

SHRI S. B. SIDNAL : Lastly, only one more point. Employment is one of the problems in this country which is related to population. And population we have never seriously taken all these days. Only Sanjay Gandhi was serious. Subsequently, we have become timid in the implementation of Family Planning programmes. Why should we be timid, I do not know. It should be made compulsory and it should be implemented. Whatever the Government considers fit should be done in this matter.

Then, coming to drinking water, there is no water in the ground, where ground water used to be available. Many people may not be knowing that in our parts heavy rains are expected every year but this year we had only limited rainfall. We are not getting water. Water should be diverted from rivers to make drinking water available. The State Governments should be asked to prepare master plans to provide drinking water to drought-affected and rain-starved areas. Otherwise, it will be very difficult.

Lastly, much has been spoken about the Rajiv Gandhi Trust. I think, I can request the Prime Minister to withdraw it. We can collect thousands of crores through our Party efforts. Why should we malign the national and international fame of Shri Rajiv Gandhi for this ? It is insulting to the big Nehru family, to which he belonged. I understand that Shrimati Sonia Gandhi has been approached with clear intentions.

AN HON. MEMBER : Has she been approached ?

SHRI S. B. SIDNAL : Giving Rs. 20 crores every year is not enough. We can raise the money because we have got lot of friends in our party and also from the public. Thank you very much for giving me the time.

14.59 Hrs.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

FUNDS EARMARKED FOR RAJIV GANDHI FOUNDATION IN THE GENERAL BUDGET 1991-92

[English]

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH): This issue of Rajiv Gandhi Foundation has been raised by many Hon. Members.

I have to inform the House that the Government have received a letter dated 31st July, 1991, from the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation. The Foundation has thanked the Government for its intention to donate a generous sum to the Foundation. However, the foundation has suggested in its letter that the best way to carry out this intention is for the Government to identify suitable projects and programmes and fund them directly and implement them under its own supervision.

15.00 Hrs.

The Government have accepted the view expressed by the Foundation. Accordingly, a sum of Rs. 100 crores proposed in this year's Budget, to be given over a period of five years, will not be donated to the Foundation. However, the Government will identify suitable projects and programmes. These projects will be named after Shri Rajiv Gandhi and the Government will spend such sums as are necessary to carry out these projects and programmes. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a very casual way of dealing with the Budget. We are discussing the Budget of the country and the discussion is going on. The Government cannot take this kind of a most casual approach to allot the money of Rajiv Gandhi Foundation and then withdraw it. From this, it appears, as if the Foundation is the master of the Budget of this country. The moment a letter comes from the Foundation the Finance Minister comes before the House and makes a statement. I do not know whether he is speaking on behalf of Cabinet. Also I do not know whether the Government had an opportunity to discuss it or not. This is not the way to deal with the Parliament of this country, which is the master of running the financial affairs of this country.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have expressed your point.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV : Sir, this House will take care of the Budget of the country.

Respecting the views of the entire Opposition as well as his own party members, will the Finance Minister in the same way, make a statement that the fertiliser subsidy, which has been withdrawn, will not be withdrawn?

Sir, he is lightly treating this Parliament and I strongly protest against the casual treatment of the Government.

SHRI P. C. THOMAS (Mavattupuzah) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your point of order?

SHRI P. C. THOMAS : Sir, we are discussing the Budget and in the Course of the Budget discussion, you have allowed the Finance Minister to make a statement. Can other Members be allowed to intrude and make a discussion on the Statement of the Finance Minister at this stage?
.... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no point of order in this.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay-North) : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your point of order?

SHRI RAM NAIK : Whenever any Minister makes a statement, he has to inform the House in advance that at such and such a time he will make a statement. No such information has been given to the House.

There are two points..... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I heard your point. Any Minister with the permission of the Chair is allowed to intervene in any debate. The Finance Minister asked the permission of the Chair and he was allowed.
(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK : I have not completed my point of order.

Kindly listen to my point of order....
(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : When I am on my feet, please sit down.

Shri Chandr Jeet Yadav wanted to know whether the Finance Minister has made this statement on his own or whether the Cabinet has decided it. I am sure—we all know parliamentary procedure—that whatever the statement the Minister makes, we presume, it is a collective decision of the whole Cabinet.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : I am not making any observation. Would the hon. Finance Minister care to inform the House as to who has signed that letter on behalf of the Foundation? Is it an unsigned letter? Is it an anonymous letter? Is it signed by the Chairman of the Foundation? Or is it such a high secret matter which is to be kept hidden from Parliament?

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH : It is a letter from the Chairman of the Foundation.

SHRI RAM NAIK : I am on a point of order. Whenever any important statement is to be made by the Minister, the House must be informed in advance so that those who are interested in that statement can come and listen to that statement. That is the general rule which is being followed. Now intervention by a junior Minister or by another Minister is also allowed. But is it intervention? This cannot be an intervention. This is a policy statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN : By no stretch of imagination can you address the Finance Minister as a Junior Minister?

SHRI RAM NAIK : I did not say so. I said that a junior Minister can intervene. The Finance Minister has a right to make an intervention. But can this be called an intervention? Intervention means a speech. But this is a policy statement... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : When I am on my feet please sit down. I think, keeping the

sentiments and the views expressed by the House in the last two days, the Finance Minister and I presume, the Cabinet in its wisdom has taken a view... (*Interruptions*) Please do not interrupt when I am talking. Will you please sit down? I take strong objection to this. When I am standing on my feet you cannot start shouting like that. Now Mr. Ramashray Prasad Singh will speak.....

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will be recorded.

(*Interruptions*)*

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN- TARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD) : I have great respect for my colleagues from the other side. While the Finance Minister replies on the general debate on Monday, I think that will be the proper time for him to keep all the facts before the House. At this moment, he just wanted to inform the House. The Minister is entitled to make a statement any time. He gets the precedence at any time. So what he has done at the moment is that he has just informed the House. If there are further clarifications or he wants to give further statement, that he can do during his reply on the general debate. (*Interruptions*). Should I take it that this is politically motivated? As long as this was there, you wanted that it should be withdrawn. Now since it has been withdrawn, you want to know how and why it has been withdrawn. I cannot say beyond this that this is totally politically motivated. I am sorry to say that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Will that letter which has been written on behalf of the Foundation and addressed to the Government or the Finance Minister, be laid on the Table of the House or is it considered a top secret?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is there any necessity to lay it on the Table of the House? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): I want to know what is the difficulty in

placing the letter on the Table of the House. (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi) : Sir, the country wants to know how and why it was withdrawn. This is public money. They will lay it when it suits them. It proves that they have utilized the money according to their fancy. They are not allowing funds for providing drinking water facility in slums. This proves it... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAM NAIK : Sir, after deciding to give such a huge grant, what new development made them change their decision. We would like to know the details... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN : They have told you the new development. He has read out the letter received from the Foundation.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Khurana was enquiring about the contents of the letter. He was not present here. The hon. Finance Minister has disclosed the contents of the letter.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN : He very specifically disclosed the contents of that letter. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : The hon. Minister is not supposed to read the letter. This is for him, if he so desires. He has just conveyed the decision of the Government. It may be confidential or it may not be confidential. You wanted a decision in this regard... (*Interruptions*). You are not concerned about the letter. You are concerned about the decision of the Government and the Government has taken the decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will be recorded.

(*Interruptions*)*

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : Mr. Chairman, Sir about 3500 women

demonstrating against the price rise were beaten up by the police and several women were injured in the incident. (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You come half way through and then start the whole thing. This has got no relevance at all. (Interruptions)

15.15 Hrs.

[SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA
in the Chair]

SHRI RAM NAIK : Madam, Chairman, now you have graced the Chair. Now, two issues have arisen. One issue is what Shri Khurana has said about the lathi charge on the... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please, this is not the time for that... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

KUMARI UMA BHARTI (Khajuraho): Male police were deployed to arrest the women holding demonstration against the price rise at Patel Chowk whereas lady police should have been deployed there. They were also lathi charged... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have had your say. Now please sit down... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

KUMARI UMA BHARTI : Several women were injured. I am coming from there. Shri Khurana was also there. The lathi-charge was done by male police and even proper buses were not provided to transport the arrested women. Please request the hon. Minister to provide full details to the House. If such a thing has happened, the guilty policemen should be punished... (Interruptions).

[English]

SHRI RAM NAIK : Madam Chairman, some letter is alleged to have been

*Not recorded.

received from Sonia Gandhi, which is alleged to be in respect of budget allocation... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are Ministers here and they have taken cognisance. Please sit down now. Yes, Ramashray Prasad Singh Ji.

15.17 Hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET, 1991-92—

GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

[Translation]

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD SINGH (Jahanabad) : Madam, the Budget which has been presented raises some doubts about the credibility of the Government. In fact, the Government's future depends on it. This Budget will lead to a 30% hike in prices in the coming days. The Government's proposal to encourage multinational companies will adversely affect the domestic industries. I agree with several hon. Members who said that this Government does not belong to any one person, it belongs to all the people of this country. But this Government will not do anything for the people. On one hand it does not do anything for the poor but on the other it gives a huge grant to the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation without taking the house into confidence and then takes it back. This shows the Government's style of functioning. If this is a Government in the real sense of the term, then it should always take steps in consultation with others and if the Government does not believe in giving due weightage to the views of members then it need not say anything here.

The entire Bihar is in the grip of drought. Jahanabad being particularly affected. Local people and cattle are facing hardship as drinking water is not available. The Chief Minister was to go on a hunger strike but he postponed the programme receiving some assurances from the Central Government.

The situation is very pitiable in the state and funds are not available for providing relief. The State Government is finding it very difficult to tackle this problem as it lacks the requisite funds. In this

situation the Central Government should extend financial assistance to the Bihar Government to deal with the drought situation.

Now I would like to give an example of red-tapism. There are several State owned tubewells in my constituency which are not working. If these tubewells were in a working condition, the entire area could have been saved from drought. A Government, be it Central or State, is formed to serve the people. If the concerned Minister had got these tubewells repaired then this situation would not have arisen. If we could have avoided this situation national productivity levels would have been higher.

Madam, ours is a country of farmers. One part of the country's population lives in rural areas and the other part in urban areas. The condition of rural and urban areas is for everyone to see. There is always money for urban areas but for rural areas there is always a shortage of funds. It is due to these reasons that terrorism is on the increase. This matter should be looked into. If such a state of affairs continues this Government will go out of power.

Matters have come to a point where terrorists kidnap a Government official and threaten to kill him if the Government does not release their arrested friends. It is the centre's writ which matters. The Government should present a budget which can check the growth of terrorism.

Madam, welfare programmes never benefit the poor. I would like to know how terrorism came into being. A person who never had the taste of development turned into a terrorist. A survey should be conducted into this. The youth of today has not been associated in the development programmes and so they are a frustrated lot. Has the Government made any plans for bringing them into the mainstream. Be it the Eighth Lok Sabha or the Ninth Lok Sabha, it has been said that efforts are being made uplift those who are below the poverty line. I have raised this matter a number of times but have not understood whether the crores of rupees spent on the poor have really benefited them. The Government's programmes are designed to

benefit its own officials. Some thing has to be done for the upliftment of the poor. Crores of rupees have been spent in my constituency but the point is whether all this expenditure has borne fruit. It is this lack of concern for the ultimate outcome of development programmes that has led the country to its present state.

Poor people are being killed. If the prevailing situation continues the country will have to face a severe crisis. If the Government do not take immediate measures and go on delaying the matter, it will become very difficult to save the country. This much I want to submit.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I oppose this Budget because it does not provide any remarkable facility to the poor and the agricultural labourers. Today, the number of agricultural labourers is quite large but their condition is very deplorable. Though laws and rules have been enacted for the upliftment of mine workers, yet when the agricultural labourers are fed up of their lives they commit suicide. They do not find any other alternative, they have no means to secure their old age. Our party has been fighting for having a Social Security Act for the welfare of the agricultural labourers so that they may be able to get security from natural calamities as well as from the old age and they may lead their lives properly. But the Government did not pay any heed to it. Opposing this Budget I conclude my speech. I am thankful to you for the opportunity you gave me to speak.

SHRI MUMTAZ ANSARI (Kodarma) :
Madam, Chairman, I oppose the Budget which has been presented in this House. This Budget appears to me rather a collection of allegations levelled against the previous Governments.

[English]

At the very outset it has been mentioned :

"International confidence in our economy was strong until November 1989 when our party was in office."

[Translation]

It creates an impression as if the non-Congress Government which took over afterwards was responsible for all the errors

committed. However, my submission is that it was only after the Congress Government came into power foreign loans were taken indiscriminately and the way the economic condition of the country is deteriorating, makes it evident that they opted to follow easy path only and did nothing concrete to improve the economy. Actually they should have imposed taxes on rich people, upper sections of the society. But they were afraid that the affluent society might have reacted on this which would ultimately deprive them of power. Therefore, they preferred to choose an easy way and took loans from foreign countries. They should have followed such an economic policy as may be helpful to encourage the agricultural production but they did not do so instead they took loan and spent it in an astrovagant manner. Thus they played with the country. The hon. Minister of Finance has also stated in the Budget :

[English]

"The origins of the problem are directly traceable to large and persistent macro-economic imbalances and the low productivity of investment, in particular the poor rates of return on past investments."

[Translation]

He has confessed that whatever the loan has been invested in different projects bore no fruit. Here I would like to submit that the loan should have been invested in a proper manner. Whereas contrary to this the money was not invested in the projects it was meant for. As a result inflation increased and production remained static ultimately creating all these problems. He himself has confessed all this in the Budget he has presented.

Secondly, in regard to the devaluation

[English]

that stands at least 20 to 22 per cent

[Translation]

20 to 22 per cent devaluation was announced. I think that the Government should have thought that the devaluation of rupee would make import costly and export cheaper. On economic perspective our demands are analytistic. Petroleum is one of the major items that we import, we im-

port crude oil at large scale and the Government have not been encouraging the production of crude oil in the country itself. Keeping all these factors in view we can say that devaluation of rupee would cause nothing but harm to us. By devaluating rupee the Government have committed a blunder. The Budget will have adverse effects on the farmers, poor sections like labourers, craftsmen, the people of minorities and suppressed people.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : We have to start the Private Members' Business now. The hon. Member may continue next day.

15.33 hrs.

MEMBER SWORN

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Secretary-General may now call out the name of the Member who is to take oath.

SHRI BRAHMANAND MANDAL
(Munger)

15.33½ Hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of Article 81, etc.)

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria) : beg to move that leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :
"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH : I introduce the Bill.