

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, I move

That the Bill be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING THE TAXATION LAWS
(AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2003 (NO.2 OF 2003).**

&

THE TAXATION LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2003.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Madam, I move the following Resolution:-

"That this House disapproves the Taxation Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 2003 (No. 2 of 2003) promulgated by the President on the 8th September, 2003".

I move it not because I disagree with the proposed amendments in the Bill. I am moving the Statutory Resolution, as I believe that taxation proposals should not be legislated through the Ordinance route. One of the most fundamental powers of the Parliament, especially of the House which is directly elected by the people is that, taxation is their exclusive jurisdiction. Even we, representing the States, do not have that power. Article 265, which provides that no tax should be levied, except by procedures of law, that right is denied the moment you want to impose, alter and vary taxation. Here in this Bill itself, you will find that the rates of taxation have been altered, of course, with the intention to give benefit to the assesses. But, nonetheless it has been altered. To adopt an Ordinance route to enact this piece of legislation, to my mind, is objectionable. Of course, there is a provision in the Constitution that when both the Houses of Parliament are not in Session and if the Executive finds it absolutely necessary, then they can resort to the Ordinance route, and can have legislations through the Ordinance route. What was the urgency? There must be urgency, an element of urgency in respect of the legislation. When the Bill was introduced in Lok Sabha, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill, the hon. Minister very correctly mentioned that he received a series of representations. After he made certain amendments in the Finance Act, against those amendments various interest groups made representations to the Government and one such representation was made by one of the Departments under the Ministry of Finance, that is, the

Department of Economic Affairs. Every time, it happens. That is why it is customary that you present the Budget on the last working day of February and you ultimately take up the Finance Bill, some time, in May. The whole months of March and April are utilised by the Finance Ministry to receive representations in respect of various taxation proposals and budgetary proposals and to react and to respond to them.

Thereafter, the Finance Minister comes to the conclusion as to whether certain amendments to his proposals are needed or not. If he finds that certain amendments are called for at the stage of consideration of the Finance Bill, that is, some time in the month of May, the Finance Minister *suo motu* moves the proposed amendments to address the problems which are expressed before the Ministry by the various interest groups. That is the normal practice, and that is the rationale for which we take Vote on Account for two months, namely, to study the Budget, to respond to the reactions and to arrive at a final decision as to what the Finance Minister would like to do. Therefore, the Finance Minister had the time to examine the various reactions which he received in the interregnum period, from the last working day of February till the day of consideration of the Finance Bill, and many of the provisions which were contained in this Bill could have been considered at that stage. Take the case of exemption for interest income of the Nordic bank. Now, there is a Memorandum of Understanding for certain developmental projects which we entered into with the Nordic Bank some time in 1986, and thereafter, an addendum was made some time in the early 90s. Now, the Economic Affairs Ministry is making a recommendation that they should be exempt from tax on interest income. I have no objection to that. By all means, you do it. It is a welcome measure. But my objection to this is: What is the urgency for which you had to go through the Ordinance route for legislating it? Was it not known to the Department of Economic Affairs the day the Finance Act was introduced on 28th February? It was known to them. They could have examined it; two months were available to them. Similarly, the demand for giving exemption to export earnings of certain products and things -- the items which have been proposed -- out of the wood industry. That is why I started my observation by saying that I am not against the proposals which are contained in 23 clauses of this amending Bill. Up to 18 clauses are related to the Income-tax Act; three clauses are related to Wealth-tax and one clause is related to the Expenditure-tax. I agree with all the proposals. I have no quarrel with that. All these proposals are intended to give some benefit to the assesses and to encourage the industries. For example, the

exemptions which you are giving to the Ship-breaking industry for acquisition of ships from abroad is a welcome measure because this will facilitate expansion of the Ship-breaking industry and will generate employment, especially in the coastal areas. These are limited points to which I am drawing the attention of the hon. Finance Minister and Leader of the House, who has so much experience in matters of money and finance, because I thought these matters should not escape his attention and he should have taken care of these matters even at the time of regular consideration of the Finance Bill. If some of these matters were brought to his notice at a time after the consideration of the Finance Bill was over, that is a different issue.

The second point to which I would like to draw your attention is this. Even to my mind, the Finance Ministry was a little late. This could have been addressed in the Monsoon Session of Parliament. After the Budget Session, we had the Monsoon Session. I think the Ordinance was issued some time in the month of September immediately, one month after the Monsoon Session. So, these problems could have been sorted out through the regular legislation in the Monsoon Session, and we need not have gone through an Ordinance.

We need not have gone through the Ordinance route. On principle, I request the Finance Minister to avoid it as far as possible. It should be resorted to only if the situation demands, for example -- of course, it was not related to the Ministry of Finance; it was related to the Ministry of Law -- we supported it because certain measures absolutely called for legislation through the Ordinance route. It was related to elections, pertaining to creation of some offices, and an amendment of Section 13A(a) of the Peoples Representation Act. Since the Winter Session was to begin in the month of December, and elections were going to be over before that, certain actions were called for. Now, an Ordinance is promulgated normally for purposes of urgency where you cannot go through the legislation in the normal way through both Houses of Parliament. That was the intention of the Constitution-makers behind vesting the Executive with the authority of legislation. An Ordinance is nothing but the legislative power of Parliament, which is being exercised by the Executive. So, as I said I have no quarrel over, or, I do not oppose, the substance of the Bill, the provisions and various sections, the amendments which the hon. Minister wants to introduce in the Income-tax Act, the Wealth Tax Act, the Expenditure Tax Act. I entirely agree with it. But for God's sake, please try to avoid having taxation legislation through the Ordinance route.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Madam, I think there is no way I can disagree with what honourable Pranabbabu has said. It is entirely correct. There cannot be a system of fiscal governance, or, the economic management of the country that resorts to taxation through Ordinance. This is absolutely unexceptionable. Taxation is the right of the Legislature. If the Executive adopts the Ordinance route, then in some fashion, perhaps, that right is being encroached upon. Whereas I share the principle of it -- Pranabbabu has also said it; both in this seat, as also in the chair that I occupy -- the Finance Minister's job is the loneliest job on this planet. Nobody likes the Finance Minister. Now, why did we resort to the Ordinance? Yes, ordinarily, I ought to have made all those amendments and changes in the Finance Bill, 2003 itself before the Parliament adopted the Bill. As it happened -- and this is how the whole situation developed; it is my fault; I am the Finance Minister; it ought to have occurred to me; it did not occur to me -- after the Finance Bill, which got adopted, some of these lacunae came up. The Nordic Bank has a status similar to the IMF, World Bank. The Nordic Bank provides developmental assistance in the same fashion. So if we denied the same facility -- which we provided to the IMF, World Bank -- to the Nordic Bank, which is not a single-country bank, which dealt with development finance, I thought it was an iniquitous situation and we must correct it; so also for shipbuilding industry; so also for wood-based handicrafts which again do not have the specific authorisation or benefits from SEZ; plus one more. Like Wealth Tax, Expenditure Tax and Income Tax, we found that a tendency had crept in of depositing money with the revenue authorities by way of advance tax and earning rates of interest, which were falling; Interest rates there were higher. The Revenue Department was not a banking facility for assesseees. So, in the Monsoon Session, I introduced a Bill for this purpose. It contained all these provisions. Now, I do not want to go into the difficulty that we faced during the Monsoon Session. There were several political difficulties. So, politics overtook the priority of financial management.

When that happens, the Bill naturally suffers relegation in importance, and therefore, it cannot be done. I felt that I would be hurting the interest of the country, if I permitted the Nordic Bank question continue to drag on, if I did not encourage the handicraft industry, if I permitted assesseees to deposit money with the revenue authorities and earn higher interests or the ship-breaking industry. We have, after all, in the coastal Gujarat today taken away the ship-breaking industry for Karachi. It is a high

employment-oriented industry. Today, it has the highest ship-breaking yards in the world. If the ship-breaking industry is facing a difficulty, I must remove it immediately. These were broadly the considerations, and the fact that having moved the Bill in the Monsoon Session, I was unable to have it considered by the Houses for various reasons, which I won't go into now. I felt it was my duty to try and manage the economy in a sense which best subserves the country's interests. And whereas I take on board, entirely and totally agree with what hon. Pranabbabu has said, as a statement of principle, taxation through Ordinance is bad. I agree. Taxation is the responsibility of the Legislature. Nobody can or should usurp it. I had an obligation to both the Legislatures as also to the country and the revenue, therefore, this Bill is here. So, I commend this Bill to the House now.

The questions were proposed.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, the hon. Finance Minister has agreed very sportingly and logically that going through the Ordinance route in regard to the Taxation (Amendment) Bill was not a welcome measure. I agree what Mr. Pranab Mukherjee has said. This is not the case with this Bill only where they have issued an Ordinance. It is the tendency of the present Government to issue Ordinances on many occasions. It has become a mechanised route. Whenever they feel the necessity of a legislation, they straightway go to the Ordinance route. Then, they come before both the Houses for approving those Ordinances. This is not the case with the Finance Ministry alone. Other Ministries are also resorting to the Ordinance route. So, I would like to request the hon. Minister that in future they must bear in mind that they should come through the Ordinance route only when it is utmost necessary; otherwise, they should bring in proper legislation.

Madam, I welcome the various measures contained in the amending Bill. I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister one thing. It is proposed to amend section 206C of the Income-tax Act, 1961, so as to reduce the rate of tax collection at source on alcohol liquor for human consumption. So, tax reduction is being proposed on alcohol for human consumption. I am unable to understand the necessity of this. Of course, 100 per cent tax exemption on ship-breaking industry, which has gone out of our country, is a welcome measure. It is also proposed to reduce interest chargeable from the assesseees and interest payable to the assesseees. It is also a welcome measure. The tax exemption given for export of wooden products for encouraging the cottage industry is also a welcome measure.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister that there is a feeling all over the world for encouraging tax revenue by collecting less tax, when a man makes more money also. If a man earns more and he is put in a higher slab, then he is discouraged. Then, either he would resort to wrong methods or he feels as to why he should do more business and pay more tax. The result is, less tax collection. Recently, several economists and intellectuals have suggested that we should change this tendency of taxing more. For example, if an executive of a company gets a very high salary, he does not get exemption on his expenses and other allowances and he is made to pay more tax. This point should also be borne in mind. As far as the industrialists, businessmen, artists, professionals or persons who are engaged in some sort of trade are concerned, they should not be taxed more. The tendency to tax more should be changed. It does not result in more revenue to the Government. That should not be there. Of course, if you compare with the past, things are better now. In the past twenty years, considerable changes have taken place in the tax system. Once upon a time, if a man made Rs. 10 lakhs, for that he had to pay Rs.8.5 lakhs towards tax. Now, it is Rs. 3.5 lakhs. Still the Finance Ministry can think of some more amendments in such a way that if anybody gets income, on the 33% tax, he can get some more rebate. If you see to it that he earns more income, he would pay more tax to the Government. The end revenue to the Government would be much more.

In conclusion, I request that the Finance Ministry, which includes the Department of Economic Affairs, the Central Board of Income Tax, must make a survey of the countries in the world, of their income-tax system. It should study how the taxation system is functioning all over the world, how the world is giving incentives and how it is yielding more revenues, the difference in the systems practised in India and the foreign countries, is there any way to get more revenue to the country by giving more incentives, also, to see how it can help a person, who generates income, save money. If the Government thinks on these things, and brings amendments accordingly, in future, it would be excellent.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. A.K. PATEL) in the Chair]

I support the Bill and the Government should bear in mind that it would not take the route of Ordinance in tax system and in various other things. It should issue Ordinances only when there is an utmost urgency. Thank you.

4.00 p.m.

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR (Tripura): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. At the very outset, I would like to mention what is written in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is written, "...references were also received from the Ministry of Finance (Department of Economic Affairs) for giving income-tax exemption to interest payable to the Nordic Investment Bank, being a multilateral financial institution constituted by the Governments of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, on a loan advanced by it to a project approved by the Central Government." My first submission is for minimising the tax rate for a project approved by the Central Government. Now by reducing the tax rate, to whom the benefit would go? First of all, that has to be looked into. If the benefit goes to the public enterprises, then it is good. But if it goes to the benefit of some individuals or group of individuals, it is not good. So, that has to be clarified. What I would like to point out is, not only this Ordinance, but as many as 6 or 7 ordinances were promulgated within a short period of seven days, a week.

(THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair)

What were the circumstances that compelled the Government to take such a big number of Ordinances to be promulgated within such a short span of time? Was the heaven falling on the Government that it required a speedy escape? I would like to refer a portion of the speech given by the first Speaker of Lok Sabha, Shri Mavlankar. He stated, "The procedure of promulgation of Ordinances is inherently undemocratic." ...*(Interruptions)*... It is not the only Ordinance. Such a big number of Ordinances were promulgated. What was the constraint faced by the Government? Did the Government go to such a stage that it could not be run? Was the obstruction like this that it had to undergo an operation in order to quickly recover from the stalemate? We would not like to see such type of precedents again. In the arguments it has been stated that the wood-based handicraft exporters were facing certain problems. These exporters were facing some problems. One of the reasons why this problem cropped up was that the interest rates in the market had fallen. Actually, the interest rate in the market did not fall easily. It has been pulled down by the policy of the Government. The interest rate in the market has fallen down. Now, in order to cope with this falling interest rate, tax rate has to be reduced. This is a very peculiar state of affairs that in order to overcome a policy

accepted by the Government, we have to reduce the tax rates. So far as wood-based handicraft is concerned, no doubt, that they should be given relief. We have to see so many other problems which the wood-based handicraft exporters are facing. One of the problems is the Custom-bounded Warehousing Restriction on transfer of goods. The other problem is with regard to the complete restriction on the use of indigenous wood. These are some of the problems which the wood-based handicraft exporters are facing. Along with the wood-based item exporters, the case of those people should also be considered whose economic activity depends on the conch shells. A large number of people in our country are dependent on conch shell business. In their case, they are not being given so much benefit as regards the tax rates. I would rather request the hon. Minister to see whether these poor artisans can be exempted totally from Income-tax. Another important point is that the Government is considering this Bill on account of some demand for concession from some foreign companies. There I would like to put my objection.

We should not concede to any demand that has been put forth by any foreign companies. As regards the ship-breaking industry, some hon. Members have said that we are maintaining the biggest industry in the world. There are also employment opportunities. That is a good thing. But, one thing is, there are examples. When ships are purchased for breaking, they are purchased before their date of expiry. The ships are purchased in good condition, in service condition, and they are bought to break and to collect material from body of ships to have good business. That has to be restricted. This should not be allowed to happen in the name of building an industry. So, this should be restricted.

I would like to raise another point. It is in page 3. It is under Clause 7(d). It says, "exports out of India" shall not include any transaction by way of sale or otherwise in a shop, emporium or any other establishment situated in India, not involving clearance of any customs station as defined in the Customs Act, 1962." Here, the domestic trading institutions are not considered for the benefit. For example, institutions like the Khadi and Village Industries, which are domestic organisations, are not included. They will remain outside the purview of this Clause. My question is, a large number of artisans are involved in this. When the tax rates are diminishing, will the benefit go to the producers, who are actually producing the goods with their own hands? They are all in the villages or in the remote corners

of the country. I would like to know whether the benefit would go to them. No. The benefit is going to the exporters, to the rich section of the people, but not to the poor. So, the Bill aims at reducing the direct taxation and increasing the indirect taxation. This is a wrong way to approach the taxation system. In our country, the direct tax is decreasing and indirect tax is increasing and this Bill is in line with that policy. This has to be reversed. With these words, I conclude my speech. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Virumbi, Shri Pranab Mukherjee gave such a big explanation and suggestion. Mr. Matilal Sarkar spoke on almost every clause of the Bill. Do you still feel there is something left in it?

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, I cannot compare myself with Shri Pranab Mukherjee. He is the senior-most Member of the House. Anyway, I have to say something on this Bill. So, kindly allow me to put forth my views.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If it is brief, it will be better because I have to attend the Business Advisory Committee meeting.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: I also have to attend the Business Advisory Committee meeting.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : Madam, I rise to support this Bill. I hope, whatever deficiencies prevail in it would be plugged. This Bill has been brought before us to revise the interest rate, payable by the assessee or payable to the assessee under the Income Tax Act, 1961. If we take into consideration the 'refunds', we know that we can justify that the Bill is appropriate. In the year 2002-03, the total refund from the direct taxes was Rs. 22,676 crores. In the year 2001-02, the refund was to the tune of Rs.17,304 crores. In the first quarter of this financial year, the refund by the Government was Rs. 12,000 crores. Madam, why is there this system of refund? Practically, the corporate sector has to pay 90 per cent of their tax, due to the Government. If any amount exceeds more than 10 per cent balance, then, they may have to pay an interest at the rate of 15 per cent. Taking into consideration the market situation, that rate of 15 per cent has now been reduced to 12 per cent. I think the rate of interest payable to the assessee has also been reduced to 6 per cent because the interest rate on treasury bills has also come down. The interest rate on treasury bills is,

now, only 6 per cent. I think, in commensuration with that, this rate of interest is also reduced accordingly. Madam, how can one thing happen? In order to show better revenue collection, the Central Board of Direct Taxes is collecting the maximum possible amount. However, subsequently, they return it. This is happening, whoever the Finance Minister happens to be. Nobody can stop it. When the Government is paying Rs. 25,000 crores, the reduction in the rate of interest, according to the prevailing market, is a welcome measure. Secondly, the Government wants to give some boost for export of the wood-based handicrafts, and also to the forest-based products. This is also a welcome measure. But, at the same time, facilities, as enjoyed by the special economic zone people, have not been given here. I would like to request the Government to consider this aspect also. Then, there are some restrictions also. Only those people get this benefit who are exporting 90 per cent of the products; or, only those people will get this benefit who are able to employ more than twenty employees. While, those people who have small units, with less than twenty employees, and selling these items to some other people who export them, also do not get this benefit. It means the people who are employing less than twenty people may not get the benefits, offered by the Government through this Bill. So, this aspect has also to be looked into. Then, if the people are asked to take raw material through import, they would oppose it. But if we give some sort of incentive to the people who want to use indigenous wood, one aspect would have to be taken into consideration, that is, it should not encourage the devastation of forests because long-term benefit would be given only through forestation.

Then, so far as the ship-making industry is concerned, I think, we have taken it, more or less, from Pakistan. Earlier, it was enjoyed by Pakistan. Now, Gujarat is enjoying it. But, if it goes to other States also from Gujarat, it would be highly helpful. Along with wood-based handicraft, if it is extended to others who use conch shells and polymer fibres, it would be highly helpful. In Kanyakumari district of Tamil Nadu, some people are manufacturing it and exporting it. So, these benefits should be extended to other people also who manufacture products, using conch shells and polymer fibres as raw materials. It would be highly helpful in the interest of exports. It would be highly helpful in the interest of nation. With these words, I support this Bill. Thank you very much.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Madam Deputy Chairperson, I am grateful for the broad support that I have received from all sections of the

House. The proposals that have come forward are really worthy. After I responded to hon. Shri Pranab Mukherjee, my good friend, Dr. T. Subbarami Reddy castigated my work by saying that I am not doing enough to reduce tax rates. He queried as to why we had reduced the interest rates for the assesseees. The interest rates were reduced because as I explained...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY : Madam, I supported it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am very glad.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY : I mainly said that it is better to have an idea about tax reduction ...*(Interruptions)*... I did not say anything about reducing the tax rates.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will respond to both these issues. One was about the reduction of the interest payable to assesseees and the other was about advance taxes. Actually, there are three issues. It was a necessary step because high value assesseees like my friend, Dr. Subbarami Reddy, pay a lot of tax and a lot of advance tax. I don't say he did it, but assesseees like him got into the habit of paying a lot of money as advance tax. I don't think there is any need to tell him. And, so, in order to correct that situation we took this measure. I am glad that he was so self-sacrificing as to say that it was a correct step and he supported it.

On the question of tax rates, I do think that we have really very significantly moved on easier tax rates. I appeal to my good friend, Dr. Subbarami Reddy not to induce the citizens to stop paying taxes. They must start paying taxes. The number of those citizens who are paying taxes is not enough. It is really not enough and every Member of Parliament should really now help us in this regard.

The third point was about the tax collection at source on liquor. It is my observation. I saw that hon. Members supported this observation that this particular trade, the liquor trade, is prone to not paying taxes. It is prone to creation of what I would call illegal money. I cannot call it anything else but illegal money. And, therefore, we introduced a system of collecting tax at source from the point of exit of the liquor from the brewery. And like tax deduction at source...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: Madam, I did not oppose it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Why did you reduce the rate?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not saying that you opposed it. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will just explain it. And, I will tell you why it had to be reduced. So, I introduced it in the Finance Bill, 2003. We introduced it at a ten per cent of the value at the exit point of the brewery. Thereafter, I received a very large number of representations from the concerned State Governments. I don't want to name the State Governments. But the concerned State Governments, and the Chief Ministers very strongly represented that ten per cent of the exit value from the brewery is not affordable. The industry will collapse and the revenues that are accrued by the State Governments will also collapse. We deferred the collection. I said, "please re-examine it". No Finance Minister can impose a tax that is so rejected by such a large number of States. And, then, finally we worked downwards from 10 per cent. And, it was only at one per cent that I found that the States were ready to co-operate with us. Unless the States co-operate, how am I going to collect this tax? Therefore, this reduction has been made. As these were the main points that came up, I am grateful to the hon. Members for their support, I, now, commend this Bill for the consideration and for passing by the House and to return it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Actually, Mr. Virumbi, told me that he had to go to the Business Advisory Committee, and requested me to convey his question on the reduction of tax on liquor to you. Now that you have answered it, I will convey it to him that you have addressed his concern too.

Now, I shall first put the Resolution moved by Shri Pranab Mukherjee to vote. The question is:

"That this House disapproves the Taxation Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 2003 (No.2 of 2003) promulgated by the President on the 8th September, 2003."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall put the motion moved by Shri Jaswant Singh to vote. The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Income-tax Act, 1961, the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 and the Expenditure-tax Act, 1987, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2-23 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, I move:

That the Bill be returned.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING THE REPRESENTATION OF
THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2003 (NO.5 of 2003)**

AND

**THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SECOND AMENDMENT)
BILL, 2003**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up Statutory Resolution disapproving the Representation of the People (Amendment) Ordinance, 2003 (No. 5 of 2003) and the Representation of the People (Second Amendment) Bill, 2003. Dr. T. Subbarami Reddy, you are going to move your Resolution that this House disapproves the Representation of the People (Amendment) Ordinance, 2003 (No.5 of 2003) promulgated by the President on the 29th October, 2003.

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Madam, before that, I would like to seek some clarifications from the hon. Minister.