

मैंने राज्य सरकारों को पशुओं के लिए चारे की निःशुल्क दुलाई की भी मंजूरी दे दी है। पानी और चारे की निःशुल्क दुलाई की ऐसी व्यवस्था जून, 2003 के अंत तक जारी रहेगी।

खाद्यान्नों के संबंध में, सरकार ने सूखे से प्रभावित 14 राज्यों को 4000 करोड़ रुपए से अधिक मूल्य के 38.75 लाख मीट्रिक टन चावल और गेहूं के निःशुल्क आवंटन की पहले ही स्वीकृति दे दी है जिसमें से 19.50 लाख मीट्रिक टन खाद्यान्न वर्तमान सूखे से राहत पहुंचाने के लिए है। यह खाद्यान्न केवल तीन महीने अर्थात् जनवरी, 2003 तक के लिए है तत्पश्चात् अधिक खाद्यान्न जरूरतमंद राज्यों को उपलब्ध कराया जाएगा। तथापि, वांछनीय है कि राहत रोजगार के सृजन हेतु इस खाद्यान्न के वास्तविक इस्तोमाल की सुव्यवस्थित ढंग से निगरानी की जाए। निःसंदेह, राज्य सरकारें आवंटित खाद्यान्नों के इस्तामाल के बाद अतिरिक्त आवंटन प्राप्त कर सकती हैं। इसी संदर्भ में सार्वजनिक वितरण प्रणाली की कार्य-पद्धति में सुधार लाया जाना चाहिए।

मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि देश के सूखा प्रभावित क्षेत्रों में जल की अत्यधिक कमी है। इसलिए मैंने रेल मंत्रालय को अतिरिक्त जल टैंकर ट्रेने चलाने का निर्देश दिया है ताकि इस जल संकट को कुछ हद तक कम किया जा सके। जल संसाधन मंत्रालय प्रभावित राज्यों को सहायता पहुंचाने के लिए इस संबंध में एक कार्यदल का शीघ्र गठन करेगा। मैं पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय को भी निर्देश दे रहा हूँ कि वह गहरे नलकूपों के लिए गहरे ड्रिलिंग रिगों का उपयोग करने की संभावना का पता लगाएं।

हमें इस सूखे की चुनौती का एकजुट होकर सामना करना है और यह सुनिश्चित करना है कि हमारे नागरिकों को सभी मुश्किलें कम हों।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य: सभापति जी, स्पष्टीकरण।

श्री सभापति: स्पष्टीकरण बाद में होंगे, अभी प्रधानमंत्री जी को जाना है।

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

MID-YEAR REVIEW OF COUNTRY'S ECONOMY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS-(CONTD.)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, we just heard the statement from the hon. Prime Minister where one of the factors mentioned in relation to the drought hit areas was that foodgrains worth Rs. 4,000/- crore would be given free of cost to those States. Now, a mention was being made about food riots in India, saying, 'we envisaged this situation'. Consider that this Rs. 4000/- crore worth of foodgrain was not given free of cost to the States, but 35 kgs of foodgrain, that is, rice and wheat were being made available to a crore families, every year, at a rate of Rs. 2 or Rs. 3 per Kg. If we convert it at the international currency rates, a family's food bill,

consisting of 35 kilograms of wheat and rice, would be anything between \$ two or two-and-a-half. That is the kind of facility, the Government of India, on account of the surplus, has been making available to the poorest of the poor of this country. This is by any stretch, for the India State; not a very developed nation, a great achievement. But we have still preferred to visualise a situation where we see horrors of food riots taking place as far as the country is concerned. This is the situation which I mentioned, is no longer new. You mentioned, how do we generate the educational resource of the country? Well, you are absolutely right when you said, 'it is the duty of the Government'. And the Government, indeed, even by amending the law, has said that primary education will be a fundamental right. Through the 1990's we unshackled ourselves even in these areas. What is the situation today? There are areas where people, who have grown out of your institutions; your human resource, is now in a position to actually make its impact in major establishments; academic and industrial corporate the world over. I remember when I was in college, one of the subjects we always used to debate and express concern about was 'brain-drain'. We spend money on them and they leave the country. Recently, I went back to the Delhi University to attend a function, and I had a young student speaking ahead of me and he was very proudly using a different phrase. He said, 'Well, we are now a brain bank'. And this is one of the changes which has taken place, during this period which you feel so concerned about I remember a situation, some 10-15 years ago, when there was a concept of 'one State, one regional engineering college'. Ask any hon. Member from Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu or Karnataka as to what the situation in their States now is. A small State, like Haryana, can, today, proudly boast of 27 engineering colleges. That is the level to which the country has grown. Yes, quality needs to be improved.

Now, I come to Information Technology institutions. These are all areas where we have been growing. And, therefore, to point out these areas, and still to paint the economy of the country backward, I think is not, perhaps, a very fair assessment of the situation.

My learned friend, Mr. Nilotpal Basu, spoke in terms of how do we make ourselves competitive in areas of concern. I think this is an area, which, at some stage when you speak in terms of consensus—I can quite appreciate his and his party's difficulty in being part of that consensus. How do we now create a labour law regime which is going to make our economy, and our manufacturing industry equally competitive? You may speak in terms of a labour law regime, which *status quoist*. And in the

present situation, you may, actually, visualise yourself as a friend of labour, and champion the cause of the present labour law regime. But any regime, which is contrary to the growth of generation of employment, in the long run, will never be labour-friendly.

As far as this area is concerned, when we speak in terms of a larger consensus, I think, many including my friend in Mr. Basu's party will have to come around. I see opposition by the Congress Party, as far as New Delhi is concerned, but I also see the Congress Party making some good headway in this area, as far as Maharashtra is concerned, because it is the Chief Ministers who know where they need a lot of flexibility. Because those are the areas which you actually need to go in terms of that. A comment has been made by the preceding speaker which was, certainly, contrary to the policy of disinvestment or privatisation which the Government of India has followed.

श्री सभापति: आप एक मिनट के लिए बैठेंगे। सदन की राय के लिए मैं सुझाव रखता हूँ कि सदन की कार्यवाही जब तक कि आज की सारी कार्यावली समाप्त नहीं हो जाए तब तक के लिए चले।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: सर, जहाँ तक हम लोगों का सवाल है, यह तय हुआ था कि आज हम सिर्फ यह डिमकशन करेंगे, परन्तु जिस बिल पर हमने आज चर्चा की है वह लिस्ट ऑफ़ बिज़नेस में बाद में डाला गया। लेकिन सर, यह तो चार घंटे की चर्चा है, इसलिए अब कितनी और देर तक हमें बैठना है?

श्री सभापति: आप कितनी देर तक बैठ सकते हैं?

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: मेरे खयाल में हम 6.00 बजे तक करके कल फिर दोबारा यह चर्चा कर सकते हैं।

श्री सभापति: देखते हैं, अभी 6.00 तो बजने दीजिए।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: क्योंकि ... (व्यवधान)

श्री सभापति: मैं आपकी बात समझ गया।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: संसदीय कार्य मंत्री से बात हुई थी।

श्री सभापति: हाँ, ठीक है।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL): Sir, let us complete it today itself, because, tomorrow, there are some other important legislations.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West bengal): Sir, let us sit up to 6.00 p.m.

श्री सभापति: सदन की अनुमति है कि 6.00 बजे तक सदन की कार्यवाही जारी रखी जाए।

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I will complete in a few minutes. One comment was made against the privatisation of the disinvestment policy of the Government. I have, now, come across a new philosophy which has been propounded, where it has been said that, well, if you want to privatise, "don't privatise the profit-making units." This seems to be a categorical statement which, particularly, the Congress Party has now been making. I find this statement somewhat surprising for the reason because, in the first instance, we must keep in mind that units which are profit making, and, particularly, the profit making units in a monopoly or a regulated regime, will not always continue to be profit making. I remember, our steel plants, for which our first Prime Minister had used the famous phrase, "The temples of modern India", were a great endeavour. Today, in a globally competitive regime, we find that some of those plants are producing the costliest steel, when compared to other steel plants in the world. What do we do with the units which were envisaged to be profit making units, which were great institutions at one point of time have, today, ceased to be profit making? Secondly, if we analyse the performance of the Congress party on this front,...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Will you please yield for a second? You just mentioned about the policy statement of the Congress Party, I would say that in course of debate on disinvestment, I had made it quite clear, and you are omitting the two phrases, that "profit-making units in a competitive environment" and "recurring profit-making units"--not once in a blue moon--those units should not be sold.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member, Shri Pranab Mukherjee.

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): यह अरुण शौरी हैं या अरुण जेटली ... (व्यवधान)

श्री सभापति: कल आपके लिए कोई पृष्ठेगा कि आप दीपांकर हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, he is repeating something which has been discussed at length. A lot of consensus was there. Instead of asking the Congress Party and Left Party, let him put this question to his own allies, the Shiv Sena, the Samata and other allies. What are their views on this? And, he should put this question to Shri Ram Naik also.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम (उत्तरांचल): सब साथ है।(व्यवधान) This issue was debated for four hours. Except BJP, every Party had said that profit-making units should not be disinvested.

SHRI SATISH PRADHAN (Maharashtra): Sir, as far as the Shiv Sena is concerned, we are in the NDA. We abide by the decisions taken by the NDA.

श्री सभापति: आप समाप्त करिए।

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, Mr. Mukherjee is absolutely right when he says that I am reaffirming and repeating what Mr. Arun Shourie has repeatedly said. Despite the fact that Mr. Arun Shourie has very convincingly reiterated it, Mr. Basu chooses to repeat that. Therefore, it becomes necessary for me to rebut something that he has stated. If we look at the period from 1991-2000, we will find that 2000 was the year when there was a significant shift from sporadic market sales to strategic sales. Sir, if we look at the first period, where 39 PSUs were divested and divested in small minority holdings, we will find that it is, when for the first five years, the Congress Party was in power, and for the next one-and-a-half or two years, it was the United Front Government which was in power. Do we recollect which were the PSUs which were divested? It is a different matter that we have an ideological difference with the Congress Party on the methodology of that divestment. But that difference apart, the difference being that we change over to a strategic sale system which we believe has bought better values, better PE ratios, as far as the exchequer was concerned.(Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: The VSNL also; the Centaur Hotel also.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Yes; Sir, the Centaur Hotel also; and the VSNL also. Sir, since the hon. Member has mentioned the VSNL....(Interruptions)... Since you mentioned this(Interruptions)... Sir, the PSUs which were divested when the Congress Party was in power, -- if we recollect them--(Interruptions)... You had shares of the Indian Oil; you had shares of the HPCL; you had shares of the BPCL; you had shares of the VSNL; and curiously enough, during the period when the United Front Government was in power, which your party was supporting,(Interruptions)... which his party was supporting, his favourite share of the VSNL was divested, when the CPI(M) was supporting the Government. Therefore, when you talk about the VSNL, you must recollect that you were supporting a Government(Interruptions)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: We are still supporting. If you divest to strengthen a company, we are still supporting. But you are privatising without any rhyme or reason with an undervalued price. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया (झारखंड): सर, ये क्या हो रहा है? ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, थोड़ा-बहुत चलते रहना चाहिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*... आप बैठ जाइए।

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Since the statement has been repeatedly made, ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I may just mention, since there is a concern with regard to values, I just give you the values of the five most bluechip PSUs divested during 1991-98. The PE ratio which the Indian Oil Corporation got was 4.9; the BPCL got 5.7; the HPCL got 5.9; and the VSNL—which you wanted to know—got 6. As against this, if you see the PE ratios through the strategic sale which, Mr. Arun Shourie, has done the BALCO got 19, the CMC got 12; HPCL got 37; IBP got 63 ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: There is a limit to everything. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, if an under-valuation took place, the under-valuation was ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: He does not understand the position.

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, वह भी करते हैं, हम भी करेंगे ...*(व्यवधान)*....

श्री सभापति: क्या यह जरूरी है, वह जो करें आप भी करें,

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल: सर, सुनने नहीं देते। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री सभापति: आप धिंता मत करिए, सब सुन रहे हैं।

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, I think, this debate should be conducted in a manner in which, I think, both sides, despite their differences, do recognise that there is some basic truth, and the hon. Member, for example, is quoting figures in a manner which is completely incomparable. What they have done or what this Government has done is sold the management in our case, it was an act of divestment. But we did not change the public sector character of the companies. You are comparing the unlike and then you draw the ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for mentioning this. The debate was being conducted by us precisely in the spirit in which he mentions. It is precisely this point that we made that we disagree with the methodology in which they carried on the process of disinvestment. It was a process which got lesser values; it is a process which did not bring in aggressive investors; it was a process which did not bring in more investment into this ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: You talk about the Mid-Year Review that we are discussing.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: It is the process which neither brought in investment nor new technologies continued with the same public sector managements, and, therefore, did no good as far as the management of the PSU was concerned. It is precisely that point that I am making.

Sir, we follow the route which, in terms of economic management of the PSUs, is a more correct route. It has brought better dividends, as far as the PSUs are concerned. It brought has greater investments to them. The Finance Minister has brought a mid-term review of the Indian economy. It is an occasions, as the Leader of the Opposition has rightly said, that we must debate upon this document. But, when we debate upon this document, if issues of policy correctives are raised, it is time the issues of policy correctives are debated. Sir, Mr. Basu mentioned that we can have consensus on some of the issues. He used the word 'consensus', but at the same time, he also talked of reversal of everything that has happened from 1991. I am afraid it is something which will never be acceptable to my party. Thank, you.

DR. P.C. ALEXANDER (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I should express my gratitude to you for giving me this early chance in the course of this debate. As was pointed out by an earlier speaker this evening, normally, the earlier chances go to the representatives of large parties. But you have been kind enough to call me, an Independent, to speak in this debate early enough. I am most grateful to you for that.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would start by congratulating the Finance Minister for the very innovative step he has taken in bringing out this report at the end of six months. What has impressed me the most about this report is its brevity. Normally, when we were all in the Government — I am sure, my successors in the Government now also have that tradition — we would think in terms of 150 pages, if it is a report to be given to Parliament

or a Committee of the Parliament. But, here, I find a very important subject being presented in a very brief manner — precise, but transparent — in 40 pages. I wish to congratulate the Finance Minister for bringing out the information in so brief a report, as he has done today.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into all the details contained in this Report. Already, the distinguished speakers before me have mentioned what they consider as the areas of concern to the nation, the shortcomings in the implementation etc. They have also pointed out the advantages of the report in highlighting the achievements of the last six months. I do not want to go into these, though I had thought of making a few observations on them. But, after listening to the debate here, I thought the basic issue is that of the rationale of liberalisation itself, which needs a re-defining; More importantly, the role of the State in liberalisation, needs, re-defining, so that we, who are representing the people here, and, through us, the people as a whole, will understand what we mean by liberalisation or globalisation. If you read the newspapers or listen to the speeches of political leaders, you really get confused, because there are some who go on telling the people in India that after 1991 India has sold its future to the multinationals; that the liberalisation route that was taken by Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, during his administration as Prime Minister, was one of the biggest mistakes that had been committed. There is another section which believes that liberalisation or globalisation means just following what the United States, France, Germany and other advanced countries of the world have done. On the other hand, there will be another section which believes that liberalisation means or globalisation means just following what the United States want or Germany or advanced countries of the world have done in their time in their countries. I thought, I would use the time that you would permit me, Sir, just to present my views as to what the policy of liberalisation should be for a developing country like ours. I would devote my talk only on that issue because I feel that we should have a sharper focus on where we stand on the issue of liberalisation particularly after the need for 'consensus' had been stressed by Shri Nilotpal Basu and also by another speaker before me. At least, let us try to define what liberalisation is in the Indian context and what the role of the State should be in the Indian context and see whether we can have a consensus on that issue. Mr. Chairman, I wish to invite the attention of the House, through you, to the fact that we have not yet, as of today, given up the philosophy of mixed economy. There seems to be a great confusion in thought in our country on that. When we became independent, two clear

options, were available to us. Two models were available to us — the United States Model or the Western Democracy Model, and the Soviet Union Model or the Controlled Economy Model. The great leaders of our country, at that time, weighed the pros and cons of these two models and took a conscious decision, a deliberate decision, that we should have a model neither adopting all that the United States or the Western democracies have done, nor accepting what the controlled economies have done. They chose deliberately the mixed economy model. It is my view that there is a consensus in this country, that we should continue with this mixed economy model. While we take the route of liberalisation, we should not give up the mixed economy model. On that, I am sure, we can start the process of evolving consensus on liberalisation. What else can be done to get consensus on the issue of liberalisation? My suggestion to the hon. House, through you, is that we have to educate our people and our leaders that each country has to have its own decision as to how far one can advance in structural reforms. What has been proved successful through structural reforms in the Far Eastern countries, the so-called Asian Tigers, or what had been proved failures in some of the Latin American countries should neither be an example, nor a warning to us. Every country has to choose its model depending upon what its requirements are, what its situation is and what can be accepted or what can be rejected. I will give my own idea as to what the model for our country should be. After accepting that we are a mixed economy, after accepting that we are not going to opt any other model without change, we should ourselves take a conscious decision about the timing, phasing and sequencing of changes. We should not allow anybody else to dictate to us about the timing of structural changes, about their phasing or about the sequencing — what should come first, and what should come second. A sovereign country like ours should not be influenced either by writings of the western thinkers and economists, or by the persuasions of international organisations like the World Bank, or the Monetary Fund. We have to be masters of these three decisions — timing of the changes, phasing of the changes and sequencing of the changes. This would be the first decision that we have to take. The second point to be borne in mind is that, even in liberalisation the crucial fact to be taken into account is that of competition. You cannot compete with the advanced countries. We cannot compete with Japan or Germany on equal terms. Competition is the essence, the core of liberalization, but you cannot ask a village wrestler to have wrestling match with a sumo wrestler, and say that both are competing. Our country must

take into account our limitations, and, our strong points, and enter areas, go for changes in areas, where we will have competitive advantages.

My third point is, the State need not divest itself of all, what it has divested earlier, its role in manufacturing; it need not divest itself of the responsibility of managing the key sectors of the economy, and of laying down basic policies on liberalization. In my opinion, for a country like ours, where gross disparities of income exist, where the poor are really very poor, and the rich are really very rich, the State has to play a very decisive and positive role, even in the era of liberalization, in ensuring that economic justice is maintained in our country. I am making an important point, because, the general impression is that once liberalization is introduced or structural adjustments are made, the State will fade away. The State should never and will never fade away, and it should not be allowed to fade away, because, State intervention is much more important and relevant to a country like ours, and that cannot be forgotten, and the State should continue to have its intervention. It may be intervening by introducing proper accounting system by the private and public sector, proper auditing system, appropriate control over the stock market operations and for preventing the frauds and the Scams in the banking system, whatever may be the sector, before liberalisation or after liberalisation, the State should have this dominant role.

My fourth point is, the State should not be a soft State, once we have opted for liberalization. We are hesitant to take decisions, even when we are convinced that there are very necessary for the growth of our economy, because, in our country, elections take place almost all the time, every month, and if I am not exaggerating, at least, every six months. Either it is an election to the Parliament or to the State Assembly. If that is not there, there are elections to the local bodies, and keeping the elections in view, the political leaders always think of what should be done, and convince us that, this is what should be done; hesitate and postpone it till the elections are over; and then come another set of elections, and this is what I mean by saying a soft State. Our hesitation to take hard decisions, our reluctance to face the realities, and think of the remedies, which are necessary for bringing up the level of our people, is at the root of all our problems. I have always talked and I always talk, in other fora, about the unmerited subsidy that our system. I am not now talking about the subsidy in the agricultural sector or the subsidy for the poor through the P.D.S., There are certain sectors, where subsidy is totally unmerited, but nobody is willing to take that step. I mention

particularly the case of higher education in our country. We should subsidize higher education for the children of the poor, those who are below the poverty line, children of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. But, why should my son or my grand-son pay only Rs. 50/- or Rs. 60/- a month as his fee in a first grade college, and get away with that? Since the rule is, higher education cannot bear a higher rate of fee, thousands of crores of rupees have been wasted on unmerited subsidy in higher education. I mentioned that point only to illustrate my point. Having made these four-five points, let me also mention four important considerations, which should be borne in mind by the political leaders of the country, and with that, I will conclude. We should take care to ensure that liberalization, which we have adopted, and which should continue, does not result in joblessness. And, if we create unemployment, then, you will find people on the streets, not because of food shortage, as has been said by Mr. Nilotpal Basu.; unemployment will create unrest, and lead to disastrous consequences. We have to be very careful in adjusting the pace of liberalization and we should ensure that joblessness does not come out as a by-product of liberalization. Secondly, liberalization should not be ruthless. It should not make the rich people filthy rich, and the poor people poorer whatever step we may take, we have to keep a balance in our decision-making process in order to ensure that the decision is not ruthless and mindless. Thirdly, you should make sure that whatever we may by way of liberalization, we do not mortgage the future of our children. It has to be a sustainable growth, not growth at any cost; and if it is sustainable growth, then we should be mindful about the impact on environment, health and various other such factors. Fourthly, we should make sure that liberalization leads also to the empowerment of the disadvantaged segments of our society, particularly, the women. If we lose sight of the goal of empowering the disadvantaged segments, like women, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, we will be defeating the very purpose of liberalization. We would have created more wealth and increased the growth rate in statistical terms, but we would have added on to the disabilities of women, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, and distorted the economic structure. Finally, Mr. Chairman — I give great importance to this — we should consciously ensure that the liberalization process does not subvert the cultural heritage of our country. We should not be blindly led into an alien culture through the route of liberalization, and our children should not think that liberalization means imitation of the people in Paris or London or New York. We are proud of our ancient culture, the values of our

ancestors, and we have to preserve the heritage that we have, without being subverted or devalued by liberalization.

I have made about eight or nine points in my intervention, and I think, if we have a consensus on these goals and objectives, in which I have them placed before the House, through you, Mr. Chairman, we can succeed in enlisting the cooperation of all sections of political people in favour of liberalization. Just one more word, and I will conclude. It is wrong even to talk about the folly of what was done by Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao or Shri Manmohan Singh in 1991. We have gone a long distance. We cannot ask the globe to stop so that India can get out of it. The globe is moving on. A new era has been created and we are a party to the creation of that era. Therefore we are already in the process of liberalization. We are signatories to a major agreement. At this stage, to say that we want to get out because we can't proceed -- we will be opting for the fate of a Myanmar or a North Korea. If we do that, it would not be correct. It is a settled fact of life that liberalization was the deliberate choice of the people of this country. And, if it is put before them clearly, what exactly it means -- that it does not mean depriving the State of its responsibilities, it does not mean ignoring the rights of the people who are unemployed -- then, we can certainly create a consensus in favour of this policy. With these words, I conclude, and I thank you once again for giving me this opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Mr. Alexander, for your maiden speech.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: सभापति महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां हैं.....

श्री सभापति: आपको जवाब मिल जाएगा, आज नहीं तो कल मिल जाएगा। अकाल तो पड़ा हुआ है न? अकाल तो है?

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: जी, अकाल है।

श्री सभापति: वह आज भी है और कल भी रहेगा।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: लेकिन सर, अकाल में जो सहायता प्रदान करनी चाहिए.....

श्री सभापति: सहायता प्रदान की जाएगी, आप कल पूछ लेना, ऐसी क्या बात है?

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: राजस्थान को तो सबसे ज्यादा दिया है।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: दिया नहीं है इसीलिए तो हम पूछ रहे हैं।