और यह स्वास्थ्यकर भी है, पर्यावरण की दृष्टि से भी उपयुक्त है, फिर भी उसका उपयोग हम नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। मुझे लगता है कि इस दिशा में, कृषि के क्षेत्र में यदि हम ज़िम्मेदारी से नहीं सोचते हैं तो यह स्थिति हमारे लिए उपयुक्त नहीं रहेगी।

उपसभापति महोदय, ग्रामीण विकास की बात भी की गई है।...

श्री उपसभापति: कृपया आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: महोदय, मैं और पांच मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री उपसभापति: आपके पंद्रह मिनट हो चुके हैं, आपकी पार्टी से दूसरे और भी स्पीकर हैं।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: श्री जेटली जी तो अभी नहीं आए हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं, नहीं, दूसरे और भी स्पीकर हैं।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: ग्रामीण विकास के संबंध में आउटले बकाने की बात कही गई है, उसे 18,334 करोड़ रुपये कर दिया गया है। किस दृष्टि से ग्रामीण विकास में यह किया गया है? आठवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में जी.डी.पी. का 14 प्रतिशत ग्रामीण विकास के लिए रखा गया था, नौवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में वह घटकर नौ प्रतिशत हो गया और अब दसवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में ग्रामीण विकास के लिए जी.डी.पी. का प्रतिशत घट कर सिर्फ पांच प्रतिशत रह गया है। आप देखें कि ग्रामीण विकास के लिए होने वाले खर्च में जी.डी.पी. का प्रतिशत लगातार घट रहा है, इसलिए मुझे लगता है कि ग्रामीण विकास के दायरे को समग्रता से देखने की आवश्यकता है। मैं सदन को इस बात से अवगत कराना चाहूंगा कि हमारे ही सदन के एक माननीय सदस्य, हमारे बुजुर्ग नेता, श्री नाना देशमुख जी ने मध्य प्रदेश के चित्रकूट में, जिस प्रकार का प्रयोग किया है, उन्होंने 80 गांव स्वावलम्बी बना दिए। वहां अब बेरोजगारी की कोई समस्या नहीं है, आय की असमानता की कोई समस्या नहीं है, लिटिगेशन की कोई समस्या नहीं है। वहां पर जो 80 गांव हैं, उनमें इस प्रकार की परिस्थिति निर्माण की है। उन्होंने इन समग्र योजनाओं के लिए जो बातें ध्यान में रखीं, उन्हें यहां पर कोट करना चाहूंगा। What Nanaji Deshmukh says, "the land, vegetation, insects, animals and human beings are all invisible part of the nature. By coordinating them, sustainable development can be attained."

ग्रामीण विकास मंत्री, वित्त मंत्री जी, हमारी जो प्रकृति है, हमारे गांवों की जो परिस्थिति है, उसको ध्यान में रखकर, यदि हम ग्रामीण विकास की बात करते हैं, तो यह हमारे लिए अच्छा रहेगा। आज गांवों की परिस्थिति क्या है, 47 per cent children below the age of three years are malnourished, 36 per cent of married women suffer from chronic energy deficiency, and 50 per cent of pregnant women suffer from micro-nutrients deficiency in the villages. This is the situation.

आप कहते हैं कि हमने ग्रामीण विकास का बजट बढ़ा दिया है, इतना कर दिया है और वाह-वाह कर रहे हैं। उपसभापति महोदय, मैं एक मुद्दा और लेना चाहता हूं।

श्री उपसभापति: आप कन्क्लूड करें।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: हमारे पेट्रोलियम मंत्री जी, अभी गुजरात में हमारे यहां आये थे, वहां पर बाँयो-डीजल से एक बस चली। वहां पर एक बात कही गई थी, "Bio-diesel plants grown in 11 million hectares of land can yield a revenue of approximately Rs. 20,000 crore a year and provide employment to over 12 million people. Also, it will reduce the foreign exchange outflow paid for importing crude oil. Bio-diesel does not have carbon monoxide emission."

मुझे लगता है कि बॉयोडीजल के बारे में इस बजट में कोई ऐसा प्रावधान नहीं किया गया है, जबकि उसके पास 12 मिलियन लोगों को रोजगार देने की क्षमता है और जो 20 हजार करोड़ रुपये की आय एक साल में आपको दे सकता है।

उपसभापति महोदय, इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर की बात कही गई है। 55 हजार करोड़ रुपये से सारे देश में फोर लाइन्स और सिक्स लाइन्स के रोड्स बनेंगे और उसके लिए जो साधन जुटने हैं, उसमें कहा है स्पेशल परपज व्हीकल्स से, Sir, I am quoting from Economic Times.

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं, आपके पास कोट करने के लिए इतना समय नहीं है। आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: सर, बहुत छोट है।

"The very little of Rs. 10,000 crores, for SPV, would trickle in for road development as funds are distributed on bankability of the projects. Except for some bypasses, tolling pass, tolling has not worked, and, therefore, roads are no financially viable in short or mid-term."

यह 10 हजार करोड़ रुपये का एसपीवी करके आपने बता दिया है कि करेंगे 10 हजार करोड़ रुपये का एसपीवी, लेकिन यह बात, बैंकेबिलिटी नहीं है, तो आपके पास यह आने वाला नहीं है। उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे एक बात गुजरात की दृष्टि से कहनी है। 12th फाइनेंस कमीशन की जो रिपोर्ट आई और उस रिपोर्ट के बारे में गुजरात सरकार ने इस वक्त एक रिप्रजेंटेशन दिया है।

श्री उपसभापति: अब आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: सर, आधे मिनट में खत्म करता हूँ। गुजरात सरकार ने एक रिप्रजेंटेशन दिया था कि गुजरात को अर्थव्यवस्था के कारण जो एशियन डेवलपमेंट बैंक से, वर्ल्ड बैंक से लोन लाना पड़ा और सात हजार करोड़ रुपये का खर्च वहाँ पर हुआ, तो उस लोन को आप ग्रांट में परिवर्तित कर दीजिए। इस बात को 12th फाइनेंस कमीशन ने नहीं माना है, लेकिन 12th फाइनेंस कमीशन ने यह ज़रूर कहा है कि जिन टर्म्स पर आपको वर्ल्ड बैंक से लोन मिले हैं या एशियन डेवलपमेंट बैंक से भारत सरकार को मिलता है, उसी टर्म्स पर आप बैंक टू बैंक गुजरात गवर्नमेंट को दीजिए। यह सिफारिश माननी होगी, जो दूसरी बात कही गई थी कि यहाँ पर जो दो प्रतिशत सरचार्ज इन्कम टैक्स पर दो साल के लिए वर्ष 2001-02 और 2002-03 लगा था। ... (समय की घंटी) ... वह भी पूरा नहीं दिया गया...

श्री उपसभापति: नेक्स्ट, श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता: मैं सरकार से आग्रह करूंगा कि इन दोनों बातों को ध्यान में रखकर गुजरात की जो मांग है, उसे पूरी करने का कष्ट करें। धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Shahid Siddiqui, your Party has 23 minutes. There are four speakers. Accordingly, divide your time.

†SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I will take twelve minutes. डिप्टी चैयरमैन सर, आपका बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। चिदम्बरम साहब बहुत अच्छे सपने दिखाते हैं इसलिए शायद सन् 97 का बजट उनका ड्रीम बजट कहा गया था। अगर हम उन्हें सपनों का सौदागर कहें तो शायद गलत नहीं होगा। इस बार भी इन्होंने सपनों का बड़ा अच्छा गुलदस्ता पेश किया है। वे हारवर्ड के पढ़े हुए हैं इसलिए भाषण बहुत अच्छे करते हैं।

شری شاہد صدیقی ”اثر پردیش“ : ڈپٹی چیئرمین سر، آپ کا بہت بہت شکریہ کہ آپ نے مجھے بولنے کا موقع دیا۔ چیدمبرم صاحب بہت اچھے سنے دکھاتے ہیں اس لئے شاید سن ۹۷ کا بجٹ ان کا ڈریم بجٹ کہا گیا تھا۔ اگر ہم انہیں سپنوں کا سوداگر کہیں تو شاید غلط نہیں ہوگا۔ اس بار بھی انہوں نے سپنوں کا بڑا اچھا گلدستہ پیش کیا ہے۔ وہ ہارورڈ کے پڑھے ہوئے ہیں اس لئے بھاشن بہت اچھے کرتے ہیں۔

श्री जयराम रमेश: सपनों के सौदागर सब उधर हैं।

†श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: वह मैं देख रहा हूँ लेकिन सपनों के सौदागर आजकल इधर हैं। आप लोग सपने दिखाने में ज्यादा माहिर हैं।... (व्यवधान)... वे फिल्मी सपने दिखाते हैं, आप असली सपने दिखाते हैं। वे कम से कम तीन घंटे के लिए खुश कर देते हैं। आपकी जो खुशी है, वह तीन मिनट में ही खत्म हो जाती है। बहरहाल, मैं बजट के समर्थन के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ इसलिए मुझे ज़रा आराम से बोलने का मौका दीजिए। मैं कम से कम इस बात के लिए माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी की तारीफ करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बार रूरल डेवलपमेंट पर 32 प्रतिशत ज्यादा धन का आबंटन किया है। पीने का पानी एक बड़ा मुद्दा रहा है उस पर 43 प्रतिशत आबंटन बढ़ाया है। एग्रीकल्चर और कार्पोरेशन पर भी 39 प्रतिशत आबंटन बढ़ाया है लेकिन इस सबके बावजूद रूरल सेक्टर में अभी भी पूरे बजट का केवल 6 फीसदी आबंटन है जबकि डिफेंस के ऊपर 18.8 फीसदी बजट खर्च हो रहा है। हैल्थ के ऊपर भी बढ़ाया है, 23 प्रतिशत बढ़ोत्तरी हुई है, शिक्षा में भी 38 प्रतिशत की बढ़ोत्तरी हुई है लेकिन हैल्थ में आज भी पूरे बजट का सिर्फ 2.07 प्रतिशत हिस्सा है जबकि शिक्षा में 3.56 प्रतिशत है। मैं फाइनेंस मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपको हैल्थ पर और

†Transliteration of Urdu script.

शिक्षा पर इसको पांच से छः प्रतिशत लाना होगा तभी हम देश के अंदर सही मायनों में लोगों को शिक्षा दे सकेंगे और हेल्थ हम देहातों और गांवों में पहुंचा सकेंगे। इसके साथ ही एक मसला जिस पर फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब को ध्यान देने की जरूरत है, वह है डिलीवरी मैकेनिज्म का। क्योंकि वे सपने तो बहुत अच्छे दिखा देता हैं लेकिन डिलीवरी नहीं होती है। जैसा कि राजीव गांधी जी ने कहा था रुपए का केवल 17 पैसा ही नीचे गांव में पहुंचता है और यह बात उन्होंने आज से सायद 20 साल पहले कही थी।

श्री शहादुद्दीन : وہ میں دیکھ رہا ہوں لیکن سینوں کے سوداگر آج کل ادھر ہیں۔ آپ لوگ سنے دکھانے میں زیادہ ماہر ہیں..... مداخلت..... وہ قلمی سنے دکھاتے ہیں، آپ اصلی سنے دکھاتے ہیں۔ وہ کم سے کم تین گھنٹے کے لئے خوش کر دیتے ہیں۔ آپ کی جو خوشی ہے، وہ تین منٹ میں ہی ختم ہو جاتی ہے۔ بہر حال، میں بجٹ کے سرٹھن میں کھڑا ہوا ہوں اس لئے مجھے ذرا آرام سے بولنے کا موقع دیجئے۔ میں کم سے کم اس بات کے لئے مانے وٹ منٹری جی کی تعریف کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے اس بار رولر ڈیولپمنٹ پر ۳۲ فیصد زیادہ دھن کا آئٹن ہے پینے کا پانی ایک بڑا دعار ہا ہے، اس پر ۴۳ فیصد آؤٹن بڑھایا ہے۔ ایگریکلچر اور کارپوریشن پر بھی ۳۹ فیصد آؤٹن بڑھایا ہے، لیکن اس سب کے باوجود رولر سیکٹر میں ابھی بھی پورے بجٹ کا صرف ۶ فیصدی آؤٹن ہے، جب کہ ڈیفنس کے اوپر ۱۸.۸ فیصدی بجٹ خرچ ہو رہا ہے۔ ہیلتھ کے اوپر بھی بڑھایا ہے، ۲۳ فیصد بڑھوتری ہوئی ہے۔ شکشا میں بھی ۳۸ فیصد کی بڑھوتری ہوئی ہے لیکن ہیلتھ میں آج بھی پورے بجٹ کا صرف ۲.۰۷ فیصد حصہ ہے جب کہ شکشا میں ۳.۵۶ فیصد ہے۔ میں فائننس منٹری جی سے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آپ کو ہیلتھ پر اور شکشا پر اس کو پانچ سے چھ فیصد لانا ہوگا تبھی ہم دیش کے اندر صحیح معنوں میں لوگوں کو شکشا دے سکیں گے اور ہیلتھ ہم دیہاتوں اور گاؤں میں پہنچا سکیں گے۔ اس کے ساتھ ہی ایک مسئلہ جس پر فائننس منسٹر صاحب کو دھیان دینے کی ضرورت ہے، وہ ہے ڈیوری سیکٹر کا۔ کیونکہ وہ سنے تو بہت اچھے دکھا دیتے ہیں لیکن ڈیوری نہیں ہوتی ہے۔ جیسا کہ راجیو گاندھی جی نے کہا تھا روپے کا صرف ۷۷ پیسہ ہی نیچے گاؤں میں پہنچتا ہے اور یہ بات انہوں نے آج سے شاید ۲۰ سال پہلے کہی تھی۔ ایک محرر ڈیمنڈ ۱۵ پیسے کہا تھا۔

एक माननीय सदस्य: 15 पैसा कहा था।

† श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: 15 पैसे या 17 पैसे लेकिन आज मुझे लगता है कि पांच पैसा भी नीचे नहीं पहुंच पाता। उसके लिए जब तक आप डिलीवरी मैकेनिज्म को ठीक नहीं करेंगे, जब तक आप इस तरह की व्यवस्था नहीं बनाएंगे जिससे पूरी तरह से इस पर नज़र रखी जा सके और कॉन्स्टेंट मॉनिटरिंग हो कि नीचे पैसा कैसे जा रहा है, तब तक कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। खुशी की बात यह है कि आपने पंचायतों को इस बार 400 प्रतिशत बढ़ाया है और पंचायतों के ज़रिए इस बार पैसे का खर्च होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे काफी इम्प्रूवमेंट होगी लेकिन आज भी इसमें बहुत ज्यादा मॉनिटरिंग की ज़रूरत है क्योंकि आज भी पर कैपिटल जो फूड ग्रेन मिल रहा है, वह सिर्फ 155 किलोग्राम है जो आज़ादी के पहले, दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद जितना पर कैपिटल था, आज भी उतना ही है—उसमें बढ़ोतरी नहीं हुई है। जबकि जो सुपर रिच हैं, जो भारत में सुपर रिच हैं, 0.01 प्रतिशत, उस सुपर रिच की बढ़ोतरी 285 प्रतिशत हुई है। यह जो स्थिति है, अगर इस स्थिति को आप बदलना चाहते हैं, अगर आप सही मायनों में गरीब की बात करते हैं, कमजोर की बात करते हैं, मज़लूम की बात करते हैं तो इसको आपको बदलना होगा। मैं खास तौर पर हाथ जोड़कर, बहुत नम्रता से, अदब से इस मुल्क की अकलियतों की बात करना चाहूंगा। अकलियतों में खास तौर पर मुसलमानों की बात करना चाहूंगा जो 15-16 करोड़ हैं और जिनकी आर्थिक स्थिति आज़ादी के बाद से बिगड़ती चली गयी है। उसका बिगड़ना मुसलमानों के लिए तो नुकसानदेय है ही, देश के लिए भी बहुत नुकसानदेय है। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी भी देश में अगर किसी एक वर्ग के लिए सारे दरवाज़े बंद हो जाएं, खिड़कियां बंद हो जाएं, उसके पास विकास का कोई रास्ता न रहे तो यह देश के लिए खतरा है और देश के सारे लोगों को इस पर चिंता व्यक्त करनी चाहिए, यह सिर्फ मेरी चिंता का विषय नहीं है। लेकिन मुझे यह दुख है कि लोक सभा की मैंने बहस देखी, बहुत कम लोगों ने इसे उठाया। अगर कोई मुसलमान होता है तो इस बात को उठा देता है। मुझे खुशी तब होगी जब दूसरे लोग भी इस विषय को उठाएं और सवाल करें कि मुसलमानों की हालत क्यों बुरी तरह से पिछड़ती जा रही है। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि हमारे देश में आज मुसलमानों की हालत दलितों से बदतर हो गई है। मैं कोई हवाई बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ। आप गोपाल कमीशन रिपोर्ट को पार्लियामेंट में रखते और देखते कि उसमें क्या लिखा है। माइनॉरिटी कमीशन के चैयनमैन हमारे यहां हैं, लेकिन माइनॉरिटी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट कभी नहीं रखी गई। उन रिपोर्टों को देखिए, आज नौकरियों में मुसलमान दो प्रतिशत भी नहीं हैं। पुलिस और फौज में डेढ़ प्रतिशत नहीं हैं। आप लाइसेंस देते हैं, पेट्रोल पम्प देते हैं, दुकानें देते हैं, इनकी ऐलॉटमेंट में मुसलमानों का दूर-दूर तक कहीं नाम नहीं आता है। मुसलमानों के लिए सारे दरवाज़े आपने बंद कर दिए हैं। पिछले साल चिदम्बरम साहब ने अकलियतों पर बहुत अहसान किया था, पूरे पचास करोड़ रुपये माइनॉरिटी डेवलपमेंट फाइनैंस कारपोरेशन को दिए थे— इतना बड़ा एहसान, हिंदुस्तान के पंद्रह करोड़ मुसलमानों पर बाकी पांच करोड़ माइनॉरिटीज़ के ऊपर किया गया था— पचास करोड़ रुपये दिए गए थे उनकी शिक्षा के लिए, उस पैसे का क्या हुआ? वह पैसा शिक्षा के लिए किसको दिया? मौलाना आज़ाद एजुकेशन फाउंडेशन को नहीं दिया, माइनॉरिटी डेवलपमेंट फाइनैंस कारपोरेशन को दे दिया गया। कैसे खर्च हुआ? पचास ज़िलों में डी.एम. के पास एक-एक करोड़ रुपया भेज दिया गया। उन जिलों में जहां मुसलमान पच्चीस-तीस

प्रतिशत है, वहां भेज दिया गया, लेकिन वह पैसा मुसलमानों पर खर्च नहीं हुआ, वह ज़िले पर खर्च हुआ। तो आपने बहुत बड़ा एहसान किया। उर्दू में कहते हैं कि “हातिमताई की कन्न पर लात मार दी” कि साहब, आपने पचास करोड़ रुपया मुसलमानों को दे दिया! उसके बाद हमने चिट्ठियां लिखीं, प्रधान मंत्री जी को लिखीं, चिदम्बरम साहब को लिखीं, माइनॉरिटीज़ ने इस पर काफी शोर मचाया, लेकिन उसके बाद क्या हुआ? इस साल के बजट में, जो आपने बड़ा अच्छा भाषण किया—जैसा कि मैंने कहा कि आप करते हैं—माइनॉरिटीज़ का अलग से स्पेसिफिक हेड बनाया गया, हमने सोचा शायद इसमें बहुत भारी कुछ मिलने वाला है, और मंत्री जी ने माना कि “Minorities would have to be brought more into the developmental process. I propose to increase the equity support as may be required for the National Markets Development and Finance Corporation.”

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि as may be required का क्या मतलब है? क्या आप नहीं समझते कि it is required now, at this juncture, at this moment? पचास सालों से क्या ज़रूरत नहीं थी? आज क्या ज्यादा ज़रूरत नहीं है? आज उन्होंने आपकी तरफ देखा नहीं है, आज उन्होंने एक सेक्युलर सरकार बनाने की बात नहीं की है। तो आज आपका, may be required का क्या मतलब था? आप कहते कि हां, हम दे रहे हैं सौ करोड़, हम दे रहे हैं दो सौ करोड़ और यही चिदम्बरम साहब थे जिन्होंने माइनॉरिटीज़ डेवलपमेंट फाइनंस कारपोरेशन को अपने ड्रीम बजट, 1997 में बनाया था और उस वक्त कहा था कि हर सौ करोड़ का हम इसमें कॉरपस बना रहे हैं। हर साल सौ करोड़ बढ़ाते जाएंगे, आज तक बढ़ाकर नहीं दिया और आज दिया तो may be required की बात कर रहे हैं?

उसके बाद कहते हैं सर्व शिक्षा अभियान में हम माइनॉरिटीज़ के एरियाज़ में देखेंगे कि सर्व शिक्षा अभियान का पैसा पहुंचे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब सर्व शिक्षा अभियान की बात हो रही है तो क्या माइनॉरिटीज़ के बच्चे इस देश के शहरी नहीं हैं? क्या वे दस प्रतिशत, पंद्रह प्रतिशत नहीं हैं? क्या दस-पंद्रह प्रतिशत उन पर खर्च नहीं होना चाहिए? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे ज्यादा पिछड़े हुए हैं, उनमें शिक्षा की ज्यादा कमी है, इसके जो भी कारण हों—ऐतिहासिक कारण हों, आर्थिक कारण हों, देश के विभाजन का कारण हो—जो भी कारण रहे हों, वे शिक्षा में ज्यादा पिछड़े हुए हैं, इसलिए आप कम से कम सर्व शिक्षा अभियान का पंद्रह प्रतिशत माइनॉरिटीज़, खास तौर पर मुस्लिम माइनॉरिटीज़ के लिए आवंटित कीजिए। उसको जब तक आप नहीं बांधेंगे, वह उन तक पहुंचने वाला नहीं है, क्योंकि मेरा experience ज़मीन के ऊपर यह है कि चाहे सर्व शिक्षा अभियान हो, चाहे आवास-विकास की योजना हो, चाहे इंदिरा गांधी आवास विकास हो—कोई भी योजना जो होती है, उसमें जो नीचे बैठ रहा अफसर है, वह मुसलमान को हिस्सा नहीं देता। मुसलमान तक खबर भी नहीं पहुंचती कि क्या हो रहा है और कैसे मिलना है और जब वह apply करता है, तो उसे नहीं मिलता। इसलिए जब तक आप उसको बांधेंगे नहीं, जब तक आप उसको फोर्स नहीं करेंगे, तब तक उसको मिलने वाला नहीं है। इसलिए मैं देश के हित में कहता हूँ कि इसको आपको करना चाहिए। खुशी की बात है कि चिदम्बरम जी आ गए हैं। उर्दू के लिए भी उन्होंने बड़ी मुहब्बत दिखाई है। मेरी सबसे बड़ी शिकायत यह है कि उर्दू को माइनॉरिटी की भाषा कहा गया है, माइनॉरिटी के हेड में रखा गया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उर्दू माइनॉरिटी की भाषा नहीं है। हम बार-बार इस बात को

کھتے ہیں کہ یہ اردو کے ساتھ انصاف ہے۔ اردو اس ملک کی زبان ہے، اس ملک کے سارے لوگوں کی زبان ہے۔ اردو کو ختم کیا جا رہا ہے اور اس ملک کی جو ہزاروں سالوں کی گंगा-جمنی تہذیب تھی، اسکو ختم کیا جا رہا ہے! ... (تصریح)

شری شاموادی: ۱۵ پیسے یا ۱۷ پیسے لیکن آج مجھے لگتا ہے کہ پانچ پیسے بھی نیچے نہیں پہنچ پاتا۔ اس کے لئے جب تک آپ ڈیوری میکنزم کو ٹھیک نہیں کریں گے، جب تک آپ اس طرح کی دوسری باتیں نہیں کریں گے جس سے پوری طرح سے اس پر نظر رکھی جا سکے اور کانسٹیٹ مانیٹرنگ ہو کہ نیچے پیسے کیسے جا رہے ہیں، تب تک کوئی فائدہ نہیں ہوگا۔ خوشی کی بات یہ ہے کہ آپ نے پچاسیوں کو اس بار ۴۰۰ فیصد بڑھایا ہے اور پچاسیوں کے ذریعہ اس بار پیسے کا خرچ ہوگا۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس سے کافی امپروومنٹ ہوگی لیکن آج بھی اس میں بہت زیادہ مانیٹرنگ کی ضرورت ہے کیونکہ آج بھی پُرکپیٹا جو نوڈ گرین مل رہا ہے، وہ صرف ۱۵۵ کلوگرام ہے جو آزادی کے پہلے، دوسرے مہینہ کے بعد پچاسیوں پر کپیٹا تھا، آج بھی اتنا ہی ہے۔ اس میں بڑھوتری نہیں ہوئی ہے۔ جب کہ جو سپر ریج ہیں، جو بھارت میں سپر ریج ہے، ۰.۰۱ فیصد، اس سپر ریج کی بڑھوتری ۲۸۵ فیصد ہوئی ہے۔ یہ جو استھتی ہے، اگر اس استھتی کو آپ بدلنا چاہتے ہیں، اگر آپ صحیح معنوں میں غربت کی بات کرتے ہیں، کمزوری کی بات کرتے ہیں، مظلوم کی بات کرتے ہیں تو اس کو آپ بدلنا ہوگا۔ میں خاص طور پر ہاتھ جوڑ کر، بہت غمناک، ادب سے اس ملک کی اقلیتوں کی بات کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ اقلیتوں میں خاص طور پر مسلمانوں کی بات کرنا چاہتا ہوں جو ۱۶-۱۵ کروڑ ہیں اور جن کی آرتھک استھتی آزادی کے بعد سے بگڑتی چلی گئی ہے۔ اس کا پکوتا مسلمانوں کے لئے تو نقصان دہ ہے ہی، دلش کے لئے بھی نقصان دہ ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ کسی بھی دلش میں اگر کسی ایک ورگ کے لئے سارے دروازے بند ہو جائیں، کھڑکیا بند ہو جائیں، اس کے پاس وکاس کا کوئی راستہ نہ رہے تو یہ دلش کے لئے خطرہ ہے اور دلش کے سارے لوگوں کو اس پر چٹا دیکھ کر پھرتی ہے، یہ صرف میری چٹا کاوش نہیں ہے۔ لیکن مجھے یہ دکھ ہے کہ لوگ سبھی میں نے بحث دیکھی، بہت کم لوگوں نے۔ اگر کوئی مسلمان ہوتا ہے تو اس بات کو اٹھا دیتا ہے۔ مجھے خوشی اس بات کی ہوگی کہ دوسرے لوگ بھی اس وٹے کو اٹھائیں اور سوال کریں کہ مسلمانوں کی حالت کیوں بری طرح سے پچھڑتی جا رہی ہے۔ میں کہنا چاہوں گا کہ ہمارے دلش میں آج مسلمانوں کی حالت دلتوں سے بدتر ہو گئی ہے۔ میں کوئی ہوائی بات نہیں کہہ

رہا ہوں۔ آپ کو پال کمیشن رپورٹ کو پارلیمنٹ میں رکھتے اور دیکھتے کہ اس میں کیا لکھا ہے۔ مائٹرائی کمیشن کے چیئرمین ہمارے یہاں ہیں، لیکن مائٹرائی کمیشن کی رپورٹ کبھی نہیں رکھی گئی۔ ان رپورٹوں کو دیکھئے، آج نوکریوں میں مسلمان دو فیصد بھی نہیں ہیں۔ پولیس اور فوج میں دیرھ فیصد نہیں ہیں۔ آپ لائسنس دیتے ہیں، پیٹرول پمپ دیتے ہیں، دکانیں دیتے ہیں، ان کی الاؤنسٹ میں مسلمانوں کا دور دور تک کہیں نام نہیں آتا۔ مسلمانوں کے لئے سارے دروازے آپ نے بند کر دیے ہیں۔ پچھلے سال چدمبرم صاحب نے اقلیتوں پر بہت احسان کیا تھا، پورے پچاس کروڑ روپے مائٹرائی ڈیولپمنٹ فائٹنس کارپوریشن کو دئے تھے۔ اتنا بڑا احسان، ہندوستان کے چندرہ کروڑ مسلمانوں پر اور باقی پانچ کروڑ مائٹرائیز کے اوپر کیا گیا تھا۔ پچاس کروڑ روپے دئے گئے تھے، ان کی شکشا کے لئے، اس پیسے کا کیا ہوا؟ وہ پیسہ شکشا کے لئے کس کو دیا؟ مولانا آزاد ایجوکیشن فاؤنڈیشن کو نہیں دیا، مائٹرائی ڈیولپمنٹ فائٹنس کارپوریشن کو دے دیا گیا۔ کیسے خرچ ہوا؟ پچاس ضلعوں میں ڈی ایم کے پاس ایک ایک کروڑ روپیہ بھیج دیا گیا۔ ان ضلعوں میں جہاں مسلمان بچپس تیس فیصد ہیں، وہاں بھیج دیا گیا، لیکن وہ پیسہ مسلمانوں پر خرچ نہیں ہوا، وہ ضلع پر خرچ ہوا۔ تو آپ نے بہت بڑا احسان کیا۔ اردو میں کہتے ہیں کہ ”حاتم طائی کی قبر پر لات ماردی“ کہ صاحب، آپ نے پچاس کروڑ روپیہ مسلمانوں کو دیدیا۔ اس کے بعد ہم نے چٹھیاں لکھیں، پردھان منتری جی کو لکھیں، چدمبرم صاحب کو لکھیں، مائٹرائیز نے اس پر کافی شور مچایا، لیکن اس کے بعد کیا ہوا؟ اس سال کے بجٹ میں، جو آپ نے بڑا اچھا بھاشن کیا، جیسا کہ میں نے کہا کہ آپ کرتے ہیں۔ مائٹرائیز کا الگ سے اسپیکل ہیڈ بنایا گیا، ہم نے سوچا شاید اس میں بہت بھاری کچھ ملنے والا ہے، اور منتری جی نے مانا کہ

"Minorities would have to be brought more into the developmental process. I propose to increase the equity support as may be required for the National Markets Development and Finance Corporation".

میں جانتا چاہتا ہوں کہ as may be required کا کیا مطلب ہے؟ کیا آپ نہیں سمجھتے کہ کیا زیادہ ضرورت نہیں ہے؟ آج انہوں نے آپ کی طرف دیکھا نہیں ہے، آج انہوں نے ایک سیکولر سرکار بنانے کی بات نہیں کی ہے۔ تو آج آپ کا، may be required کا کیا مطلب تھا؟ آپ کہتے کہ ہاں، ہم

دے رہے ہیں سو کروڑ، ہم دے رہے ہیں دو سو کروڑ اور یہی چدمبرم صاحب تھے جنہوں نے مائنارٹیز ڈیولپمنٹ فائننس کارپوریشن کو اپنے ڈیم بجٹ ۱۹۹۷ میں بنایا تھا اور اس وقت کہا تھا کہ ہر سو کروڑ کا ہم اس میں کاریں بنا رہے ہیں۔ ہر سال سو کروڑ بڑھاتے جائیں گے، آج تک بڑھا کر نہیں دیا اور آج دیا تو *maybe required* کی بات کر رہے ہیں۔

اس کے بعد کہتے ہیں سر وکٹشا ابھیان میں ہم مائنارٹیز کے ایریا میں دیکھیں گے کہ سر وکٹشا ابھیان کا پیسہ پہنچے۔ میں جانتا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب سر وکٹشا ابھیان کی بات ہو رہی ہے تو کیا مائنارٹیز کے بچے اس دیش کے شہری نہیں ہیں؟ کیا وہ دس فیصد، پندرہ فیصد نہیں ہیں؟ کیا دس پندرہ فیصد ان پر خرچ نہیں ہونا چاہئے؟ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ زیادہ بچھڑے ہوئے ہیں، ان میں شکشا کی زیادہ کمی ہے، اس کی جو بھی وجوہات ہوں، اتنا سبک کارن ہوں، آرتھک کارن ہوں، دیش کے و بھاجن کا کارن ہو، جو بھی کارن ہوں، وہ شکشا میں زیادہ بچھڑے ہوئے ہیں، اس لئے آپ کم سے کم سر وکٹشا ابھیان کا پندرہ فیصد مائنارٹیز، خاص طور پر مسلم مائنارٹیز کے لئے آؤٹ کیجئے۔ اس کو جب تک آپ نہیں باندھیں گے، وہ ان تک پہنچنے والا نہیں ہے، کیونکہ میرا experience زمین کے اوپر یہ ہے کہ چاہے سر وکٹشا ابھیان ہو، چاہے آؤ اس وکاس کی یوجنا ہو، چاہے اندرا گاندھی آؤ اس وکاس کو۔ کوئی بھی یوجنا جو ہوتی ہے، اس میں جو نیچے بیٹھا ہوا انفر ہے، وہ مسلمان کو حصہ نہیں دیتا۔ مسلمان تک تجربہ بھی نہیں پہنچتی کہ کیا ہو رہا ہے اور کیسے ملنا ہے اور جب وہ apply کرتا ہے، تو اسے نہیں ملتا۔ اس لئے جب تک آپ اس کو باندھیں گے نہیں، جب تک آپ اس کو فورس نہیں کریں گے، تب تک اس کو ملنے والا نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے میں دیش کے ہٹ میں کہتا ہوں کہ اس کو آپ کو کرنا چاہئے۔ خوشی کی بات ہے کہ چدمبرم جی آگئے ہیں۔ اردو کے لئے بھی انہوں نے بڑی محنت دکھائی ہے۔ میری سب سے بڑی شکایت یہ ہے کہ اردو کو مائنارٹی کی بھاشا کہا گیا ہے، مائنارٹی کے ہیڈ میں رکھا گیا ہے۔ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اردو مائنارٹی کی بھاشا نہیں ہے۔ ہم بار بار اس بات کو کہتے ہیں کہ یہ اردو کے ساتھ ایٹائے ہے۔ اردو اس دیش کی بھاشا ہے، اس دیش کے سارے لوگوں کی بھاشا ہے۔ اردو کو ختم کیا جا رہا ہے اور اس دیش کی جو ہزاروں سالوں کی لنگا جتنی تہذیب تھی، اس کو ختم کیا جا رہا ہے۔ مداخلت.....

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा) : यह कांग्रेस की मानसिकता है।

†श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी : यह दोनों तरफ है....दोनों तरफ है। अटल जी भी माइनॉरिटी का वोट लेने के लिए उर्दू की बात करते थे। दो करोड़ उर्दू टीचर लगाने की बात करते थे। बहरहाल, यह कहा गया कि यूपी०, बिहार में उर्दू के टीचर्स लगाए जाएंगे, लेकिन उनके लिए कोई पैसा आबंटित नहीं किया गया। जब मैंने पता किया तो पता लगा कि इस बजट में उर्दू टीचर्स के लिए एक करोड़ रुपया दिया जाएगा। मैं आपको बताना चाहूंगा कि आज उर्दू के टीचर्स एवेलेबल नहीं हैं। वे क्यों एवेलेबल नहीं हैं, इसलिए एवेलेबल नहीं हैं कि जो उर्दू से बी०ए० करता है, उर्दू से जो एम्०ए० करता है, उसको किसी बी०ए० कॉलेज में एडमिशन नहीं मिलता है और वह उस कम्पटिशन में नहीं आ पाता है। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि आप जब उर्दू के टीचर्स लगाना चाहते हैं तो उर्दू के टीचर्स नहीं मिलते हैं। मैं पहली चीज तो यह कहूंगा कि कम से कम उर्दू का टीचर्स ट्रेनिंग कॉलेज खोलने का काम करें। चिदम्बरम जी, यदि आपको उर्दू से मोहब्बत है तो उसके लिए दस-बीस करोड़ रुपए दे दीजिए। चिदम्बरम जी ने उर्दू की बात की और सारी बातें की हैं, लेकिन जो भी इनकी सोशल जस्टिस के लिए स्कीम है, जो ह्यूमन रिसोर्स डेवलपमेंट का पैसा है, उसको आप आबंटित कीजिए वरना अक्विलयतो तक वह रकम पहुंचने वाली नहीं है। अब मैं मौलाना आज़ाद एजुकेशन फाउंडेशन की बात करना चाहूंगा, उसके लिए एक सौ करोड़ का कारपस बना था, जिसमें 70 करोड़ रुपए एजुकेशन फाउंडेशन को मिले थे और 30 करोड़ रुपए सरकार के पास थे। उससे जो इन्स्ट्रुट मिलता था, सरकार वह इन्स्ट्रुट मौलाना आज़ाद एजुकेशन फाउंडेशन को देती थी। इसको और बढ़ाने की जरूरत थी, लेकिन चिदम्बरम साहब ने हाथ की सफाई दिखाई। ये हाथ की बहुत अच्छी सफाई दिखाते हैं साथ ही जादूगर भी हैं। कल ही लोक सभा में यह ऐलान किया कि हमने मौलाना आज़ाद एजुकेशन फाउंडेशन का कारपस 100 करोड़ का कर दिया। वह सौ करोड़ का तो पहले से ही था। 70 करोड़ उनके हाथ में था और जो 30 करोड़ सरकार के पास था, उसका इन्स्ट्रुट भी मिलता था। आपने सौ करोड़ से ज्यादा एक नया पैसा भी नहीं बढ़ाया है। आप यह मजाक मत कीजिए। अगर आपको कराना ही है तो कम से कम पांच सौ करोड़ का होना चाहिए। उपसभापति जी, यदि पांच सौ करोड़ का कारपस होगा तब 40 करोड़ रुपया का इन्स्ट्रुट मिलेगा। इतनी बड़ी आबादी के लिए, पन्द्रह करोड़ की आबादी के लिए 40 करोड़ का इन्स्ट्रुट बहुत भारी चीज है। अगर हम अपने देश के दलितों के लिए, जिनके लिए हमारी सारी भावनाएं हैं, 6253 करोड़ रुपया आबंटित कर सकते हैं, शैड्यूल कास्ट और शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लिए, मैं इसका पूरा समर्थन करता हूँ। क्या इस देश के मुसलमानों के लिए पांच सौ करोड़ आबंटित नहीं कर सकते? मौलाना आज़ाद एजुकेशन फाउंडेशन के लिए हम पांच सौ करोड़ नहीं दे सकते? ताकि हम उसमें 40 करोड़ रुपया साल के, उनकी एजुकेशन पर, स्कॉलरशिप के लिए खर्च कर सकें। आज जो सौ करोड़ रुपया दे रहे हैं, उससे

کितنا मिलेगा، उससे मिलेगा आठ करोड़ साल का। इस आठ करोड़ में से चार करोड़, पांच करोड़ रुपया तो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन, आफिस पर खर्च हो जाएंगे। मुसलमानों की एजुकेशन के लिए, उनकी स्कॉलरशिप के लिए, स्कूल बनाने के लिए तीन, साढ़े तीन करोड़ रुपया देंगे, अगर आठ करोड़ भी लगाएं तो हर मुसलमान के हिस्से में पचास पैसे आते हैं। आप बड़ी माइनोरिटीज की बात करते हैं। आप सैकुलरिज्म बनाकर, सरकारें बना कर गिराते हैं। आपने सैकुलरिज्म के नाम पर, सैकुलरिज्म को माप-दंड बना दिया है। लेकिन सही मायनों में सैकुलरिज्म तब देखा जाए, जब आप इस देश के पिछड़ों को, माइनोरिटीज को, कुचलों को, आगे बढ़ाने के लिए काम करेंगे। इस तरह से उनके साथ मजाक नहीं किया जाएगा। आज जो हो रहा है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह माइनोरिटीज के साथ एक मजाक है L... (समय की घंटी)...

شرعی مشاہدہ مدلیتی : یہ دونوں طرف سے ہیں۔ دونوں طرف سے۔ اس میں بھی نا انصافی ہے۔ دونوں نے اپنے اپنے اردو کی بات کرتے تھے۔ دو کروڑ اردو ٹیچر لگانے کی بات کرتے تھے۔ بہر حال، یہ کہا گیا کہ یو۔ پی، بہار میں اردو کے ٹیچرس لگائے جائیں گے، لیکن ان کے لئے کوئی پیسہ آویٹ نہیں کیا گیا۔ جب میں نے پتہ کیا تو پتہ لگا کہ اس بجٹ میں اردو ٹیچرس کے لئے ایک کروڑ روپیہ دیا جائے گا۔ میں آپ کو بتانا چاہوں گا کہ آج اردو کے ٹیچرس اوپیلیٹل نہیں ہے۔ وہ کیوں اوپیلیٹل نہیں ہے، اس لئے اوپیلیٹل نہیں ہے کہ جو اردو سے بی۔ اے کرتا ہے، اردو سے جوائنم۔ اے کرتا ہے، اس کو کسی بی۔ ایڈ کالج میں ایڈمیشن نہیں ملتا ہے اور وہ اس کمپنیشن میں نہیں آ پاتا ہے۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوتا ہے کہ آپ جب اردو کے ٹیچرس لگانا چاہتے ہیں تو اردو کے ٹیچرس نہیں ملتے ہیں۔ میں پہلی چیز تو یہ کہوں گا کہ کم سے کم اردو کا ٹیچرس ٹریننگ کالج کھولنے کا کام کریں۔ چدمبرم جی، اگر آپ کو اردو سے محبت ہے تو اس کے لئے دس بیس کروڑ روپے دے دیجئے۔ چدمبرم جی نے اردو کی بات کی اور ساری باتیں کی ہیں، لیکن جو بھی ان کی سوشل جنٹس کے لئے اسکیم ہے، جو ہیومن رسورس ڈیولپمنٹ کا پیسہ ہے، اس کو آپ آویٹ کیجئے ورنہ اقلیتوں تک وہ رقم پہنچنے والی نہیں ہے۔ اب میں مولانا آزاد ایجوکیشن فاؤنڈیشن کی بات کرنا چاہوں گا، اس کے لئے ایک سو کروڑ کا کارپس بنا تھا، جس میں ۷۰ کروڑ روپے ایجوکیشن

فاؤنڈیشن کو ملے تھے اور ۳۰ کروڑ روپے سرکار کے پاس تھے۔ اس سے جو انٹرنسٹ ملتا تھا، سرکار وہ انٹرنسٹ مولانا آزاد ایجوکیشن فاؤنڈیشن کو دیتی تھی۔ اس کو اور بڑھانے کی ضرورت تھی، لیکن چدمبرم صاحب نے ہاتھ کی صفائی دکھائی۔ یہ ہاتھ کی بہت اچھی صفائی دکھاتے ہیں ساتھ ہی جادوگر بھی ہیں۔ کل ہی لوک سبھا میں یہ اعلان کیا کہ ہم نے مولانا آزاد ایجوکیشن فاؤنڈیشن کا کارپس ۱۰۰ کروڑ کا کر دیا۔ وہ ۱۰۰ کروڑ کا تو پہلے سے ہی تھا۔ ۷۰ کروڑ اس نے ہاتھ میں تھا اور جو ۳۰ کروڑ سرکار کے پاس تھا، اس کا انٹرنسٹ بھی ملتا تھا۔ آپ نے ۱۰۰ کروڑ سے زیادہ ایک پیسہ بھی نہیں بڑھایا ہے۔ آپ یہ مذاق مت کیجئے۔ اگر آپ کو کرنا ہی ہے تو کم سے کم پانچ سو کروڑ کا ہونا چاہئے۔

اُپ سبھا جی، اگر ۵۰۰ کروڑ کا کارپس ہو گا تب ۴۰ کروڑ روپیہ سال کا انٹرنسٹ ملے گا۔ اتنی بڑی آبادی کے لئے، ۱۵ کروڑ کی آبادی کے لئے ۴۰ کروڑ کا انٹرنسٹ بہت بھاری چیز ہے۔ اگر ہم اپنے دلش کے دلوں کے لئے، جن کے لئے ہماری بھادنائیں ہیں، ۶۲۵۳ کروڑ روپیہ آؤنٹ کر سکتے ہیں، شینڈول کاسٹ اور شینڈول ٹرانس کے لئے، میں اس کا پورا سمرقن کرتا ہوں۔ کیا اس دلش کے مسلمانوں کے لئے پانچ سو کروڑ آؤنٹ نہیں کر سکتے ہیں؟ مولانا آزاد ایجوکیشن فاؤنڈیشن کے لئے ہم ۵۰۰ کروڑ نہیں دے سکتے؟ تاکہ ہم اس میں ۴۰ کروڑ روپیہ سال کے، ان کے ایجوکیشن پر، اسکالرشپ کے لئے خرچ کر سکیں۔ آج جو ۱۰۰ کروڑ روپیہ دے رہے ہیں، اس سے کتنا ملے گا، اس سے ملے گا آٹھ کروڑ سال کا۔ اس آٹھ کروڑ میں سے چار کروڑ، پانچ کروڑ روپیہ تو ایڈمنسٹریشن، آفس پر خرچ ہو جائیں گے۔ مسلمانوں کی ایجوکیشن کے لئے، ان کی اسکالرشپ کے لئے، اسکول بنانے کے لئے تین، ساڑھے تین کروڑ روپیہ دیں گے، اگر آٹھ کروڑ بھی لگائیں تو ہر مسلمان کے حصے میں پچاس پیسے آتے ہیں۔ آپ بڑی مانتا رہیز

کی بات کرتے ہیں۔ آپ سیکولرزم بنا کر، سرکاری بنا کر گراتے ہیں۔ آپ نے سیکولرزم کے نام پر سیکولرزم کو ماپ۔ دنڈ بنا دیا ہے۔ لیکن صحیح معنوں میں سیکولرزم تب دیکھا جائے جب آپ اس دیش کے پھڑوں کو، مائنارٹیز کو، کچلوں کو، آگے بڑھانے کے لئے کام کریں گے۔ اس طرح سے ان کے ساتھ مذاق نہیں کیا جائے گا۔ آج جو ہو رہا ہے، میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ مائنارٹیز کے ساتھ ایک مذاق ہے۔..... (وقت کی گنتی).....

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): The Government should take note of all these points. He has made specific points. He has made good suggestions.

†**SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI:** Thank you, very much. But, unfortunately, I do not think that anybody has paid attention to what I had been saying, and it is because I am speaking in Urdu or whatever. आखिर में, मैं अपने प्रदेश, उत्तर प्रदेश की बात करना चाहूंगा। मैं चाहूंगा कि चिदम्बरम जी उत्तर प्रदेश की ओर ध्यान दें। मान्यवर, उत्तर प्रदेश बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ प्रदेश है और वहां पर 18 करोड़ की आबादी है। इस 18 करोड़ की आबादी वाले प्रदेश के लिए आपने कोई कदम नहीं उठाया है। अगर साथ में उत्तर प्रदेश का निर्माण नहीं होगा तो आप जो देश को आगे ले जाने की बात करते हैं, भारत-निर्माण की बात करते हैं, वह भारत-निर्माण कैसे सम्भव होगा? उत्तर प्रदेश ने आप से स्पेशल पैकेज मांगा, लेकिन उस तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। वहां के मुख्य मंत्री, प्रधानमंत्री जी से आकर मिले, चिदम्बरम जी से मिले, लेकिन उस पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। आपने उत्तरांचल में स्पेशल इकनोमिक पैकेज दिया है। आपने वहां पर स्पेशल इकनोमिक जोन बनाया है। वहां पर सेंट्रल एक्साइज ड्यूटी में आठ से चौबीस प्रतिशत, दस साल के लिए एग्जम्पशन दिया गया है। इनकम टैक्स में एग्जम्पशन दिया है, तीस प्रतिशत पांच साल के लिए। नतीजा क्या हो रहा है? हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में सहारनपुर, बरेली, मुजफ्फरनगर, मुरादाबाद, रामपुर जैसे इलाकों से उद्योगों का पलायन हो रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान लीवर उत्तरांचल में अपनी फैक्ट्री लेकर चली गई है सड़क के इस पार उत्तर प्रदेश है, सड़क के उस पार उत्तरांचल है। वहां पर एग्जम्पशन ही एग्जम्पशन है, यहां पर एग्जम्पशन नहीं है। यह कैसा अंतर है? ये कहते हैं कि वह पिछड़ा है, यह पिछड़ा नहीं है। आपने एक प्रदेश बनाया था, बहुत अच्छा किया जो बनाया, लेकिन हमारे साथ तो यह अन्याय मत कीजिए। हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश को पैकेज मिलना चाहिए। अगर यह पैकेज नहीं मिलेगा तो अनुचित होगा। मैं चाहूंगा कि जब वित्त मंत्री अपना जवाब

†Transliteration of Urdu script.

دें तब बताएं कि यह क्यों है? पैकेज दिये जाने का क्या मापदंड है? क्या पैकेज दिए जाने का यह मापदंड है कि आपको किसी ने वोट दिया है, किसी ने वोट नहीं दिया है? क्या राजनैतिक मापदंड है? अगर राजनैतिक मापदंड है तो भारत का निर्माण नहीं हो सकता। भारत के निर्माण के लिए राजनीति से ऊपर उठकर आर्थिक मापदंड बनाने होंगे। आप हमें दीजिए, मत दीजिए, दूसरों को दीजिए लेकिन कोई मापदंड एक हो... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: Thank you, very much. But, unfortunately, I do not think that attention to what I had been saying, and it is because I am speaking in anybody has paid

Urdu or whatever آخر میں، میں اپنے پردیش، اتر پردیش کی بات کرنا چاہوں گا۔ میں چاہوں گا کہ چدمبرم جی اتر پردیش کی طرف دھیان دیں۔

مانیور، اتر پردیش بہت بچھا ہوا پردیش ہے اور وہاں پر ۱۸ کروڑ کی آبادی ہے۔ اس ۱۸ کروڑ کی آبادی والے پردیش کے لئے آپ نے کوئی قدم نہیں اٹھایا ہے۔ اگر ساتھ میں اتر پردیش کا زمانہ نہیں ہوگا تو آپ جو دیش کو آگے لے جانے کی بات کرتے ہیں، بھارت زمانہ کی بات کرتے ہیں، وہ بھارت زمانہ کیسے ممکن ہوگا؟ اتر پردیش نے آپ سے اسٹیشن چیک مانگا، لیکن اس طرف دھیان نہیں دیا گیا۔ وہاں کے وزیر اعلیٰ، وزیر اعظم جی سے آکر ملے، چدمبرم جی سے ملے، لیکن اس پر کوئی دھیان نہیں دیا گیا۔ آپ نے اتر انچل میں اسٹیشن اکونومی چیک دیا ہے۔ آپ نے وہاں پر اسٹیشن اکونومی زون بنایا ہے۔ وہاں پر سینٹرل ایکسائز ڈیوٹی میں آٹھ سے چوبیس فیصد، دس سال کے لئے ایگزیمپشن دیا گیا ہے۔ اکم ٹیکس میں ایگزیمپشن دیا ہے، تیس فیصد پانچ سال کے لئے۔ نتیجہ کیا ہو رہا ہے؟ ہمارے اتر پردیش میں سہارنپور، بریلی، مظفرنگر، مراد آباد، رامپور جیسے علاقوں سے صنعتوں کا پلاں ہو رہا ہے۔ ہندوستان لیور اتر انچل میں اپنی فیکٹری لیکر چلی گئی ہے۔ سڑک کے اس پار اتر پردیش ہے، سڑک کے اس پار اتر انچل ہے۔ وہاں پر ایگزیمپشن ہی ایگزیمپشن ہے، یہاں پر ایگزیمپشن نہیں ہے۔ یہ کیسا فرق ہے؟ یہ کہتے ہیں کہ وہ بچھا رہا ہے، وہ بچھا نہیں ہے۔ آپ نے ایک پردیش بنایا تھا، بہت اچھا کیا جو بنایا، لیکن ہمارے ساتھ تو یہ انیائے مت کیجئے۔ ہمارے اتر پردیش کو چیک ملنا چاہئے۔ اگر یہ چیک نہیں ملے گا تو مناسب نہیں ہوگا۔ میں چاہوں گا کہ جب وزیر مالیت اپنا جواب دیں

تب بتائیں کہ یہ کیوں ہے؟ پہنچ دیے جانے کا کیا مآپ۔ دنڈ ہے؟ کیا پہنچ دیے جائے گا یہ مآپ۔ دنڈ ہے کہ آپ کو کسی نے ووٹ دیا ہے، کسی نے ووٹ نہیں دیا ہے؟ کیا سیاسی مآپ۔ دنڈ ہے؟ اگر سیاسی مآپ۔ دنڈ ہے تو بھارت کا زمانہ نہیں ہو سکتا۔ بھارت کے زمانہ کے لئے سیاست سے اوپر اٹھ کر آتھک مآپ۔ دنڈ بتانے ہوں گے۔ آپ ہمیں دیتے ہیں، مت دیتے ہیں، دوسروں کو دیتے ہیں، لیکن کوئی مآپ۔ دنڈ ایک ہو.... بد اخلاقت....

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार): वित्त आयोग को उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने क्या कहा था?

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: कोई तो मापदंड हो....(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: अब आप कन्वल्ड कीजिए...(व्यवधान)...

†श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: कोई तो मापदंड बनाकर चलिए, कोई तो बुनियाद बनाइए। उस बुनियाद पर आप चलेंगे तो नतीजा यह होगा कि भारत का निर्माण हो पाएगा वरना मैं नहीं समझता कि भारत का हम जिस तरह से निर्माण चाहते हैं, जिस तरह से विकास चाहते हैं, वह हो पाएगा। मैं खास तौर पर माइनोरिटी के सवाल पर चाहूंगा कि पूरा सदन मेरा समर्थन करे क्योंकि माइनोरिटीज की जो बात है, वह खास तौर पर इस देश के मुसलमानों की बात है। आज अगर इस देश के मुसलमानों ने हमें सानिया मिर्जा दी है, इरफान पठान दिया है, सलमान खान दिया है, तो इसलिए दिया है क्योंकि उन क्षेत्रों में, फिल्म के क्षेत्र में, संगीत के क्षेत्र में, आर्ट के क्षेत्र, स्पोर्ट्स के क्षेत्र में कोई भेदभाव नहीं होता। ये सेक्युलर क्षेत्र हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि फिल्म के बारे में बहुत बुरी बातें कही जाती हैं, लेकिन मैं भारत की इस फिल्म इंडस्ट्री को सलाम देना चाहूंगा कि यह एक सेक्युलर फिल्म इंडस्ट्री है, यह सबसे ज्यादा सेक्युलर फिल्म इंडस्ट्री है। यह देश फिल्म में सेक्युलर है, संगीत में सेक्युलर है।

अगर हम वहां आ सकते हैं तब कुलियों क्यों नहीं बन सकते? मुरादाबाद में कुलियों का सर्वेक्षण किया गया, जहां शहर के अंदर मुसलमान साठ से सत्तर प्रतिशत हैं, कुलियों में मुसलमान पंद्रह प्रतिशत हैं। क्या मुसलमान कुली भी नहीं बन सकता? जब आप स्कूटर, टैक्सी का लाइसेंस देते हैं, उसमें भी मुसलमान को नहीं देते, यह क्यों नहीं मिलता? मुसलमान में सलाहीयत है। कारगिल के अंदर शहीद होने वालों में आठ प्रतिशत मुसलमान थे। फौज में कितने प्रतिशत हैं? फौज में दो प्रतिशत हैं। फौज में दो प्रतिशत हैं लेकिन शहीद होने वालों में आठ प्रतिशत हैं...(व्यवधान).... मेरे भाई, जब पोटा या टांडा की बात आती है तो पहले मुसलमान याद आता है, लेकिन जब विकास की बात आती है तो मुसलमान याद नहीं आता। क्यों हमारी हर लड़की सानिया मिर्जा नहीं बन

सकती है, बन सकती है। क्यों हमारा हर नौजवान कारगिल पर जाकर शहीद नहीं हो सकता, हो सकता है। आप मौका दीजिए। यह देश के संतुलित विकास के लिए, आतंकवाद से लड़ने के लिए, देश को बांटने वालों से लड़ने के लिए, जो हमारे देश के विरोधी हैं, जो हमारे दुश्मन पड़ोसी हैं, उनसे लड़ने के लिए यह अति आवश्यक है। यह अति आवश्यक है, इसके लिए मैं सबका समर्थन चाहूंगा, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

شری شاہد صدیقی: کوئی تو ماپ۔ دنڈ بنا کر چلنے، کوئی تو بنیاد بنائیے۔ اس بنیاد پر آپ چلیں گے تو نتیجہ یہ ہوگا کہ بھارت کا زمانہ ہو پائے گا ورنہ میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ بھارت کا ہم جس طرح سے زمانہ چاہتے ہیں، جس طرح سے وکاس چاہتے ہیں، وہ ہو پائے گا۔ میں خاص طور پر مانٹرائی کے سوال پر چاہوں گا کہ پورا سدن میرا ستر تھن کرے، کیوں کہ مانٹرائیز کی جو بات ہے، وہ خاص طور پر اس دلش کے مسلمانوں کی بات ہے۔ آج اگر اس دلش کے مسلمانوں نے ہمیں ثانیہ مرزا دی ہے، عرفان پٹھان دیا ہے، سلمان خان دیا ہے، تو اس لئے دیا ہے کیونکہ ان جھیتروں میں، فلم کے جھیتروں میں، سنگیت کے جھیتروں میں، آرٹ کے جھیتروں، اسپورٹس کے جھیتروں میں کوئی بھید بھاؤ نہیں ہوتا۔ یہ سیکولر جھیتروں ہے۔ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ فلم کے بارے میں بہت بڑی باتیں کہی جاتی ہیں، لیکن میں بھارت کی اس فلم انڈسٹری کو سلام دینا چاہوں گا کہ یہ ایک سیکولر فلم انڈسٹری ہے، یہ سب سے زیادہ سیکولر فلم انڈسٹری ہے۔ یہ دلش فلم میں سیکولر ہے، سنگیت میں سیکولر ہے۔

اگر ہم وہاں آسکتے ہیں، تب قلی کیوں نہیں بن سکتے؟ مراد آباد میں قلیوں کا سرویکشن کیا گیا، جہاں شہر کے اندر مسلمان ساٹھ سے ستر فیصد ہیں، قلیوں میں مسلمان پندرہ فیصد تھے۔ کیا مسلمان قلی بھی نہیں بن سکتا؟ جب آپ اسکور، ٹیکسی کا لائسنس دیتے ہیں، اس میں بھی مسلمان کو نہیں دیتے، یہ کیوں نہیں ملتا؟ مسلمان میں صلاحیت ہے۔ کارگل کے اندر شہید ہونے والوں میں آٹھ فیصد مسلمان تھے۔ فوج میں کتنے فیصد ہیں؟ فوج میں دو فیصد ہیں۔ فوج میں دو فیصد ہیں لیکن شہید ہونے والوں میں آٹھ فیصد ہیں..... مداخلت.....

†Transliteration of Urdu script.

میرے بھائی، جب پوٹا یا ناڈا کی بات آتی ہے تو پہلے مسلمان یاد آتا ہے، لیکن جب وکاس کی بات آتی ہے تو مسلمان یاد نہیں آتا۔ کیوں ہماری ہر لڑکی ثانیہ مرزا نہیں بن سکتی ہے، بن سکتی ہے۔ کیوں ہمارا ہر نوجوان کارگل پر جا کر شہید نہیں ہو سکتا، ہو سکتا ہے۔ آپ موقع دیجئے۔ یہ دلش کے سنبھلے وکاس کے لئے، آنکھ وادے لڑنے کے لئے، دلش کو بانٹنے والوں سے لڑنے کے لئے، جو ہمارے دلش کے درودھی ہیں، جو ہمارے دشمن پڑوسی ہیں، ان سے لڑنے کے لئے یہ بہت ضروری ہے۔ یہ بہت ضروری ہے، اس کے لئے میں سب کا سمر تھن چاہوں گا۔ بہت بہت دھنیو اؤ۔

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned to meet at 2.30 p.m

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty minutes" past two of the clock,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr K. Malaisamy, your party has got 23 minutes. I hope you will adhere to time...(Interruptions)... and, you will spare some time for others also.

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you very much for enabling me to make my presentation on behalf of the AIADMK Party, which is the ruling party in Tamil Nadu. It is my pleasure and privilege to speak on the most important subject, namely, the General Budget, which is the axis and assistance around which the entire Government revolves.

Sir, the Budget is not only a statement of receipts, expenditure, estimation of resource and resource mobilisation, but, on the other hand, it is also the policy of the Government. Sir, in the process of the three Ps, namely, planning, preparing and performing the Budget, it is viewed with the political, social, administrative realities of the country as a whole.

Sir, many Governments have presented the Budgets. One Government may come and present it, and, some other Government may come and go. So, the frequent changes of the Government lead to a hurdle for consistency and continuity of policies and effective implementation. Not only that, when a new Government comes, they invariably undo, particularly when they are opposing the earlier Government, what all they have already done. So, in other words, Budgets are subject to various other compulsions and constraints. For example, the UPA Government has got its own constraints and compulsions from its allies and partners. The Government has seen the compulsions and other things. Thus many Budgets are made in an *ad-hoc* manner under political compulsions. Sir, this is the way that I look upon the background of this Budget and its presentation.

Now coming to the Budget, the hon. Finance Minister, by virtue of his background as a well-informed and well-learned Finance Minister under his apex leadership has been able to prepare the Budget speech and present it. In his presentation, in his opening remarks itself, he said that the UPA Government has charted to reap the concept and harvest of the utilitarian theory, namely, the greatest happiness of the greatest number. This is what he has said.

Then I could also see that the language and the jargons used are very much attractive and highlighting. By making use of the word power and 'word play', literally they have tried to add charm to the Budget. The bureaucrats as well as the Finance Minister have done a good exercise to prepare an attractive Budget.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You were also a bureaucrat, Sir....(Interruptions)...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Thirdly, the hon. Minister has been very cautious while making remarks in his speech on certain areas, particularly the outlay and the outcome. While making jargons like 'assault on poverty and unemployment', 'empowering people', 'thrust', 'focus', etc., in the case

of 'outflow and outcome', he has been very cautious. He had his reservations on this with an object to explain later how it could not be done. Sir, a close friend of mine, a journalist and a good critique-turned politician, used to say that a "clever politician is one who throws umpteen number of promises left and right and then he must know to explain later why such promises could not be complied with and could not be fulfilled." The reason why I am saying this here is that, probably, our Finance Minister is also not an exception to it.

Sir, now, I come to the other aspect, the main feature of the Budget. Much has been said about the plus and minus points of the Budget and we have seen it in papers, in the media. Some of them have given the pat and praise on the one side, some others have given brickbats, on the other. The ills and evils of the Budget have been highlighted on the one side, while some "well" aspects of the Budget have also been highlighted on the other. To illustrate a little, the Budget has risen up to the challenges. Secondly, the Finance Minister has been praised for his skilful job of preparing the Budget. It has also been said that it is a growth-oriented and balanced Budget. It is also said that it is a 'gender justice' and 'friendly Budget'. These are all plus sides of the Budget. On the negative side, it is said that it is a directionless Budget; it is a half-baked Budget; and a lot of sectors have been neglected. It gives lot of hopes and dreams, but it will be difficult in execution or reality; then, 'it is more out of political experience' etc. This is the other side. There are some people who are in between--neither here nor there. If you ask me what is my opinion, then I would say, I like to be very objective and I like to be fair and there are certainly a few plus points in the Budget. At the same time, there are umpteen number of grey areas also. Sir, the Finance minister has quoted in his Budget Speech a famous couplet of *Thirukkural*. In this connection, I am reminded of a couplet of *Thirukkural* of the great saint *Thiruvalluvar*, viz.

*Gunam naadi Kutramum nadi,
Avatrul migainaadi mikka kolal*

which means to reach a conclusion of an issue, analyse the plus and minus points, and whatever is on the higher side one should lean to it in

making a decision. As far as I am concerned, *Thirukkural* couplet is going to be adopted, in appreciating or deprecating the Budget. My first observation is....(*interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you have come to the first observation! (*Interruptions*)

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, my first observation is this. It sounds very well but whether the sound will be really heard is a question mark. Secondly, Sir, they have preached very well, but can it be put in practice? That is my second question. In other words, there is a great gap between the precept and the practice. My second observation is that he has given umpteen number of schemes. But most of the schemes which have been enunciated or incorporated in the Budget speech are mostly the schemes of the earlier Governments and those schemes have been tailored, in such a way, or, named in such a way to give an impression as if it is a new one. In other words, the old wine has been put in a new bottle. This is my second observation. Thirdly, Sir, he has said that by his Budget speech, he has touched several hearts. Nicely worded, I mean, to be honest with you. But in many places, it is likely to dry up the hearts also. Why I say so can be illustrated. Sir, in the recent past, the *Dandi Yatra*, I mean the 75th anniversary of the *Dandi Yatra*, was flagged off in Gujarat in which Shrimati Soniaji was also a participant. The celebration is well taken. The entire House knows that the *Dandi Yatra* was initiated by the great Mahatma Gandhi to protest against the levy of tax on common salt. This was the purpose of Gandhiji's *dandi Yatra*. Now, I am sorry to say that under VAT, this item is charged. What is your precept? You are preaching Gandhian principles but what are you actually doing?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): I think this is too serious issue to be taken light heartedly, Sir, VAT is not a Central tax, VAT is not imposed by Parliament. VAT, as Mr. Jaitley and Mr. Ravi Shankar will confirm, is under Entry 54 List 2 and is a State law. Empowered Committee of State Finance Ministers have recommended various rates, it is entirely for the States to either impose or not impose. Parliament has

nothing to do with it; the Central Government has nothing to do with it. The Budget has not imposed any tax on salt. I don't think you should give the impression that the Budget has imposed tax on salt.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Thank you very much for the clarification. Sir, coming to the other issue. On this point, the Finance Minister has been so considerate to reduce the custom duty, import duty, encouraging some of the items of import. What exactly is the net result? Most of the products which are manufactured in India, particularly by small-scale industries and khadi and village industries, they could not compete with the multinational companies, they could not compete with the products which are coming from elsewhere. Are you protecting the small scale industries or the khadi and village industries? That is my question. My next point is about de-reservation of several items from small-scale industries. Many of the small-scale industries are depending upon such of those items. Once you dereserve them, what will happen to the fate of those small-scale industries? This is my point.

Sir, coming to the most important aspect, in which everyone is interested, namely, the personal taxation. Shri Ramachandraiah spoke about it. He is an Auditor and Chartered Accountant. Mr. Deputy Chairman himself is a Chartered Accountant. I have consulted some Chartered Accountants on this issue. I want to place before the House to consider whether are the high sounding concessions or relief that have been announced, are really true or not. Sir, you will see, we were very happy when we read that the gender justice has been done viz. upto for 1.25 lakh, there is no income tax for women. There is no tax for senior citizens up to 1.5 lakhs. All these things were well taken by everyone. Then he has said that up to Rs. 1 lakh for everyone, it is exempted. But on close analysis, we could see that there was no tax at all up to one lakh even earlier. Now he says it is exempted. What is the jugglery? What is the net result? Even up to one lakh for others, there was no tax earlier as well. Now, they say it is 'exempted up to one lakh'. What does it mean? This is my first point. Secondly, as regards women, in the earlier budget, Rs. 5,000/- relief was allowed to women. Even this relief of Rs. 5,000/- which was allowed to women in the last Budget, is

not available to them now. If you apply this Rs. 5,000/- relief, you can go beyond Rs. 1.25 lakhs. What I am trying to say is that, though it may look as if some benefit has been given to the women folk, in reality, it is not so. This is the calculation given to me by the auditors, (*Interruptions*) In the case of senior citizens, in the earlier Budget, they had given the relief up to Rs. 20,000/-. If you apply Rs. 20,000 relief, and if you calculate all these things, you will find that there is no benefit at all. What I am again trying to say is that either in the case of women or in the case of senior citizens, it looks as if a great benefit has been allowed to them by the Finance Minister, by way of this Budget but in reality, it is not so.

Thirdly, I come to the standard deduction. Standard deduction has been given a go-by once for all. So, the salaried class has been severely hit. Earlier, up to Rs. 1.2 lakh, they could have a ceiling. The standard deduction was there. What I am trying to highlight is that in respect of personal taxation, whatever benefits, reliefs or exemptions seem to be there, in reality, they do not exist at all.

Coming to the corporate tax, they have reduced the corporate tax from 35 per cent to 33 per cent. It is well taken. Again, by decreasing the depreciation rate, it has been offset. What I am trying to highlight, is the technique, the strategy of the Finance Minister. He will give something by right hand and take it away by left hand. He is the giver as well as the taker. The latter part is not understood by many of us. We are not conscious of it. In case of direct taxation, he will give some concessions or exemptions. By way of indirect tax, he will impose some levy. This is my observation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Malaisamy, five minutes are left. You should make your observations very, very carefully.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Now, I come to another important aspect. The Finance Minister has said that his Budget will bring the greatest happiness to the greatest number of people. I would like to know the composition of

[18 March, 2005]

RAJYA SABHA

population in India? Nearly 70 per cent of the people are poor, and they are to be taken care of. I am told that one-third of world's poor are in India. Nearly 35 crores of people are below poverty line. Nearly 50 per cent of the population is either having low income or under-employed. Such people are using impteen number of products. All these products have been taxed. So, where is the question of bringing greatest happiness to the maximum number of people? The poor and unemployed people are hit hard in one way or the other. This is my point.

Then, I come to the question of employment. Employment needs investment and proper infrastructure should be created. As far as the question of creation of employment is concerned, this Budget is totally silent on this point. They are making tall claims. Under the Bharat Nirman Scheme, they are seeking about hundred lakh rural jobs. But not a single pie has been set apart for the said purpose. They may try to say that resources can be created here and there. But I would like to know whether it is feasible from the practical point of view. No specific allocation has been set apart for this purpose.

Another aspect is about the Centre-State relations, which is very, very relevant. Sir, the Finance Minister has said that the Plan allocation to the States, as far as this Budget is concerned, has been reduced to the extent of Rs. 15,000 crores, from last year to this year. What are they going to do in such a situation? The answer is that the States can go to the market for borrowing money. How can they go and borrow it from the market, Sir? They are already on red track. They did not have enough money. They are depending upon the Centre for allocation of funds, but you ask them to go and borrow money from elsewhere! How can they go and borrow money? How can that happen? Sir, they are empowering the backward States with a regional grant or fund, we are not against their assisting the backward districts or the backward States. My point is that a well-performing State should not be penalised and an ill-performing State should not be encouraged. On the other hand, giving this kind of grant or money adds to the burden of the borrowing States.

As far as the Centre-State relationship is concerned, hon. Finance Minister will appreciate that most of the schemes are implemented by the States. What is the mechanism you have got for coordination with the States? Most of the schemes concerning agriculture, education etc., and

the schemes which are often talked about, are being implemented only by the States. You are giving funds; they are also using their own resources. Ultimately, the schemes are implemented by them. What is the mechanism you have got for coordination with the States, particularly with States which are not seeing eye to eye with Central Government. This is a very important point. You may be interested in States having partnership with UPA. But there are umpteen number of States which are not used to join with you on all issues; they should not be looked upon from a hostile angle. I will illustrate it a little later, Sir, how...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; not a little later!

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, in this connection, I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Finance Minister...(Interruptions)... He is a Minister for the entire country; there is no doubt about it. But he is hailing from Tamil Nadu; he cannot afford to miss Tamil Nadu; he cannot afford to ignore Tamil Nadu. He should take care of...(Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have come to the final point. That is good...(Interruptions)...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: He should take care of every State. But he should have some soft corner as far as Tamil Nadu is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will appreciate it. (Interruptions)...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, you are normally considerate, but you are now showing...(Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am very considerate to you already.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, I have not consumed my time of 23 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The stopwatch is here.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, normally, the first speaker is given more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The problem is, I want to tell you, and also to the other Members, that there are names of 23 members more, and we have to complete it in two hours; at 5 O' clock, the hon, Minister has to reply, So, that is the constraint.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, are you going to give me another ten minutes? (Interruptions)...

[18 March, 2005]

RAJYA SABHA

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sir, please extend the time by one hour...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, I won't be able to highlight all the points.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is why I said in the beginning, "Please be brief."

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Will you exclude the time taken by the Chair and the Members in interruptions?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, not; please conclude.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, I will tell you how Tamil Nadu has been neglected, whether done consciously or unconsciously. I would like to bring it to the notice of the House and the hon. Minister, in particular, that tall claims have been made about the Setusamudram project. Sir, this is a project which we have been talking about it for a century. During the last Government, the BJP Government...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, please don't interrupt. There are other speakers also...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: it took some shape. Now, it is being well-talked about, an often-talked about project. Whenever they come from Delhi-I do not mean or Finance Minister: I mean the Ministers from Tamil Nadu--when they make tall claims that they have done this or that, but I am surprised to see that nothing has been set apart for the Sethusamudram project. It does not get...*(Interruptions)*... But they may try to explain that it is...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, don't interrupt him. You should cooperate with us...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Narayanasamy, when your turn comes...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI S.G. INDIRA (Tamil Nadu): We are also having so many records. The State Government is fully cooperating with the Centre...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, please don't interrupt him...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Narayanasamy, you will reduce the time of all the speakers...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Narayanasamy, please take your seat. *(Interruptions)*... You will reduce the time of all the speakers. *(Interruptions)*.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Coming to the second issue regarding Tsunami, as you very well know, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Tamil Nadu is the worst hit. Out of a total of 10,000 people who died in the Tsunami, 8,000 odd people are from Tamil Nadu and it suffered the greatest losses. The other day, when the Home Minister was answering a question, he said that they were making all-out efforts and resources were not a problem at all. He said that they were giving all-out assistance. We are very happy to take note of it. The Finance Minister in his Budget Speech said that he had set apart, subject to correction, Rs. 10,000 crores or Rs. 13,000 and odd crores. Our Chief Minister has sent a proposal justifying all the requirements and demanded Rs. 4,800 crores as one-time allocation from the Centre. The Central Team has visited Tamil Nadu also corroborated the requirement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI R. SHUNMUGASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): It is not reaching the people. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is not reaching the people. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please. You can say that when your turn comes. *(Interruptions)*..

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Now, I want to put a specific question to the Finance Minister, whether the full requirements will be met. *(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Malaisamy, you promised me in the beginning that you would adhere to the time. I can't further extend the time. My problem is how I can accommodate all the speakers. *(Interruptions)*....

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Coming to the desalination plant, which is a very sensitive plant-our Finance Minister is well aware of it-an amount of Rs. 5 crores had been set apart in the last Budget. But nothing has been set apart in this Budget. How, there is a dearth of water in Chennai. We are making all-out efforts to do something in that regard.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next speaker, Dr. Subbarami Reddy.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Nothing has been mentioned about interlinking of rivers. Nothing has been mentioned about the desalination plant. The point is that the State Government is making all-out efforts. Why don't they give a substantial allocation by way of grant to the State Government? *(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I have identified Dr. Subbarami Reddy *(Interruptions)*...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Coming to railways...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, we are not discussing railways. *(Interruptions)*...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Though it relates to railways, the Minister will be interested to know, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the Railway Budget

DR. K. MALAISAMY: The BG conversion from Tiruchi to Manamadurai...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, he will not answer that question. *(Interruptions)*...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: and Madurai to Rameswaram should be taken up and executed immediately. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will take a couple of minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. *(Interruptions)*...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, kindly give me two minutes. Please give me two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: You have said so many things by way of tax reforms. I would like to say that while generating revenue, the paying capacity and the willingness of the tax payers should be taken into account. To quote Arignar Anna... *(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't quote.

DR. K. MALAISAMY:"pat the poor, tap the rich, and extract tax without tears". You reduce the rates of your taxation, improve your equity horizontally and vertically, improve the administration by way of simplification and rationalisation of the procedure, etc., broaden your tax base and minimise leakages. *(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, Dr. Malaisamy, please conclude.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, this is the last sentence. The following things are needed for a good Budget and its execution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You said that.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, I want to say only a few words. They are, (1) direction; (2) political will; (3) professional skill to execute the political will; (4) enough vision and mission; (5) decisiveness and commitment. I don't know. . (*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think all these things the Finance Minister has. (*Interruptions*)...

DR. K. MALAISAMY: It is up to him to react. (*Interruptions*)... Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Subbarami Reddy. You have five minutes. (*Interruptions*)...

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Then I won't speak. (*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I can't help it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, he can speak for 10 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your party has got 30 minutes. There are five speakers from your party. (*Interruptions*)...

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: I will speak for 15 minutes, whether you agree or not. That is all. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): We would like to have the wisdom of the great Member. (*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, you have to cooperate and see to it that we complete it in time. If he takes 15 minutes, other Members should not complain.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: I will take 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I leave it to your party.

3.00 P.M.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me congratulate the Finance Minister for having given a magical budget which made the entire nation spellbound. In fact, every sphere of life, every section of the society was simply enthralled, thrilled and electrified with his magical budget. I must say a small verse from the Bhagawad Gita, "लोकोत्तर...निरूपमः" It means his presentation is a matchless phenomenon, unparallel spectrum. My friends, rather than loving the Budget, for name's sake and with great difficulty could find little flaw in it and while concluding the said, "I like it and I would like to support it". I read in *The Hindu*, where respected Atal Bihari Vajpayee said, "The Budget seems to be good for growth but it would lead to inflation". इसका मतलब यह है कि दिल से तो वे इस बजट की तारीफ़ कर रहे हैं, किन्तु ऊपर से यूँ ही कह रहे हैं कि इससे इन्फ्लेशन बढ़ेगा। Like that, Shri Ramachandraiah, who is a leader of the Telugu Desam Party, had criticised a few points. But in conclusion he said, "I support this Budget". That means, in a democratic country, even if it is a policy matter, we must accept a good cause and a good result, irrespective of the political parties. Through this Budget, Shri Chidambaram has conquered the hearts of millions and millions of Indians. People have appreciated this Budget all over the world. Normally, when the budget is presented industrialists get upset, farmers get upset, manufacturers get upset, salaried people get upset, women get upset but here the women are happy because they have got income tax exemption up to Rs. 1.25 lakhs. The senior citizens are happy because they have got exemption up to Rs. 1.50 lakhs. Farmers are happy. He has covered the agriculture sector, rural sector, rural infrastructure, rural electrification, textile sector, education, health, etc. My friends were saying that he has given money by one hand and taken away by the other hand. He cannot manufacture money. He has given a magical budget. He has prepared this budget conscientiously, judiciously, meticulously, practically and in such a way that everybody has admired it. The Finance Minister has met farmers' credit needs. Measures for sugar, horticulture, cooperative banks, micro irrigation, knowledge centres, SHGs, backward districts, housing and electricity are great. One of my friends said, crop insurance and vagueness on irrigation allocations are disappointing. But I do not agree with him. The Budget is fair and balanced. Increase in income tax exemption limit upto Rs. 1 lakh a year, slashing corporate tax rate by 30 per cent and cutting peak customs duty from 20

per cent to 15 per cent have initiated big ticket tax reforms. The Budget also seeks to give a major thrust to rural infrastructure and development. This Budget is in the right direction. The Finance Minister has taken a approach of all-round development with a focus on fiscal consolidation and tax reforms. The Budget has a strong focus on infrastructure investments, alongwith rural development and investments in the social sector like education and health care. Not only will this improve the standard of living but will also expand rural demand. The special emphasis given to the textile sector is positive and will lead to employment generation. The decision to cut corporate tax for domestic companies by 5 per cent is a positive step but actual impact on the companies will be only 1-2 per cent. IT software continuing to get exemption is great news. Both hardware and software prices are expected to come down. So, I visualise growth for both. Job creation of seven million is possible only if investment is made for IITs, NIITs and IIITs.

I must say the gross Plan has been increased by 17 per cent. The Central Plan has been increased from Rs. 87,000 crores to Rs. 1,10,000 crores, *i.e.* 26.5 per cent. A total of Rs. 75,000 crores has been allocated to the priority areas of the Common Minimum Programme. You must also bear in mind that a road map is to reduce the fiscal deficit by 1.1 per cent by 2006-07. It is the dream of the Finance Minister. The FRBM Act stipulate that every year the Government must reduce the fiscal deficit by 0.3 per cent and revenue deficit by half a per cent. This year around, the Finance Minister, in all his capability, has reduced the revenue deficit, against a target of half a per cent, by almost one per cent, from 3.6 per cent of the GDP to 2.7 per cent of the GDP and the fiscal deficit figure from 4.8 per cent of the GDP to 4.5 per cent of the GDP. Sir, one more thing that we appreciate is, there is a new deal for rural India. A sum of Rs. 50,000 crores has been kept aside out of the gross budgetary support of Rs. 1,70,000 crores for this purpose. The Government has decided to form a corpus of Rs. 8000 crores for infrastructural development fund. An amount of Rs. 400 crores has been set aside for micro and drip irrigation. We shall come to the midst of 2007. They want to provide in one lakh villages out of the six-lakh villages, a rural knowledge centre with the latest information communication technology. It is a challenge. Till now nobody has done. Our Government has come forward and our Finance Minister has to be admired. For expansion of village telephones about Rs. 4000 crores has

to be provided, and a universal service of national fund. One more important thing is the UPA Government is committed to raise allocation on education from 3 per cent of GDP to 6 per cent for the next four years. They have fulfilled it. They have given an allocation of Rs. 18,337 crores in this coming financial year against the previous year of Rs. 8225 crores, which means 125 per cent he has given more to education. Even though some people were saying, education has not been provided funds, it is totally wrong. You cannot compare the total Budget and say 'why only Rs. 18,000 crore is given?' For Education, till now no Budget has provided Rs. 18,000. You must admit. Also substantial amount has been given to rural health, elementary education, mid-day meal, sanitation, drinking water, micro-rural development. Sir, one more thing I would like to say is, these are the highlights of the Finance Minister's Budget speech. Some more clarifications I would like to give. A part of the country is affected by floods and another part by drought. The Finance Minister must concentrate on how to solve this problem. The Indian economy is very much interlinked with drought and floods. Several times, several States on the same day face calamities. On the one side, some States face floods; and at the same time some States face drought. For that you must focus on irrigation. Water should not be wasted. The clarification, which I want from the Finance Minister, is as on today irrigation projects are the top most priority for every State in the country. Of course, for Andhra Pradesh he is having a very ambitious plan to have irrigation projects and complete them in five to six years; and bring 54 lakhs acres of land under irrigation and solve the irrigation and water problem permanently. To realise that, today, the commercial banks are flooded with funds. Institutions are flooded with funds, the World Bank is flooded with funds. The World Bank wants to invest in India only. Once upon a time there was a lot of difficulty faced by many commercial banks in deposit mobilisation. They are flooded with deposits. They are coming forward to give loans to the State Governments also. Any State Government even with norms must take permission from the Central Government to borrow the money for any purpose. What I would like to ask for clarification is: in case any State Government wants to borrow money from any commercial bank on productive basis—production means, suppose if you borrow and invest money you are assured of getting back the money—it can pay back the money with interest. If you borrow money and give incentives you will become *diwalia* in no time. Nobody will accept such a financial system. Here I would like to have a clear cut clarification from the Finance Minister: is he going to give any mechanism for all the State Governments to borrow money from commercial

banks or from the public on a productive basis? Will they be liberal? if so, how much time will they take? They should not take much time. Sir, normally, I do not believe in repetition of the same points made by other hon. Members. I always consciously say about the new points.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Every word is a new word! ...(*Interruptions*)...

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: Therefore, I want a clarification from the hon. Minister. Is he going to give a clear-cut permission to Andhra Pradesh, whenever he gets a request from this State, for obtaining loan for productive purpose either from the public or from the financial institutions?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reddy, you have to cooperate with me. You have to conclude now.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: Sir, he has taken twenty minutes. I will take only three minutes.

SHRI MURLI DEORA (Maharashtra): Okay, Granted ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, No individual Member can grant time ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, 50 per cent of his speech goes in praising the Finance Minister.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: In our country, the steel sector is an important sector. Now, everybody is feeling that there is an abnormal increase in the price of steel. Everybody is feeling the burden of price increase. It is also proportionately responsible for inflation. It is also connected with the construction activity and infrastructure activity. I want a clarification on this from the hon. Finance Minister. Having presented such a beautiful Budget, he has increased excise duty by 4 per cent—from 16 per cent to 20 per cent—on steel. The point is, it will not fall either on the manufacturer or the trader, but on the consumer. It will fall on the construction activity. It will slowdown the infrastructure activity. And, ultimately, it will lead to inflation. So, I want to know from the hon. Finance Minister whether it is possible to re-examine the decision once again.

My last point is on real estate. The Service Tax charges imposed to the tune of 10 per cent. Here, I wish to mention that there are flats for rich and there are flats for common man and middle-class people. In cities, middle-

class people, salaried-class people and retired people want only flats since they cannot afford to have independent houses due to high prices. If you put 10 per cent Service Tax uniformly, then, there would be a burden on the middle-class people. I request the hon. Minister to look into it.

Finally, in the Lok Sabha, after presenting the Budget, all our friends, who are sitting here, raised only one point—tax on withdrawal of Rs. 10,000 or more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot quote the proceedings of the other House in this House.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: Yesterday, the hon. finance Minister gave an indication that he may roll back this proposal. What I would like to say here is this. There are people who want to withdraw money for marriage purpose. There are people who want to withdraw money to pay his agricultural labour once in a week. Due to this, you cannot issue a cheque to a small employee, a peon or a driver as their monthly salary. So, this proposal should be reconsidered. One cannot find this method of taxation in any part of the world. He says we can curb black money. Curbing black money is a good indication to the economy. But, there may be different methods to control black money.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: Therefore, in conclusion, I once again appreciate and congratulate the hon. Finance Minister. Thank you.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (Gujarat): Thank you Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, for permitting me to speak on this Budget. Since this House does not really vote upon the General Budget, I wish to make a few points which are of very deep concern to me and my party with regard to what has been proposed by the hon. Finance Minister through his Budget. I am sure the hon. Finance Minister, a very distinguished professional would certainly need to some of our suggestions which deal with the concerns of our economy as also the plight of the common man.

Let me just start with a lighter note wherein the very second paragraph of his Budget speech, the hon. Finance Minister considers his predecessor as a very lucky man. I think his predecessor, also a very distinguished Finance Minister, had the support of the Government in policy formulation,

and in giving a thrust to the economic development of this country. There were certainly very many difficult decisions which the Government of that time had to take. But the then Finance Minister had the support of the Government and also of the various groups, supporting the Government at that time. I think, Mr. Chidambaram is also substantially lucky, if not entirely lucky. It is only a lucky Finance Minister who inherits an economy that was growing at 8.5 per cent. (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: For one year.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: It is only a very lucky Finance Minister who inherits an economy where there is stable inflation rate where there is a record foreign exchange reserve, where exports are growing at 20 to 25 per cent. And, India is increasingly making its presence felt, as far as the economy is concerned in the world context, today. You are lucky, Sir, because nobody has a choice in the matter of selecting his predecessor, but you always have a choice is selecting your present company. That is where your luck fails you, when you choose your present company. I can certainly see the enthusiasm and commitment with which you want to take certain steps. But, then a large number of your present company members do not permit you to do so. You want to take some radical steps, but face criticism from those who choose to support you. And, I think, it is this very problem that is going to be a serious problem for you in the course of the year and years to come that you really have to address yourself. I know, from the core of your heart, you want to unlock some of the resources in certain sectors by disinvesting, but your company does not permit you to do so. Your colleague attempts to give India a modern infrastructure in terms of airports, but your company does not permit you to do so. In fact, you are, at times, compelled to make certain announcements which really eat into the resources, which otherwise would have gone into more useful areas, such as, infrastructure creation. And, that is why, when you have to work towards these compromises, you produce a document. I must say that there are steps that you have taken towards rationalisation of taxes, etc., which have certainly been steps in a positive direction. But there are also some concerns which arise out of the proposals that you have made. And, that is something which disturbs me and it should disturb you also. When Budgets are normally announced by any Finance Minister, the public opinion, the reactions of the media, in the next few hours, are of a particular kind. And, in the context of this Budget,

one of the most significant and disturbing fact I found was that to understand this Budget, one did not have to watch television that evening, or, even read the next morning's newspapers. It was only 24 or 48 hours later that people started discovering that there is some devil in the details itself. And, that is the devil that creates problem. (*Interruptions*)

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: What's the devil?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Now, my friend, Subbarami, wants to know what is the devil. Let me tell you some of the problems that arose out of this Budget itself. Fiscal deficit, I think is an issue of concern for everybody. The revenue, the expenditure, the entire health of the economy becomes evident. And, that is one of the key indicators itself. The Budget document indicates that from a consistent fiscal deficit of 4.5, 4.4, 4.5, per cent in the past two years, will be coming down to 4.3 per cent in the coming year itself. And when one went into some of the details itself, one of the reasons by which you manage to achieve this was not the accounting formulation that had been carried out in the last two years, but, there was a change which was brought about this year. Now, it may be a defence that this change has been brought about after the recommendations of the Twelfth Finance Commission itself. Shri Jairam Ramesh referred to the blue book, the first part of the expenditure budget. For instance, the Central assistance to the States, both in terms of grants and loans, now you maintain the grants as in previous years, but as far as the loans are concerned, I find that there is a significant absence. There is an asterisk. For instance, in the Revised Estimates, the grant in the last year was Rs. 27,738 crores. It becomes Rs. 30,454 crores. The loan of Rs. 24,588 crores last year is not there this year. And when you look at the details itself, you discover, the asterisk says, that an amount of Rs. 29,003.22 crores is included towards loans which the States of the Union Territories shall be unable to raise as market loans in terms of the recommendations of the Twelfth Finance Commission itself. Now, what is significant is not the switch over. The switch over is the mechanism whether you take loans from the Central Government or you take the loans from the market itself. That is a different formulation that you have brought about. But if these loans, as per the previous years practice, were added to the expenditure side, the concern with regard to the fiscal deficit itself would be much more significant and higher. And it is this that is amongst various factors which is causing concern as far as the state of the economy today itself is concerned. Now,

my friend, Shri Subba Rami Reddy says which the areas of concern are. Now, the first announcement was made that corporate taxes are down from 35 per cent to 30 per cent. That is, the corporate taxes, for the first time, have come down to the level of individual taxation itself. Now, there was a significant welcome to this. From the corporate world to the Wall Street, we can earn kudos by making an announcement of this kind. But when we look at the actual impact of the entire Budget on corporate taxation, what do we find? From 35 per cent, the tax has come down to 30 per cent. But, immediately, in the same Budget, the surcharge is increased from 2.5 to 10 per cent. Therefore, what is reduced is really not 35 to 30, but that 30 itself has become 33 because there is a 10 per cent surcharge itself. *(Interruptions)*. The educational cess was there last year in the nine month Budget. It is there today. That takes it to 33.66 per cent. Then, the Finance Minister announces that the depreciation goes down, in certain categories from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. Now, in all the industries which have an intensive capital assets as a base, and it is here that the manufacturing industry would directly come in, the impact of the reduction of depreciation itself would be felt in the accounts of every corporate, and add to it the fringe benefit tax. I have read reports from one corporate to another. In fact, one of the newspapers gave a chart itself that the net effect of all the these steps, 35 became 30, but you add 3 to 30, you add .66 as the educational cess, you add the impact of the depreciation change, you add the impact of the fringe benefits tax, would be that the taxation in a large number of corporates would be 38 per cent to 40 per cent of even 41 per cent. But the first announcement in the Budget itself says that the reduction from 35 to 30 per cent has taken place, even in the context of individual taxation, as I said in the beginning. I have no hesitation in reiterating that Rationalisation of individual taxation was long overdue. It is a positive think that the Finance Minister has taken several steps in that direction. But having taken those steps, there are a large number of concerns which need to be addressed and when I read his statement yesterday in the newspapers today that since he would revisit some of these proposals, I am sure he would take this in the right spirit as a suggestion and revisit it because under the earlier scheme, from Section 80L to 88 to the Standard Deduction under Section 16, there are a large number of deductions which were available. Now, he has bracketed all of them, abolished those deductions and reliefs, which were entitled to, and made a 'one lakh' standard base, Now, there is a debate going on whether you get more, or, less, but I really will keep myself away from that debate.

But, Sir, one vulnerable section is the 'senior citizens,' And, in the context of senior citizens, today itself, I read in the '*Hindustan Times*' a reasoned article working out the chart itself as to how the changed proposals in the context of the senior citizens actually increased the tax liability itself. Now, if this is correct, on the basis of the these calculations - and I tried to make some rough calculations on the back of the envelope myself - I do feel that some of these have substance. This is one area where the Budget *prima facie* looked attractive, but when you see the details, it doesn't really work out with the object with which it was intended and, I am sure, the Finance Minister when he responds to our suggestions, now or after the break when the Finance Bill itself is taken up, would certainly like to revisit this area which deals with the senior citizens, particularly, those whose tax liability has now increased as a result of these budgetary proposals themselves. Take, for instance, Sir, the proposals with regard to the *Bharat Nirman* scheme. This scheme was also referred to in the Presidential Address to the Joint Session of Parliament. And then I thought that there was a large amount of grant being made for the benefit of the rural sector itself. I thought after the *Rastrapati's* Address, some very significant initiative in the direction of *Bharat Nirman* is coming. We were anxiously awaiting the announcements because the President himself in the Central Hall had announced that the Finance Minister would deal with it in details in the Budget speech itself. But when I look at the *Bharat Nirman* proposal, to bring in an additional area of one crore hectare under irrigation, it is a very good proposal. But this very good proposal needs a huge amount of money to be allocated to it. I have't come across any money being allocated for it to connect all villages having a population of a thousand or five hundred people with road. It is a very good proposal, but then rather than grudging at us, you must, Sir, certainly say that Mr. Vajpayeeji's Government had taken this particular steps towards the *Bharat Nirman*. *Bharat Nirman* is not started on the 23rd of May, 2004. If this was *Bharat Nirman*, it had started long ago. In fact, allocations have been made and for a very large number of villages of this country, literally lakhs of them, the connectivity process had already started.

Now, there is a scheme for additional houses for poor. You can re-name the 'Yojanas'. But the 'Yojanas' has already existed. Drinking water, electrification, etc. are all big challenges, and if the Finance Minister, through all the initiatives which were taken earlier, particularly, after the Electricity Act and now, as far as the village sector is concerned, is able to

provide that connectivity, - because this has to be done really at the level of the States, and the States, and the States have to be persuaded to act in terms of these reforms, - I think we give him all credit for this.

Finally, I come to telephony as far as the villages are concerned. It is also a great challenge. It is only in the last 7-8 years that this country has, post 1995-96, really seen the telecommunications revolution in this country. Out tele-services are expanding at one of the fastest paces. Almost 8.5 is today the tele-density of this country. In our first fifty years, it was less than one per cent. So, that really has proved how the change-over of the new policy of telecom has benefited the country. You have plurality of choice, you have better services, you have, probably, the cheapest telecom services in the world and one of the fastest growing telecom services. But one of the great challenges is that even those who have been now authorised by licences or otherwise to provide telephony have been inadequate in connecting our villages to it. Therefore, if this is all to be done, these are all existing schemes. So, when I said that when you look at the Budget, *Bharat Nirman*, the build-up after the Presidential Address, was that there are some very good innovative programmes with very large amount of fund being allocated for this which is coming, I find most of it is really a combination of the earlier initiatives taken by the earlier Government, by the Governments even before that, and that is an element of continuity which has been maintained. I find the same with regard to the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. Now, as far as the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is concerned, you can very well allocate about Rs. 5000 crores to it. But then, that is not an amount, which is going to provide to almost one-fourth of India one job for every rural family. For the rest, the 'Food for Work Programme' now becomes the 'National Food for Work Programme'. Now, already there is a 'Food for Work Programme' that is on. It has been called the 'National Food for Work Programme' and then, it is expected that this would bring about an adequate change as far as that is concerned. I think, these are all initiatives, which have been going on, and if these initiatives really manage to produce the results, it is only then that a Finance Minister of Shri P. Chidambaram's calibre and capacity would really have a lot to smile about.

As far as infrastructure is concerned, infrastructure needs resources. Infrastructure needs private-public partnership. The NDA Government has taken many steps towards the creation of infrastructure. In

Telecommunications, the earlier Government had brought about some changes in the whole policy and we gave an impetus to it. The Rural Roads, the National Highways Development Programme, These are all infrastructure programmes. But there are many areas of infrastructure; the power sector, particularly, is the most challenging out of that. It needs resources. It needs the will to implement, and that is something that the States have to come into.

Look at the condition of our ports today. Our exports are increasing by something like 24-25 per cent. The imports are increasing by 30 per cent. So, there the growth, as far as foreign trade is concerned, is three to four times more than our GDP growth. Therefore, that sector has the potential to become one of the great engines as far as growth is concerned, and the centre where this whole industry lies is really our ports. Now, if you look at the last few months, the kind of clogging on our ports, which is taking place, is absolutely, unimaginable and unbearable. Trade facilitation costs and costs of delays, are actually adding to the cost of our products and making them non-competitive. It is these areas, which we really have to look into and for this, we need a public-private partnership. Wherever you have expanded, even with private partnership, you have seen the effect on efficiencies. The Nava Sheva port is a living example. The Prime Minister just went and inaugurated the new proposal as far as Vallarpadam is concerned. If that project takes off, it will go down as one of the most historical programmes as far as port expansions are concerned. These are areas where we need to invest the resources. But while we have to invest the resources, where will the resources come from?

If the Finance Minister bears with me, in his last Budget Speech made nine to ten months ago, under the heading 'Infrastructure', the Finance Minister had said - I am just going to read those three sentences - "An Inter-Institutional Group in the power sector has succeeded in bringing six power projects to financial closure. Another ten projects are on the verge of achieving financial closure. The concept can be extended to some other infrastructure sectors. I am glad to announce that IDBI, IDFC, ICICI Bank, SBI, LIC, Bank of Baroda and Punjab National Bank have formed an Inter-Institutional Group (IIG). They will pool their resources on a callable basis, and a sum of Rs. 40,000 crore will be made available as and when necessary. The IIG will ensure speedy conclusion of loan agreements and implementation of infrastructure projects. Initially, airports, seaports and

tourism will be the target sectors of the IIG." It was a very well considered statement that the Finance Minister made. Now, how much of it has really taken of?

Now, when I read the chapter on 'Infrastructure' on this Budget, I found that after Telecommunications, National Highways, Rural Electrification and Indira Awas Yojana, we come to a 'Special Purpose Vehicle'. Now as far as the Special Purpose Vehicle is concerned, the Budget does not make an allocation. It reads, "for 2005-06, I propose to fix the borrowing limit at Rs. 10,000 crores." The borrowing limits have been fixed. Now, I do hope that something did happen last year. It is a fact that we want to know from the hon. Finance Minister. Now, I can understand a Special Purpose Vehicle for a particular project, whether it be for highways, or, ports, or, airports, or seaports, or, for some power projects.

Now, the Inter-Institutional Group with a lending capacity of Rs. 40,000 crores last year, a borrowing limit of Rs. 10,000 crores for the Special Purpose Vehicle to be created, all these proposals look very fine as they are stated. But then, what really is the eventual object, which these are able to achieve? How much is the implementation of these which is really going to take place? Let me just tell the Finance Minister that there is a genuine concern in the country that some of the infrastructural projects need to be expedited far more than they presently are. There is a growing feeling about the National Highways Programme for instance, as to what is the expedition in that which is required for want to which is slowed down. Is it maintaining the same pace? There is a lot of cynicism that the kind of centre-stage that project occupies today it does not appear as far as that project is concerned. Having said so, Sir, I have certain specific suggestions for the hon. Finance Minister to consider in this Budget, and some of them are suggestions which we may even like to consider over later date. The Budget indicates that as far as duties are concerned, both in customs and excise, he separately dealt with them. They have been brought down. I heard the views of one of my colleagues from the Left Party yesterday where he was somewhat apprehensive about the custom tariffs in the manufacturing sector being brought down. Now, brining it down today has its own advantages. Our manufacturing sector has been somewhat slow to pick up over the last few decades, but now it seems to be indicating a situation where it can almost go ahead; it is crossing the 8 per cent growth figure and has the capacity to get into a double figure

growth. Manufacturing sector is where the jobs are. Inputs for the manufacturing sector are raw materials, capital goods, etc. If they are imported into the country on cheaper rates, raw materials increase, and that is an indication itself that your manufacturing sector itself is growing and if the manufacturing sector is growing, the advantages of it in terms of creation of employment, in terms of profitability, in creation of revenue, in terms of enrichment of Government, infrastructure creation, can be seen, and that is a positive circle which moves on. It is a positive step; I am not opposed to the step. I remember, only a few years ago when the peak rates in the manufacturing sector of duties was 35 per cent, and when gradually, 5 per cent every year, it came down to 20 per cent last year and finally you brought it down by another 5 per cent this year. My only concern in this is: Should this reduction be announced every year in the Budget itself—even the previous Government, My Government, was announcing it in the Budget—or we must now seriously consider reducing this as a part of our multi-lateral negotiations? And, I say this with some sense of concern. The agricultural negotiations are separately taking place. NAMA, the non-agricultural sector negotiations are separate negotiations, which are taking place in the manufacturing sector. Now, the WTO is the forum where you do not get anything for free. You have to pay a price when you want something and you have to charge a price when others want something from you. Particularly, when there is a multi-lateral pressure on us to bring our customs tariffs down, any unilateral announcement really does not bring any credit as far as those negotiations are concerned, and therefore for future here is a point which the Finance Minister would like to consider. Secondly, Sir, there is an issue where I am one with my friend, Shri Subbarami Reddy. More and more sectors have been coming into the service tax roll. It is understandable for the reason that the entire burden cannot fall on customs duty or direct taxes or excise duties, which is mostly on the manufacturing sector. Service sector today occupies 52 per cent of the GDP and, therefore, service sector must also come within the tax net itself. But there are some sensitive areas, just as we mentioned the senior citizens in the case of the direct taxes, where service tax really requires reconsideration, and there are two specific areas in your Budget which require a reconsideration. One is in the context of apartments blocks—a building where there are 12 or more apartments—and second is the cleaning and maintenance services. Housing is one area where we have had tremendous growth in the last few years and this is one area

which is going to grow by leaps and bounds. When housing is going to grow and housing is something which every man, even from the poorer sections, desire, a lower middle-class man desires, the effect of this proposal has been that in every co-operative housing society, in every builder-developed apartment, the prices have overnight gone up by 10 per cent. I can see the disagreement with the Finance Minister, but I would like him to consider this matter. In the context of developers and others hiring contractors, some of it would be MODVATable, but when developers and owners, and developers and housing societies sell it to their members or flat owners, in the hands of the apartment owner from a developer, it will not be MODVATable. If I buy an apartment, there is no other duty against which it can be offset. The same is going to be the position and this is a very vulnerable section because the people living in apartments belong to the middle class, or to the lower middle-class. The cleaning and maintenance services—every co-operative housing society in Delhi, Mumbai and all over the country, that is a new trend, now go in for community services, as far as these apartments are concerned. And, a ten per cent on top of that, I think, is an area of serious concern.

I will only refer to it because he has made a statement yesterday that he is revisiting this whole concept of cash withdrawal tax. But, it is an area on which, I think, there is within the system, a very large consensus developing and he will certainly, I am sure, respect the wishes of that larger consensus and when he makes his own announcements later, he would like to withdraw that.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: He has not imposed the tax; it is just a proposal.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: The Budget is always a proposal till the Finance Bill is passed. But, since he has made an indication yesterday, I am only supporting the sentiment of those who had made this suggestion....*(Interruptions)*...

The fringe benefit tax, I think, is an area on which he did not make any indication of a concession yesterday. There is a view to which I subscribe that the fringe benefit tax is really not only going to increase the tax burden, but the fringe benefit tax will also bring back the *inspector raj*. The fringe benefit tax will also become a tax on expenditure. And, therefore, the fringe benefit tax, itself, requires an element of reconsideration by the Finance Minister himself.

On the two cesses that he charges—one for education and one for national highway programme—I think, it will do, it will be a good precedent to start of, that how this cess has been consumed separately in both the cases, a transparent, clear statements is made every year and placed before the country through the Parliament, so that we know that since this is a cess we are paying for something, this is not to go into the Consolidated Fund of India and be used for other purposes; this is to be used for these purposes and, therefore, it is reduced.

Another area, and I am conscious of the controversy around this area, is the area of retrospective taxation which has begun. I am not referring to the Ordinance that he brought about earlier this year. That itself is retrospective taxation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to conclude.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, it will take just three or four minutes. Retrospective taxation in any developing economy, particularly when we attract investment, it destabilises the stable taxation regime. One of the great talking points that we have is that India has a very stable tax regime. We don't have an extraordinary taxation regime where people can be charged for what they did ten years ago, accounts have been settled, and costs have been passed on to the consumer. And therefore, there are a lot of difficulties which arise. There is already a debate going on which is not a part of the Finance Bill about this retrospective taxation. That is in the context of the Ordinance that the Finance Minister brought about because it upsets the tax planning of any investor itself. It is a bad indication, or a bad signal, that we give to potential investors, both domestic as well as international. But, I found that even in the present Finance Bill, there are, at least, three proposals which amount to, in my respectful view, a retrospective taxation. If the Finance Minister makes a note of clause 82, clause 83 and clause 87, some of these are to overcome the court judgements. These are the changes, the first one is the change to the Central Excise Rules of 1944. It is a retrospective taxation. It says that it has been amended retrospectively and it will be applicable for the period 1st August, 1996 to 30th June, 2001. The second is the retrospective taxation in 1983, to the CENVAT rules. The third is retrospective amendment to the Chapter 15 of the Schedule itself. Now, these are the areas which I think also require a reconsideration by the Finance Minister

because retrospective taxation in any growing economy itself destabilises the planning of any investor, and, therefore, as a rule we should avoid this practice to the extent it is possible.

I have again a point to support my friend Subbarami Reddy on the question of increase in the steel duty to 16 per cent. Now, in most cases where the manufacturing sector uses it, I agree with what the Finance Minister said in his speech that it is 'modvatable'. But in the context of construction industry, where the eventual burden comes to the consumer himself, the steel that we buy for building our own houses—housing again being an important sector—would not be modvatable, and, therefore, the 16 per cent higher rate for an item as basic as this, I think, is an issue which the hon. Finance Minister would have to consider.

Sir, I have concerns about the non mentioning of—and, I am worried because you mentioned the irrigation issues for the long term—what is the Government's thinking on the interlinking of rivers proposal, what is the progress being made with regard to the Kisan Credit Cards which is one of the successful programmes that the Government has been implementing. These are all areas the Finance Minister would have to consider. (*Time-Bell*).

Lastly, Sir, my suggestion to the hon. Finance Minister would be regarding the SEZs. Sir, the SEZs are going to be very important engines of growth. For the last few years, we have been debating to bring the SEZs under a Central legislation. But if the SEZs have to come under a Central legislation, the SEZs would require the kind of infrastructure, the kind of trade facilitation, and, also the kind of tax structures, which their competitors internationally have. Those who manufacture within the SEZs don't compete with domestic manufacturers, they compete with international manufacturers, and unless we can give them a regime in terms of infrastructure, in terms of interest rates, and, in terms of taxation measures which is competitive compared to the international players in the field, our SEZs really will not produce the same kind of results which SEZs, let us say, in China and other parts of the world have produced.

I read in the newspaper that my friend Mr. Kamal Nath has been advocating a few more concessions in the SEZs proposed legislation. I would like to throw whatever support my voice has, behind the Commerce Minister for what the Finance Minister would like to give him. This is one

area where the SEZ proposals itself can be beneficial to the overall direction as far as the economy is concerned. (*Time-Bell*). Sir, my time has run out. There were a few more points but I leave it for my other colleagues to mention them. I am sure some of the concerns, which we have expressed, some for this Budget and some for the future, the Finance Minister will certainly bear them in mind. Once again, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to participate in this discussion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the House agrees, I would like to ask Mr. Murlī Deora to occupy the Chair for some time...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Ramachandraiah...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, I am not in the Panel

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No member from the Panel of Vice Chairmen is here. That is why...(*Interruptions*)... Dr. T. Subbarami Reddy...(*Interruptions*)...

[The Vice-Chairman (Dr. T. Subbarami Reddy) in the Chair]

SHRI K. CHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): Sir, the other speaker of our party made a maiden speech, so that time has to be allotted to me. I think so.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY): Okay, take a maximum of ten minutes.

SHRI K. CHANDRAN PILLAI: Sir, while registering certain observations regarding this Budget, first of all, the focus, let me say, a democratic and determined focus, on the common man's issue, is indeed a welcome step. At the same time, I want to make an observation that the overall Budget proposals are moving through the economic reforms track itself. In a way, it is accelerating also. Actually, the Left Parties submitted a memorandum to the Government to consider the commitments made in the Common Minimum Programme. I think some aspects of the memorandum, submitted by the Left, are already appeared in the Budget. That much is appreciated. The Part I of this Budget mainly dealt with that objective only. ...(*Interruptions*)... I am taking that also. ...(*Interruptions*)... The Memorandum was of the Left Parties and the Common Minimum Programme was of the UPA; Left Parties were not signatory to that. Regarding employment, education, health, sanitation, drinking water,

nutrition and marginal sections, considerations of SC and ST, they are all coming under Part I, naturally reflecting the aspirations of the last verdict. I think we can put it in the political compulsion category. I am registering certain apprehensions and concerns, which are appearing in the Budget proposals. In the Agriculture sector, there is a definite proposal for the credit facilities. I think agro-business and investments in the rural sector are focussed on that part. So the direct benefit to the poor sections is not at all ascertained. It has to be revisited. That is my one observation.

Another point is that in the Common Minimum Programme, there was a commitment of 2-3 per cent of the GDP for the health sector, which is actually between Rs. 70,000 crore to Rs. 1,05,000 crore, but the allocations are only to the tune of Rs. 10,000 crore plus. I think this deficiency is a major lacuna in the Budget. Health is a vital area, and there are contradictions between the commitment and the real allocation. It is disappointing also. Likewise, in the National Food-for-Work Programme, which is related to the National Employment Guarantee Scheme, a newly coming up scheme, the total allocation is only Rs. 11,000 crore and that again with added value of the grains which is supplementary-nearly Rs. fifty lakhs. I think for a better imaginary programme for employment, you have to go through the National Sample Survey as well as the recent Census report. Our rural employment growth rate is too low as compared to the population growth rate. That is a reality. In such a situation, we are offering only targeted 150 districts and 100 days' work for each family member. 'Employment for all' is the dream slogan, which all are celebrating. But we are now confining ourselves to a limited section only and the allocation is only Rs. 11,000 crore. That allocation does not match the requirement of the real gravity of the problem, which we are confronting. According to some rough estimates, more than Rs. 25,000 crore per annum for 100 day's employment was the commitment. That is not adequately addressed in the Budget. That has to be looked into further. All the tax proposals are aimed, with a strong direction, towards furtherance of economic reforms. Only two fresh initiatives are introduced in this Budget. One is the withdrawal tax and the other is fringe benefit question. Most likely that may be withdrawn according to the Finance Minister's reply yesterday. But I want to say, so many tax concessions are allowed this time in the Budget. In the corporate taxation, after all relaxations, the Finance Minister is expecting a 33 per cent increase because of the

concessions and an income-tax increase of 30 per cent again because of concessions. Again in excise duty, the Finance Minister is expecting a 21 per cent increase. I strongly believe, our past experiences are not so encouraging whenever tax concessions are allowed. Whenever tax concession is there, realisation is poor. Here an opposite thinking is coming up from the Finance Minister. I doubt whether the aspiration put up by the Finance Minister is going to materialise or not. And there is a strong protest to the corporate tax reduction. 36 per cent is according to me unwarrantedly reduced to 30 per cent. Whatsoever be the argument, I can't find any logic in it. (*Time-Bell*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY): Hurry up, a number of speakers are also there. Your time is over. I am just indicating.

SHRI K. CHANDRAN PILLAI: In the Budget speech, Sir, imaginative ideas were there. FDI attraction by India is to go up to match with China. Not matching at present, but considering the advantage of China, we should also go up. That is one idea. But we have to see the manufacturing industries and the real situation also. China's GDP contribution through manufacturing industry is 54 per cent, according to my understanding, whereas our service sector is now contributing 60 per cent. This is a disappointing situation. In such a situation manufacturing industry is getting a very bad treatment in this Budget. That is my argument. I mean manufacturing sector inclusive of small-scale industries. Well, almost 77 items are de-reserved by this Budget. Otherwise also, SSIs are in doldrums. Without properly addressing that area, now fresh attack is again launched by this Government. In the manufacturing sector, customs duty reduction to 15 per cent is going to affect them negatively. Capital goods permitted with reduced customs duty mean indigenous industries are going to suffer. So the point is not only we are losing our resources to the exchequer, but we are acting against the interest of the manufacturing sector of India which is coming down year by year overall GDP contribution-wise. Another point which I want to make is diversification proposal for agricultural products. I think this point is to be reviewed. At least the advices from towering personalities like Dr. M.S. Swaminathan have to be taken care of. Sir, the agriculture sector actually is demanding a protection. In the international regime, we are in a competitive world. With the total acceptance of that reality, I am saying India is an agriculture-predominant country, protection to the agriculturists is not adequate through this Budget. And the livelihood

4.00 P.M.

of crores of people is also involved in it, food security is also involved in it. While diversifying from the present agricultural products, what will happen to our food security is a major problem which is to be looked into. Another question is a cess rise of 50 paise per litre on diesel and petrol. I think that will naturally go to escalate the prices overall in the economy. That has to be withdrawn. Another area is regarding the SLR and CRR removals. I don't think it is going to benefit our economy at large. I think, even the Reserve Bank of India has some reservation in that area. We are actually leading that activity to a speculative regime, which is not fair at all. That has to be reviewed. Another question is, when the withdrawal tax was introduced, it was mentioned that its main purpose is to control black money. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Mr. Pillai, I am just referring to the statement made by you. The changes that are being proposed to CRR, SLR, the upper and lower limits, are proposed on the advice and recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, and therefore, the statement that you made that the Reserve Bank of India is opposed to it, is not correct.

SHRI K. CHANDRAN PILLAI: Sir, I stand corrected. Let me take up another point. In this Budget, certain major allocations are actually off-budget allocations. Such off-budget allocations are actually because of the political compulsions. But, these off-budget allocations are leading to a lesser allocation to the vital sectors. That is an area where we have to make some corrections.

Now, I come to the question of the FDI permission to the mine sector as well as to the pension fund. I am just citing the example of Myanmar. After permitting Burma Shell... *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY): You have already taken twelve minutes. Kindly conclude.

SHRI K. CHANDRAN PILLAI: Sir, let me complete the point which has been taken up by me. In the mine sector, if you are giving an entry to an MNC through an FDI route, the experience has been that we will exhaust our national resources in a very short span of time. Myanmar is the recent example. Now, that country is ranked fourteenth among the least-developed countries. So, the admission of the MNCs to the mine sector is totally unwarranted, and that has to be reviewed. Likewise, in the area of pension

fund also, why are you permitting the FDI and other agencies to work in this area? Ultimately, it will have a negative impact at the cost of the pensioners of this country. With these words, I conclude.

श्री गांधी आज़ाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बजट के समर्थन में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। बजट में साझा न्यूनतम कार्यक्रम, एक पथ-प्रदर्शक के रूप में माना गया है। मैं कुछ बिन्दुओं पर प्रकाश डालना चाहता हूँ। गरीबी और बेरोजगारी को मिटाना है। आज देश की अहम समस्या, गरीबी और बेरोजगारी है और हमारे देश में सबसे बड़ी सम्पदा, हमारे देश का मानव संसाधन है। लेकिन आज गांव में जुताई, बुवाई, सिंचाई, कटाई, कुटाई और पिसाई सभी के मशीनीकरण के कारण से, गांव का मजदूर बेकार होता जा रहा है। उनके पास अपना खेत नहीं है, अपनी जमीन नहीं है, जिसमें काम करके वह अपनी जीविकोपार्जन कर सके। अतः वह मजबूर होकर, सामंती कुप्रभाव का शिकार होने के कारण, गांव से पलायन करता है। वह पलायन करके, शहरों के औद्योगिक नगरों में शरण लेता है, लेकिन वहां भी मशीनीकरण के कारण, कम्प्यूटरीकरण के कारण इन हाथों को काम नहीं मिलता है। अतः आज इस देश में सबसे बड़ी भयावह समस्या देश का इंसान बनता जा रहा है। आज इस देश में सारी चीजें महंगी होती जा रही हैं और मानव श्रम सस्ता होता जा रहा है, यह एक विचारणीय विषय है। इसलिए हमारा वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन है कि जब तक गांव का पलायन नहीं रुकेगा, देश विकास की गति को प्राप्त नहीं कर सकेगा। इस पलायन को रोकने के लिए हमारा एक सुझाव है कि प्रदेश के सारे मुख्य मंत्रियों की बैठक बुलाई जाए और हर प्रदेश में जो कृषि योग्य ऊसर परती जमीन बची हुई है, वह भूमिहीन कृषकों, खास तौर से अनुसूचित जातियों में और अन्य भूमिहीनों में वितरित की जाए, ताकि उन्हें अपनी भूमि पर रोजगार का अवसर मिल सके, जिससे बेरोजगारी की समस्या का भी निदान हो सके और गरीबी का भी निदान हो सके। हालांकि माननीय मंत्री जी ने सौ दिन के काम के रोजगार की व्यवस्था का प्रावधान किया है, लेकिन मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी सौ दिन के काम की व्यवस्था तो है, लेकिन दो सौ पैसठ दिन की व्यवस्था क्या है? सौ दिन के काम के बाद क्या तीन सौ पैसठ दिन का गरीब मजदूर काम चला सकता है? यह एक चिंतन का विषय है, इस पर गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिए ताकि आज भूख के कारण, जो देश के कोने-कोने में मृत्यु हो रही है और आर्थिक विपन्नता के कारण, जो आत्महत्याएं हो रही हैं, उन पर अंकुश लगाया जा सके।

दूसरा मुद्दा है, अंत्योदय अन्न योजना। माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने बजट भाषण में इसे डेढ़ करोड़ परिवार से बढ़ाकर दो करोड़ परिवारों तक बढ़ा दिया है। यह एक अच्छा कदम है, किंतु सरकार को यह ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि "अंत्योदय योजना" के अंतर्गत उन्हें सस्ती दर पर जो गेहूं और चावल उपलब्ध कराया जाएगा, उस संबंध में मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे जो अंत्योदय परिवार के लोग हैं, क्या उनमें उसे क्रय करने की क्षमता भी है? अगर क्रय करने की क्षमता नहीं है

तो उनके क्रय की क्षमता बढ़ाने के लिए क्या उपाय है? इसके साथ ही साथ मैं एक निवेदन और करना चाहता हूँ कि गांवों में जो बी.पी.एल. कार्ड बनाया जाता है, वह ग्राम प्रधान की देखरेख में बनाया जाता है। ग्राम प्रधान अकसर सर्कस किस्म के लोग होते हैं, जो उनके गोल गोलेटी के लोग वोट दिए जाते हैं, उनके लिए बी.पी.एल. कार्ड बनाया जाता है, चाहे वे संपन्न हों, चाहे विपन्न हों। इस तरह से विपन्न लोगों को जो लाभ मिलना चाहिए, वह नहीं मिल पाता है। इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि इस व्यवस्था में, ग्राम प्रधान से हटकर किसी निष्पक्ष इकाई द्वारा बी.पी.एल. कार्ड बनाए जाने का कार्य सौंपा जाना चाहिए। अनुसूचित जातियों और अनुसूचित जनजातियों के कल्याणार्थ, अनुसूचित जातियों के लिए 1137 करोड़ से बढ़ाकर 1180 करोड़ रुपए किए गए हैं। 43 करोड़ की यह बढ़ोतरी बहुत ही कम की गई है। इसी तरह से अनुसूचित जनजातियों के लिए 1087 करोड़ से बढ़ाकर 1146 करोड़ अर्थात् 59 करोड़ की बढ़ोतरी नाकाफी है, इसे भी बढ़ाने की जरूरत है। पिचासी प्रतिशत आबादी वाली अनुसूचित जाति, जनजाति के लिए, यह जो धन है, यह बहुत ही कम है। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि इस क्षेत्र में राशि बढ़ाने की जरूरत है। इसी तरीके से अल्पसंख्यकों के कल्याण के लिए और विशेष रूप से उनकी शिक्षा को ध्यान में रखते हुए, अल्पसंख्यक विकास तथा वित्त निगम के लिए 50 करोड़ रुपए का प्रावधान किया गया है। इस देश में अल्पसंख्यकों की संख्या 15 प्रतिशत के आसपास है, इसलिए यह धन बहुत ही कम है। अल्पसंख्यकों के कल्याण के लिए इस धनराशि को बढ़ाने की जरूरत है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में, शिक्षा को प्राथमिकता की श्रेणी में रखा गया है और माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने बजट में दो प्रतिशत उपकर लगाकर, 400 करोड़ रुपए से लेकर 500 करोड़ रुपए प्रतिवर्ष धन प्राप्ति की आशा की है और इस संपूर्ण राशि को शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में खर्च करने की योजना बनाई गई है। इसमें विद्यार्थियों को दोपहर में पका हुआ भोजन देने की व्यवस्था है, लेकिन इसके कारण गांव का प्रधान और स्कूल का अध्यापक, अपना सारा समय उस भोजन की व्यवस्था करने के काम में व्यतीत करता है। जो समय शिक्षा में देना चाहिए, वह विद्यार्थियों के लिए भोजन पकाने में खर्च हो जाता है। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि इस व्यवस्था में परिवर्तन लाने की जरूरत है। बच्चों के दोपहर के भोजन के लिए जो आर्थिक सहयोग दिया जा रहा है, वह चाहे अनाज के रूप में हो, चाहे खाद्यान्न के रूप में हो, चाहे रुपए के रूप में हो, लेकिन वह बच्चों के अभिभावकों को दिया जाए, ताकि वे अभिभावक घर से ही अपने बच्चे के खान-पान की व्यवस्था करके, बच्चों को स्कूल भेजने का काम करें। इससे शिक्षकों का जो समय खाना पकाने में खर्च हो रहा है, वह बचेगा और बच्चों को समुचित शिक्षा मिल सकेगी, और वे स्कूलों से होनहार विद्यार्थियों के रूप में निकल सकेंगे।

महोदय, देश की आबादी का लगभग 25 प्रतिशत, अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जनजातियों का है और वे आज भी शोषण की शिकार हैं। उनको शोषण से मुक्ति दिलाने के लिए सरकार बहुत-सी योजनाएं बनाती है, लेकिन इन योजनाओं का क्रियान्वयन सही रूप से नहीं हो पाता है और ये सारी की सारी योजनाएं कागज़ पर धरी की धरी रह जाती हैं। इसलिए मैं सरकार से अपील करना चाहूंगा कि अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जनजाति के लाभ के लिए जो योजनाएं बनाई जाएं, उनको उन लोगों तक पहुंचाने के लिए कारगर उपाय किए जाएं। इसी तरह से इस देश की आबादी का 15 प्रतिशत अल्पसंख्यक समुदाय का है, और यह आज़ादी के बाद विकास के क्षेत्र में पिछड़ता चला जा रहा है, उनके हितों का भी ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए। मैं अपील करूंगा कि आज़ादी के बाद जिन वर्गों को अभी तक विकास की गति नहीं मिल पाई है, उनका ध्यान रखा जाए। योजनाएं बनाई गईं, लेकिन उनका क्रियान्वयन नहीं हो पाया है। वे उपेक्षित वर्ग, अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जनजाति, पिछड़ी जातियां, तथा अल्पसंख्यक वर्ग के हितों का विशेष ध्यान रखे जाने की प्रत्याशा में, मैं बजट का समर्थन इस शेर के साथ करना चाहता हूं कि—

गरीबों का दुनिया में है कोई जीना,

हो गरमी या सरदी, पसीन-पसीना।

उनका पसीना पोंछने के लिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि—

अगर हो जाए नज़रे इनायत किसी की,

कट जाए यों ही मुसीबत सभी की।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY): Mr. B.J. Panda, you have 8 minutes.

SHRI B.J. PANDA (Orissa): Thank you, Sir. I beg the same indulgence of the Chair that the other people with 8 minutes have also got.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: How much time has he been given?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY): He has been given 8 minutes.

SHRI B.J. PANDA: Sir, last year, on the same occasion, I mentioned a cricket analogy where I said the hon. Finance Minister was the star batsman of the UPA Government, but was in the unusual position of facing bouncers from his Government's supporters rather than from the Opposition. I must say that he has negotiated those bouncers well and very deftly conducted

a balancing act in furnishing the Budget this year, and I compliment him for that. There are elements in this Budget this year, and I compliment him for that. There are elements in this Budget that even we in the Opposition must applaud and what must also be applauded is what is not stated explicitly in this Budget. Away from the spotlight of the Budget, decisions, which are a continuance of what has been done earlier, have been taken on VAT, FDI limits, disinvestment, etc., which are all to be congratulated. These are no bad things at all. Sir, many had been enthused, with the composition of this Government team, to imagine that this second coming of the original architects of reforms would lead to something larger. Many had also been expecting more because of the rhetoric of this UPA Government; the rhetoric of equitable development, the rhetoric of focusing on rural development. But on many important counts this Budget stops short of a big transition into the next generation of reforms. Let me describe that. I would describe that big transition as three basic points. One, big ideas but backed up with concrete plans; two, replacement of the plethora of programmes at the ground level with simple but targeted programmes and most importantly, three, jump starting capital expenditure particularly on infrastructure. To be fair, there has been one big idea which is backed up with concrete plans and that is education. We had passed a Constitutional amendment three years ago to make it mandatory and to provide resources to give free primary education to every child until the age of 14 years, but we have never allotted enough resources for this. I compliment the Finance Minister for taking this big idea forward with concrete steps and with allocation. This is a step forward from what we had been trying to do in the NDA Government with 'Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan' and I congratulate him on this. But the same enthusiasm has not been shown for other big ideas. The same enthusiasm, for instance, has not been shown on a focus on infrastructure. Why is this important? Let me spell it out. The World Bank says that for developing countries to get developed, seven per cent of the GDP must be devoted to infrastructure. Sir, in the NDA Government, we made a big push forward with huge investments in roads and in highways. But despite that refocusing on infrastructure, India's investment on infrastructure is barely three per cent or a little less than that of the GDP. Let us compare this with China. I compare this with China because we compare ourselves with China on many counts. We have often debated in this country whether democracy is slowing us down, whether we are paying something like a democracy tax in taking more time to make policy

decisions. It has been written in media all over the world that the single greatest differentiation between the economies of India and China is not the speed of decision-making, not the mode of governance, but investment in infrastructure. In his Budget speech, the hon. Finance Minister particularly mentioned the China's Finance Minister looking at him in talking about the Chinese getting 10 times more FDI into their country. Two weeks ago, the hon. Senator Hillary Clinton was in town. It was an occasion where many young MPs were interacting with her. In reply to a specific question as to why American and the Americans think that China deserves more FDI, she came up with this very succinct answer and said, "If I have to keep it down to one particular reason, the reason is Government investment in infrastructure. The Chinese Government over the last 20 years has made huge investments in ports, in roads and in airports which we simply have not even begun to scratch the surface as yet. The other most significant shortcoming of this Budget is on the fiscal deficit. Much has been talked about the fiscal deficit. But I want to get to the roots of this. why is the fiscal deficit and the management of it so important? Fiscal deficit is a fundamental measure of the health of our economy and it is a fundamental measure of the seriousness of this Government. I would like to cite India's sovereign rating in the international market. There are several agencies which rate our country's sovereign rating. Coming to the fundamental measure, when companies like Standard and Poors, Moody's, rate the country on the fundamental measure—and I have it from the horse's mouth—from these companies themselves, is fiscal deficit. The give far more weightage to the issue of fiscal deficit management and not to many other areas that we might think that they do. For example, we have very large foreign exchange reserves, it counts for much less. We have a very attractive GDP growth rate, it counts for much less. We have inflation that is not too bad really but that also counts for much less. What count significantly is the management of the fiscal deficit. Sir, it is for this reason that we in the NDA Government introduced and enacted the Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act. Sir, it has worked so far.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: You didn't notify.

SHRI B.J. PANDA: We didn't have the time to notify it. Sir, the Fiscal Responsibility Act has worked. Sir, even during the last one year of this Government the Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act has worked. In that, the reduction of fiscal deficit has been more than the 0.3

per cent per annum which has been mandated. That is why there is such a great disappointment that this year, all we have is a pious statement to say that we are perilously close to the limits of our profligacy. But we need more than words. We need concrete targeted measure of reduction of fiscal deficit, keeping in line with the Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act. We are putting off for a future year or future years our obligation under the Act. Sir, this Budget is also relying on a surge in revenues to ensure that the fiscal deficit is kept under check. This I think we must take on a wing and a prayer. Also, most importantly, this has an adverse demonstration effect on our States. On the one hand the Centre is lecturing all the States to keep their fiscal deficit under check and it has an adverse effect in demonstrating that the Centre will do just the opposite. In other words, don't do what I do but do what I preach. There is another big idea which is the Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme which is not backed up with resources. Sir, we must get away from this tradition of trying to treat the symptom rather than the underlying cause. Sir, if we don't have the resources, if we don't concretely allocate the resources, then, the symptom is unemployment. That is not the cause. There are underlying causes and I have just talked about it, infrastructure for example. Let me give you an example from my own State of Orissa. Everybody in this House must have heard of Kalahandi, Bolangir and Koraput. The KBK districts which are synonymous with poverty, which are synonymous with malnutrition. But, Sir, I doubt how many people in this House know that Kalahandi is also known as 'the rice bowl of Orissa.' And the reason that rice is not competitive when it is grown in Kalahandi is that there is no road infrastructure. So that even moving that rice 50 kms. to the market is a non-starter. It is infrastructure which is required in Kalahandi which will really provide job opportunities for our people there and not noble sounding ideas which are not backed up by the funds. Sir, I am coming to the close. When we talk about equitable development, my home State Orissa stands out as a stark contrast. By any measure, Sir, we deserve special attention. We are at the bottom of the human development index. We are at the bottom when it comes to poverty. We have one of the highest tribal populations. Sir, I must point out to this House that for 50 years there has been reverse subsidisation from my State, from in fact, many Eastern States, from Bengal, from Jharkhand, from Orissa by way of such policies as freight equalization which ensured that economically viable mineral-related projects did not come up in our State. They came up elsewhere

although there was no economic logic. We had subsidised the rest of the country. We need a special helping hand to come out of the poverty trap. Sir, it is not just the negative side that I want to highlight. Sir, I want to highlight the positive side as well. Sir, the hon. Finance Minister on a recent trip to Orissa gave our Government a pat on the back for taking steps to reducing the fiscal deficit and to taking some concrete steps to improving our financial condition. This requires a tremendous amount of political will and a tremendous amount of courage. And this courage and political will deserves more than just a pat on the back. It deserves a special helping hand. This Government has introduced special packages for certain States. We do not grudge them. I think, areas that have been administered by some of the partners of this Government deserve special attention. We deserve special attention as well. This Budget provides nothing specific for our State. There are other contradictions in the Budget. My senior colleague, Mr. Arun Jaitley, and other hon. Members have talked about it. I will just mention one. Sir, on the one hand this Budget talks about Rs. 11,000 crores equity being pumped into the public sector and Rs. 3,500 crores of debt into the public sector, but separately, out of the Budget, the media has reported that the Government's objective is to raise Rs. 50,000 crores from disinvestment. And, I understand from a particular media Report, Rs. 7,000 crores would be in this year itself. Now, these appear to me to be contradictory. If we are going to go ahead with disinvestment, raise the resources and put them into rural employment or put them in infrastructure, let us do so. But, to do a little bit of this and a little bit of that is, perhaps, what is needed in this coalition and in this balancing act. I will, to that extent, support the hon. Finance Minister in his attempts.

In conclusion, Sir, I would like to again use a cricket analogy. I said, 'last year the star batsman of the team has successfully negotiated the bouncers coming from his own side.' But this year, it has transitioned into a situation where we have a Budget that is full of googlies.

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR (Maharashtra): And No Balls.

SHRI B.J. PANDA: I don't know about No Balls. It is full of googlies.

I would conclude by saying this that if it is a balancing act which is required to keep the big ideas away from the spotlight of detractors from within your own team; so be it, Sir, we will support you in that, but the end result must be there. Thank you.

DR. BIMAL JALAN (Nominated): Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there is a lot to say on the Budget, naturally, for somebody with my background, but we do not have the time. I am aware of it. So, with your permission, I will just make seven or eight points in telegraphic language. I would not try to explain them. They may be somewhat incomprehensible but you will forgive me. I am doing so just to save the time of the House.

SHRI P CHIDAMBARAM: You can speak. Nobody is stopping you.

DR. BIMAL JALAN: The first point is regarding the fiscal deficit that has been discussed. The point I wanted to make on the fiscal deficit is slightly different from the point just made by Mr. Panda and other speakers.

Sir, all of us are aware that there is no country in the world which has grown or which has developed or which has done well on the basis of the fiscal deficit. There is no country. The primary reason is not what the Standard and Poors says or what the international rating agencies say are wrong so far as India is concerned. Because they are looking at the possibilities of default, they are rating default ratings, etc. They are simply wrong. I mean, India has not defaulted, India will not default and there is no question of India being in a position where it would default. It has now the lowest debt to GDP ratio. It has one of the highest reserves in the developing world. So, I would say that I would not go by what they are saying Mr. Panda. And I would say the same thing to the rest of the world. That is not the issue.

The issue about the fiscal deficit, which the research shows, is essentially that there is a behavioural dynamics of soft Budgets. When the fiscal deficit increases then generally, it goes into soft subsidies, soft targets, soft areas rather than creation of jobs, development or infrastructure. This is the experience of the Latin America. This is the experience of African countries. And that is why the fiscal deficit is important and, across the party-line, I would say that when you have a high fiscal deficit and low capital expenditure as we are having now, you should attend to it. I think that the Finance Minister will be the first to agree that most of our fiscal deficit is revenue deficit which is going into salaries, which is going into revenue expenditure and is not creating jobs or creating infrastructure or creating things that we want. It is not that percentage of 4.2, 4.3 or 4.6 that is important. So, this is the first point.

The second point is this. It is also there in the President's Address and the hon. Prime Minister, a great economist, has also emphasised this. Mr. Chidambaram, a great thinker, also agrees with it. It is about the outlay and outcomes. I think nobody can disagree that we should have 'outcomes', and that the 'outlay' should be related to 'outcomes'. The one possible outcome that we should be careful about is 'no outlay and no outcome'. But if our administrative systems are such that you are not able to spend—and the Finance Minister is keeping an eye on 'outcome', and if there is no outcome, he will not give any money — and if the administrative bottlenecks and the clogging up of the arteries of administration are such that if you don't spend, there is no outcome, then, that is not what development is; that is not what our country wants. I have written to the Finance Minister; I have written to the Rural Development Minister on EGS. It is only for illustration. I have said that if you look at the way the whole Employment Guarantee Scheme has been conceived, if you look at the ten agencies, five State Government Ministries and five Central Government ministries—twenty agencies are involved in monitoring, evaluating, grievance redressing, and so on and so forth then, it is bound to be 'no outcome and no expenditure'. It is better than 'all expenditure and no outcome'. But, I think, this is not what our country wants. So, I would like to mention to the hon. Finance Minister that while we must watch outlay, the more important thing is to watch outcome and make it more positive. And, that can only be done if he is able to reduce the administrative bottlenecks that we ourselves create. And, the EGS Bill, in my opinion, is a very good example extremely well-intentioned, extremely well done but you have created a system which, in my opinion, just cannot work. I would like to see after a year whether it works or it does not work.

The third point that I want to make is regarding the need for simplification of return filing. Simplification is not just that what we articulate. Simplification is what you want the tax pay to do. Now, if simplification means that I have to file an income-tax return which requires me to hire a Chartered Accountant, then, I have not simplified it. This is the test. The test is not that I am dropping that; I am dropping clause 'C' replacing it with clause 'D'. The test is that the Finance Minister should ask the department, with which I had been very closely associated. I have great respect for the officers. But it is not a problem of an individual; it is systemic. Take a sample of people, take the MPs, take the Members of the Rajya Sabha, can they fill their tax returns on their own? That is simplification.

(Interruptions) This was the point about simplification—can we do it without the help of a lawyer or an expert? And, this is the test. I am very happy that he has announced that is going to happen by the end of the year. He is going to bring in a new manual, or whatever it is, to simplify the return filing. But that should be the benchmark to test it.

There are some great-sounding ideas and the economists are famous for it, something which sounds very nice and very good. But, on the ground, you find that it becomes so complicated that it cannot be implemented. There is a lot of talk about it, and, I think, the Finance Minister would know it. Let me say this about the Value Added Tax. It is a great idea. It is a fantastic thing. It has been tried very well in other countries. But I would request him to look at it as to whether it is a complex system, or, is it a system which can be followed by the shopkeepers, by people who are not very literate, by people who are not accountants, by people who are not very sophisticated, the common people. If it can be done, we must have it. If it cannot be done, we should look into it and see what can be done to make it better. This is my fourth suggestion to him.

My next point is about the Tax Information Network. It is again a great idea. And, if we can succeed in doing what the Tax Information Network wants to do, I think the country would definitely be better off. But my suggestion to the Finance Minister is that the Tax Information Network should not be used to go after individuals. You should set up a research team, which would analyse the tax behaviour of different groups of people. For example, he has himself made the point that only 75,000 or 85,000 people declare income of more than Rs. 10 lakhs. *(Interruptions)* Sorry, on income of more than ten lakhs. What we need to do is to think of an incentive for payment of tax, rather than an incentive for avoidance of tax. This can only be done if full Tax information Network System is publicised what is the rate of taxation pertaining to groups of people, say, lawyers, doctors, traders in Khan Market and so on and so forth. What is the average rate of taxation? And Finance Minister should promise that if a person is paying 15 or 20 or 30 per cent more than the average tax for his class, he is not going to be scrutinised. Then, you create an incentive for the people to declare the tax, rather than the other way round. What I am saying, Sir, is that this is my next suggestion to him that please use the TIN for inducing people to pay tax and this can only be done if you look at it group-wise, rather than individual-wise.

The next point, Sir, again, is with regard to EET, EEE, TEE. There are these three alternative ways of taxing. And one of the ideas which is, in my sort of tribe, generally being propounded is, Exempt Exempt Tax. This has been discussed in the literature, this has been discussed in the newspapers and so on. I would strongly advise our Finance Minister against going for EET. It is much better to go for TET.... (*Interruptions*).. on the basis of the present value of what the tax should be when you withdraw 20 years later, people should know how much is that in our country. I may simply say just this. We will talk about it later. The idea of EET works in a country where incomes are rising for the average middle class person. So, the idea is, you pay tax when you withdraw it. In future, the incomes are much higher, so the incidence of tax is lower. I would suggest that if you want to tax savings, you should go for TEE, that tax at a lower rate, at the present value of what the future tax would be. But, anyway, this is a very complex subject.

I would make just two final points. Sir, in taxation every action creates a reaction. This is a new point, something about which F.M. is very bored, the cash transaction tax. He has talked about it. The real interesting point about this is that you can discourage deposits. If there is a tax trail that he has talked about, if you don't want to leave a tax trail by withdrawal, the best thing is not to deposit. And is this what you want? I think that we must give incentives for deposits; rather, not create a system where doing business with a bank is less preferable than doing cash transaction. That is really the heart of the matter, and I am glad that he is looking into it. Now, last but one thing, is with regard to the fringe benefit tax. The problem I think is that we should try to avoid a new tax, if possible. It is a lot better to have a disallowance. You already have disallowances of various kinds. You can say that if anybody has more than 20, 25 or 30 per cent of salaries as fringe benefits, then that is a disallowance. It is much better to use the existing system rather than to create a new system, because that new system always creates a new set of paraphernalias, forms and so on.

Finally, and this is probably the most important point, that I look forward to a day when the Budgets are not about tax rates. But the Budgets are about what we are discussing here, Budgets are about the macro-economy, Budgets are about fiscal deficits, the Budgets are about capital expenditure, Budgets are about infrastructure, Budgets are about pattern of expenditure, Budgets are about business, Budgets are about growth, and Budgets are

about development. So, I look forward to his next Budget when he would have stabilised the tax rates, when he would have done what needs to be done on the rates. It doesn't matter whether it is 35, 30, 32, 31. Stabilise it. Don't make changes, and let the Budget not be on front page. It would be very nice if you take it to page 3! Thank You.

श्रीमती मोहसिना किदवई (छत्तीसगढ़): माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपकी बहुत आभारी हूँ, बहुत मशकूर हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस बजट पर बोलने का मौका दिया यह गवर्नमेंट, जो यह बजट लेकर आई है, इससे उसकी नीयत व नीति साफ झलकती है और नीयत व नीति के साथ-साथ ही वे देश को किस दिशा में ले जाना चाहते हैं, देश के लिए क्या करना चाहते हैं, यह भी इससे पता चलता है। मैं इस बजट का खैरमकदम करने के लिए, समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूँ क्योंकि इस बजट का जो फोकस है, सबसे बड़ा फोकस है, वह गरीब लोगों के ऊपर है, उन्हीं से मिलती हुई नीतियां हैं और जो बजट ऐलोकेशन हुआ है, वह भी इसी सिलसिले में हुआ है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपने मुझे बताया नहीं कि मेरे लिए आपने कितने मिनट का समय रखा है?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा० टी० सुब्बाराामी रेड्डी): दस मिनट।

श्रीमती मोहसिना किदवई: ठीक है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं कह रही थी कि यह बजट बहुत ही ढंग से, बहुत ही सलीके के साथ इंडिकेट करता है कि silent revolutions through their economic policies and fiscal management की तरफ एक खामोश इशारा करता है, ऐसा मुझे इसमें नज़र आता है। मैं समझती हूँ कि यह पहला ऐसा बजट है, जिसके अन्दर देश में जो सबसे महत्वपूर्ण चीज़ है, एलीमेंटरी एजुकेशन या सर्वशिक्षा अभियान, उसकी बात कही गई है। मैं मंत्री जी को इसके लिए बहुत मुबारकबाद देना चाहती हूँ कि मंत्री जी ने इस सबसे महत्वपूर्ण नुक्ते की बात को इसमें शामिल किया। यह मुद्दा बहुत दिन से चल रहा था, किन्तु उसे गंभीरता से नहीं लिया गया था। यह बजट विज़िनरी बजट है, जिसने दूर के हिन्दुस्तान को देखा है और हिन्दुस्तान में रहने वाले हर तबके, हर फिरके, हर व्यक्ति को देखा है और साथ ही साथ यह कोशिश की है कि किसी तरह से हमारी नज़र वहां तक भी जाए जो कि इस देश की बुनियाद है।

मैं सर्वशिक्षा की बात करना चाहूंगी, कहना तो मुझे बहुत कुछ था, किन्तु मैं स्वयं को कुछ मुहों तक ही सीमित रखूंगी। सर्वशिक्षा की बात मैं इसलिए करना चाहती हूँ क्योंकि यह सरकार इस प्रोग्राम को बहुत की व्यापक तौर पर और सिस्टमैटिक तरीके से चलाना चाहती है। इसके लिए मैं उन लोगों को मुबारकबाद देना चाहूंगी, जिन्होंने सर्वशिक्षा अभियान के पेपर तैयार किए हैं, जिन्होंने इसका प्रोग्राम तैयार किया है या इसकी प्लानिंग की है। इसमें उन्होंने वे सभी चीज़ें लाकर रखी हैं,

जिसकी इस देश के उन सभी बच्चों को जरूरत है, जो एलीमेंटरी एजुकेशन हासिल करते हैं। मैं इस पर जोर इसलिए देना चाहती हूँ क्योंकि शिक्षा का यही सबसे महत्वपूर्ण हिस्सा या समय होता है, जो एलीमेंटरी एजुकेशन का या प्राइमरी एजुकेशन का होता है। सबसे बड़ी चीज़ है कि बच्चे का दिमाग जो बनता है, वह छः वर्ष से लेकर बारह वर्ष तक के समय में बनता है। वह दिमाग एक कच्ची लकड़ी के समान होता है, जिसे जैसा चाहे ढाला जा सकता है या उस मिट्टी की तरह होता है, जिसे जिस भी सांचे में ढालना चाहें, ढाल सकते हैं। It is the most important period of the education.

बच्चे का दिमाग हायर सैकेन्डरी स्कूल में, कॉलेज में या यूनिवर्सिटी में नहीं बनता, उसका कॅरेक्टर यूनिवर्सिटी लैवल पर नहीं बनता है, उसका कॅरेक्टर इसी आठ-दस वर्ष में बनता है, जो कि बहुत महत्वपूर्ण समय है। मुझे कहने में कोई भी हिचकिचाहट नहीं होती है कि इस हिस्से को सदैव नज़रअंदाज़ किया जाता है। जो सबसे महत्वपूर्ण हिस्सा था, उसमें न कोई अध्यापक, न कोई स्कूल, न कोई दरी, न कहीं घर, न कहीं कुछ और इसलिए इस प्रकार की चीज़ जो आपके द्वारा लाई गई है, मैं मुबारकबाद देना चाहूंगी। एक अच्छा इन्सान बनने के लिए जिस सांचे की आवश्यकता है, वही आपने इस सर्वशिक्षा अभियान के माध्यम से शुरू किया और मैं समझती हूँ कि सोशल सैक्टर में सबसे अधिक एलोकेशन शिक्षा क्षेत्र को हुआ है, 18000 करोड़ से भी अधिक और उसमें भी लगभग 4000 इस सर्वशिक्षा अभियान को एलोकेंट हुआ है। मैं समझती हूँ कि आपका प्रोग्राम जितना विस्तृत है, उसके लिए यह एलोकेशन बहुत कम है और उसमें जो सबसे महत्वपूर्ण बात मैं समझती हूँ वह यह है कि जब आप इसके विस्तार में जाएंगे, तो सबसे बड़ा कार्य अध्यापकों की ट्रेनिंग का और उनके चयन का होगा कि अध्यापकों की ट्रेनिंग में किन चीज़ों को शामिल किया जाए, क्योंकि आम तौर पर शिक्षकों को जो ट्रेनिंग दी जाती है, उससे बिल्कुल विपरीत ट्रेनिंग उन्हें दी जाएगी, जो कि आपके इस अभियान के लिए शिक्षक चयनित किए जाएंगे, उन्हें चाइल्ड साइकोलॉजी की जानकारी होना भी आवश्यक है।

दूसरी तरफ जब राज्य सरकारें और केन्द्र सरकार मिलकर उसे फंड करेंगे, मुझे डर है कि आपका यह सर्वशिक्षा कमीशन एक फंडिंग बोर्ड बन कर न रह जाए, क्योंकि आपका प्लान है कि आप नौवीं योजना में इसे 85% एवं 15% रखेंगे और फिर उसके बाद धीरे-धीरे आप उसे 50%-50% तक ले आएंगे। यदि राज्य सरकारें आपको सहायता नहीं करेंगी तो बहुत ही मुश्किल होगा, इसलिए आपको अच्छे से राज्य सरकारों के साथ तालमेल करके इसे चलाना होगा। बच्चों को स्कूल चाहिए, उन्हें अच्छा वातावरण चाहिए और मैं समझती हूँ कि यह शिक्षा ही है, जो आज हिन्दुस्तानियों को एक अच्छे सांचे में ढालेगी। अगर हम इस पर पूरा जोर देंगे और पूरी ईमानदारी के साथ राज्य सरकारें भी काम करेंगी तो कोई वजह नहीं है कि इन स्कूलों से अच्छे इन्सान बन कर न निकलें। हिन्दुस्तान में आज जो समाज की खुराफात चल रही है, उन सबसे उन्हें बचाया जाए और उन्हें ट्रेनिंग देकर उन्हें अच्छी सीख दी जाए।

दूसरी बात मैं स्वास्थ्य के लिए कहना चाहती हूँ कि बहुत समय से इस मुल्क की एक बहुत समस्या है और बहुत ही ज्वलंत विषय है, वह यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनसंख्या बहुत ही तेज़ी से बढ़ रही है। जिस समय हम आज़ाद हुए और आज़ादी के तुरन्त बाद बर्थ रेट व ग्रोथ रेट तकरीबन एक ही था। डेथ रेट और बर्थ रेट तकरीबन एक था, इसलिए उस वक्त इतना महसूस नहीं होता था। जब सरकारी आई और हेल्थ सेक्टर में भी और वैसे भी, हर तरह से, सारी स्कीम्स चलीं, उस वक्त भी मेरा ख्याल है कि life expectancy 27 या 32 साल थी और मेरा ख्याल है कि आज वह बढ़कर 65 या 70 हो गई है। डेथ रेट तो कम हुआ है, लेकिन बर्थ रेट में उतनी कमी नहीं आई जितनी आनी चाहिए थी। जब हम फैमिली प्लानिंग की बात करते हैं, तो जो बच्चे हैं, अगर वे जिंदा रहें और उनकी देखरेख सही हो तो कोई वजह नहीं है कि लोग फैमिली प्लानिंग की तरफ न आएँ – जब तक यह ऐश्वर्य नहीं किया जाएगा कि जो उनके लिविंग चाइल्ड हैं, उनकी देखरेख, उनकी हेल्थ, उनके खाने-पीने का ध्यान रखा जाएगा।

महोदय, मैं वित्त मंत्री जी को इसके लिए मुबारकबाद देना चाहती हूँ कि Integrated Child Development Service में भी आपने ऐलोकेशन बढ़ाया है, लेकिन मैं समझती हूँ कि ऐलोकेशन उसमें फिर भी बहुत कम है। मेरी आपसे दरखास्त है कि इन चीज़ों में जितना भी पैसा आप दे सकें, दीजिए। जैसे आपने मिड-डे मील शुरू किया है, वह बहुत अच्छी चीज़ है, लेकिन आप रोज़ अखबारों में पढ़ते हैं कि मिड-डे मील में कहीं कोई सांप निकल रहा है, कहीं कोई छिपकली निकल रही है, कहीं सड़ा-गला खाना दिया जा रहा है। इसलिए मेरी इसमें आपको एक राय है और एक्-आरूडी-मिनिस्टर को तो मैं लिखूंगी ही, लेकिन मैं समझती हूँ कि जहां खाना पकाया जाता है, वह साफ-सुथरे ढंग से, सेहतमंद ढंग से, बच्चों को दिया जाए। इसके लिए एक रुपया प्रति बच्चा, मैं समझती हूँ कि यह बहुत कम है और इसको बढ़ाने की ज़रूरत है। जब आपने एक काम का बीड़ा उठाया है तो इसको पूरी सीरियसनेस के साथ लेना चाहिए। इसी में मेरी एक राय और है कि जो आप कुक रखते हैं, उनकी जगह, जो बच्चे पढ़ने जाते हैं, अगर उनकी मदर्स खाना बनाएंगी तो मैं समझती हूँ कि अच्छे ढंग से उनको पका-पकाया खाना मिल सकता है।

तीसरी चीज़ मैं एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में कहना चाहती हूँ। मैं बहुत मुख्तसर कह रही हूँ, लेकिन कहना बहुत चाह रही हूँ। एग्रीकल्चर के बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि ज़मीन का बोझ आबादी की वजह से बढ़ता जा रहा है, इसलिए डाइवर्सिफिकेशन तो करना ही है और जिस ढंग से हम कर रहे हैं, मैं समझती हूँ कि उसमें और चुस्ती लानी है। आज सुबह ही हमारे कृषि मंत्री जी जवाब दे रहे थे कि हिंदुस्तान फलों और सब्जियों के उत्पादन में विश्व में सेकेंड लाजेंस्ट कंट्री है, लेकिन जो प्रोसेसिंग है वह 2 परसेंट से ज्यादा नहीं है, इसलिए एक्सपोर्ट नहीं हो सकता। तो यह जो मज़बूत इनफ्रास्ट्रक्चर की हर जगह बात है, उसको हमें समझना चाहिए। मुझे खुशी है कि मज़बूत इनफ्रास्ट्रक्चर के लिए गवर्नमेंट ने इस बजट में बहुत सी बातें कही हैं और हमारे यहां मज़बूत इनफ्रास्ट्रक्चर न होने के कारण आज यह परेशानी है।

एक और बात जो इसमें कही गई है माइक्रो इरिगेशन की, मैं समझती हूँ वक्त के हिसाब से बहुत देर से यह कही गई, लेकिन उसके ऊपर भी सरकार की नज़र है क्योंकि यह global phenomenon है और ग्लोबल प्रॉब्लम है। रोज़ आप journals हैं मैं पढ़ते हैं कि अंडरग्राउंड वाटर की कमी हो रही है और उसकी सतह नीचे जा रही है। ये सारी चीज़ें अभी से हमें सोचकर रखनी चाहिए और उसके लिए और ज्यादा अनुसंधान होना चाहिए कि किस तरह से हम इस चीज़ को आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं।

महोदय, आप भी सउदी अरब गए होंगे, आप देखिए कि वहां माइक्रो इरिगेशन से जो सारे deserts नज़र आते थे, आज वहां जाइए जो फल-फूल, सब्जियों के बड़े-बड़े बागान नज़र आते हैं। ये सारे माइक्रो इरिगेशन के ज़रिए ही हुए हैं। डाइवर्सिफिकेशन की बात जब मैं करती हूँ तो मैं समझती हूँ कि मज़बूत इनफ्रास्ट्रक्चर गांवों में होना चाहिए। आज किसानों की क्या प्रॉब्लम्स हैं, उनको समझना चाहिए। जब तक उनकी ट्रेनिंग सही न हो, तब तक कुछ नहीं हो सकता है। आज हमारे किसान suicide कर रहे हैं। जब इस देश के 36 करोड़ लोगों के लिए खाना नहीं था, वही किसान आज एक अरब से ज्यादा लोगों को खिला रहा है और अगर आज उस किसान की हालत हम नहीं देखेंगे, उसको नए तरीके नहीं समझाएंगे और उसकी परेशानियों को नहीं समझेंगे, तो यह देश फिर से गरीबी की तरफ बढ़ेगा, क्योंकि यह कृषि प्रधान देश है। इसकी ज्यादातर सारी इकानॉमी कृषि के ज़रिए ही है, तो ज़मीन के बोझ को कम करने के लिए डाइवर्सिफिकेशन और उसके अलावा ये जो एग्रो-बेस्ड इंडस्ट्रीज़ हैं, काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज़ हैं, ये ही एक रास्ता है यह खादी कमीशन के ज़रिए भी यह काम हो सकता है।

एक और बात मैं वीवर्स के बारे में कहना चाहती हूँ। मुझे खुशी है कि वीवर्स के बारे में इस बजट में कहा गया। उनको लाइफ इश्योरेंस की बात कही गई है, उनके हेल्थ इश्योरेंस की बात कही गई है और कृषि के बाद, जो सबसे बड़ा उद्योग है इस देश का, वह है डलूम सेक्टर है। हैडलूम में लाखों, करोड़ों लोग लगे हुए हैं जिससे उनकी रोजी-रोटी चलती है। लेकिन आज वीवर्स के हालात क्या हैं, आज बनारस में भी लोग सुईसाइड करने पर आमादा हैं। जिस तरह से आप एग्रिकल्चर में डायवर्सिफिकेशन की बात करते हैं, इसी तरह से आपको टेक्सटाइल में भी डायवर्सिफिकेशन की बात करनी होगी। आज वही पुराने तरीके चले आ रहे हैं, बनारसी साड़ी बन रही है तो बनती रहें, चाहे उनकी मार्किट हो या न हो। आप मेटिरियल बनवाइए, कुछ और करवाइए। इस तरह से आपने ध्यान दिया है, मैं बहुत मजबूर हूँ, लेकिन इसके ऊपर और ज्यादा ध्यान देने की, और इसकी डिटेल्स में जाने की जरूरत है। तीसरी बात को मैं मुबारकबाद देना चाहती हूँ कि पिछली जुलाई में फाइनैस मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा था कि हम जनरल बजटिंग की बात करेंगे। मुझे खुशी है कि आपने इसको इन्ट्रोड्यूस किया है और पहली मर्तबा जनरल बजट की बात कही गई है। लेकिन मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगी कि इसमें तो एलोकेशन बहुत ही कम है, फोरटीन थाउजैंड समथिंग, तो इसलिए चूँकि आपने शुरूआत की है, मैं इस दफा कुछ कहना नहीं चाहती हूँ। लेकिन

आपने यह एक बहुत अच्छा कदम उठाया है। आज इस देश में इस जनरल बजटिंग की जरूरत है। इसके लिए भी मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करना चाहती हूँ। मैं फिर यह कहना चाहूंगी कि आपने [श्री सभापति पीठासीन हुए]

एग्रिकल्चर सेक्टर में भी यह बात कही है, क्योंकि को-ऑपरेटिव बैंकों की बड़ी भूमिका होती है। हमारे ज्यादातर को-ऑपरेटिव बैंक देहात में या छोटे-छोटे शहरों में हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि किसी ने पहली मर्तबा को-ऑपरेटिव बैंकिंग की तरफ तवज्जह दी है। आपने अपने भाषण में यह कहा है कि आपने टॉस्क फोर्स बनाई है तो जो को-ऑपरेटिव बैंकों की प्रोब्लम्स हैं, उनको देखें। मैं समझती हूँ कि यह बहुत अच्छी बात है कि उसमें कुछ आरूबीआई के लोग भी रहें क्योंकि ये सारे पॉलिटिकल लोगों के हाथों में रहते हैं। इसमें सबसे बड़ी परेशानी किसानों को होती है। जो आपकी इकनोमिक पॉलिसीज हैं, उनके लिए और देहात के लोगों के लिए, इस वक्त ये बैंक एक मजबूत इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि इसमें को-ऑपरेटिव बैंक की एक बहुत बड़ी भूमिका होती है। आपने यह एक बहुत अच्छा कदम उठाया है। मैं अगली बात एजुकेशन के सिलसिले में कहना चाहती हूँ कि आपने जो कस्तूरबा विद्यालय की बात कही है, यह भी एक बहुत अच्छी बात है और उससे भी अच्छी बात यह है कि आपके रेजिडेंशियल स्कूल्स लड़कियों के लिए हैं। रेजिडेंशियल स्कूल का एक बड़ा महत्व होता है। महोदय, नाम का भी बहुत फायदा होता है। आप कस्तूरबा के नाम से जो विद्यालय खोलेंगे, उनमें अपने आप वे सारी चीजें आएंगी, जो आज एक इंसान के लिए जरूरी चीज हैं। आज इस देश में रहने वाले बहुत से लोग टू-नेशनल् की थ्योरी भी बात करते हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि इस देश में टू-नेशनल् की थ्योरी की बात करना, इस देश के साथ बात करना, बड़ी भारी ना-ईसाफी की बात करना है। क्योंकि जहां इस देश में हजारों जात-बिरादरी के लोग रहते हों, वहां टू-नेशनल् की थ्योरी की बात करना, देश के साथ कोई बहुत अच्छी बात करना नहीं है। मैं अगली बात यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि आपने माइनोरिटीज के लिए भी बहुत कुछ कहा है। मुझे खुशी है कि आपने उनकी बात कही है और जो हम लोगों की नीति है, उसके तहत आपने यह किया है। मैं समझती हूँ कि यह बजट एक दूर-अंदेशी के साथ, एक विजन के साथ है। देश की खासतौर से वे समस्याएं जिनको हम हटाकर, इस देश को एक सेहतमंद समाज दे सकते हैं, इस देश को एक सेहतमंद दिशा दे सकते हैं। मुझे खुशी है, जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि इस देश में इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर की कमी है, लेकिन फिर भी मैं यह कहती हूँ कि लोग यह कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने इस देश को बर्बाद किया है, मैं कहती हूँ कि अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी का वह विजन नहीं होता, वह शिल्प नहीं होती, वह दिशा नहीं होती, दूर-अंदेशी नहीं होती तो आज इस देश में न इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर होता, न इंडस्ट्रीज होती और न देश दूसरे मुल्क के मुकाबले के लिए खड़ा होता। इन शब्दों के साथ, मैं आपका बहुत आभार प्रकट करती हूँ कि आपने मुझे मौका दिया।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Jaya Bachchan, absent. Shri N.K. Premachandran, absent. Shri R.S. Gavai. You have four minutes. Others have 30 minutes and there are 12 persons. So, please, try to finish it within four minutes.

5.00 P.M.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (Maharashtra): Sir, I will try my level best to finish as per your directions. At the outset, I welcome the Budget. It is the most balanced Budget. It is a Budget of welfare. Particularly, I would urge the hon. Finance Minister that more subsidies should be given to agriculture, credit firms, insurance, drinking water, electricity, housing and communication. I compliment the hon. Finance Minister for accepting the principle of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme and incorporating it in the Budget. No doubt, it is a gigantic task, yet I would say that the Employment Guarantee Scheme, which is existing in Maharashtra since 1978, has gone on successfully and not only that, the outcome of the productive works is very much there. Therefore, despite all the gigantic problems, this Employment Guarantee Scheme should go ahead. Sir, the Common Minimum Programme of the UPA Government dealt with the social justice. I would like to mention some facts about the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. Sir, the total allocation of the Central Plan outlay is Rs. 143,497 crore, out of which, the allocation for the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment is Rs. 1534 crore, which is hardly 1.6 per cent. And, the allocation for schemes for the Scheduled Caste development goes up to Rs. 1,039 crore, which accounts for 0.72 per cent. Sir, the hon. Finance Minister, on page 6 of his Budget speech, has said that the three ongoing scholarship schemes for SC/ST students under the Central Plan-per-matric scholarship, post-matric scholarship and merit-based scholarship-will continue. But, for the educational schemes like girls' hostel, boys' hostel, pre-matric scholarship, the Plan allocation of Rs. 1 lakh is there, which is a very nominal amount. It appears that the Plan allocation originally made under the Scheme, has been transferred to the State sector. Sir, to indicate the figures, I would like to say that the allocation for girls' hostel in 2004 was Rs. 22 crore; in this Budget, it is Rs. 1 lakh. For boys' hostel, allocation was Rs. 26 crore; now it is Rs. 1 lakh. For pre-matric scholarship scheme, allocation was Rs. 600 crore for the year 2004-05, and now it is Rs. 1 lakh. And, the surprise is that the National Scheme for Liberation and Rehabilitation of the Scavengers (NSLRI), there is no allocation of funds at all under this Scheme. Sir, for minor irrigation, as assurance was given in the Common Minimum Programme for the Scheduled Caste farmers, but that Scheme has been transferred and it has been dumped; nobody is bothered. The

Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment has ignored this responsibility. It does mean that we should not keep the assurances given by the Common Minimum Programme. Sir, may I mention, as per the thinking of the Planning Commission, in 1980, the Planning Commission had proposed to transfer a Central scheme for the educational development of the Scheduled Castes during the period of Sixth Five Year Plan. At that time, Shrimati Indira Gandhi intervened and retained it. Again, in 1986, the Planning Commission proposed to transfer some of the schemes to the State sector, then Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the youngest Prime Minister of India, and, the youngest Chairperson of the Planning Commission stopped the transfer. May I request the Finance Minister to reconsider it and not transfer the responsibility to the State Government?

Sir, nearly one-and-a-half decade after the introduction of the structural reforms and the economic liberalisation, one would like to know what we have achieved. Sir, the Budget is an instrument for giving shape to the Plan programme. One would also like to know whether the Budget has successfully dealt with the problems faced by the people living in rural areas, small or marginal farmers, unorganised labour, those who constitute a major segment of the population. We have to ensure that the finances allotted, under different heads, are really spent and not go waste. I would like the Government to ask the National Institute of Public Finance to conduct a survey, study and come out with a status paper.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude, Mr. Gavai.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI: Sir, I will put forth some points of bare reality before the hon. Minister of Finance for his further consideration. What is the present position with regard to the availability of the pulses, main protein supplement for the poor? Today, it has come down from 36 grams to 28 grams. The per capita availability of cereals has fallen and has come down by 20 per cent if compared to the corresponding period. Currently, 47 per cent of the child population is suffering from malnutrition, and, 74 per cent is anaemic. As many as 36 per cent of the married women in the age group of 15 to 49 in the rural areas suffer from chronic energy deficiency. About 54 per cent has no access to education, and, about 50 per cent of the pregnant women suffer from malnutrition. These are some of the points, which I wanted to bring to the notice of Finance Minister for his further consideration. Once again, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak on this important subject.

MESSAGES FROM LOK SABHA

(I) THE APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 2005

(II) THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 2005

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

(I)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 2005, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 17th March, 2005.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India".

(II)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Appropriation Bill, 2005, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 17th March, 2005.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India".

Sir, I lay a copy each of the Bills on the Table.

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 2005-2006 — *Contd.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Jaya Bachchan, you have five minutes.

SHRIMATI JAYA BACHCHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I will take only two minutes. First of all, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak on this subject. Sir, I am quite used to reading lines that have been written for me. I have made a maiden effort to write this for myself and I shall read it.

Sir, presenting a Union Budget is a Herculean task. But I must compliment the Finance Minister for crafting a Budget in which each one of us has something to cheer about. Certainly, this is a forward looking balanced Budget which seeks to reconcile the long term requirement of