

GENERAL BUDGET, 1981-82—
GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Finance Minister.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE
(SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): Sir,
... (Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Not allowed. There is no intimation. Nothing will go on record without my permission.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: This is point of disorder. Where is the point of order?

(Interruptions)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले पाइंट आफ डिस्टर्बर्डर के अस्त्यार दें, फिर पॉइंट आफ आर्डर को लेंगे।

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: How are we to proceed?

(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब काफी हो गया है।

(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अंत आ कर मुझसे बात कीजिए।

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing doing. बहुत हो गया है।

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will go into record without my permission. Whatever goes on without my permission should not go on the record of the House. What is said without my permission will not form part of the record.

(Interruptions)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बस कीजिए। आपको कोई तरीका निकालना चाहिए।

(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने पहले बहस करवा दी है, और करवा दूंगा। रास्ता बनाइये। अगर आपको इससे कोई फायदा होता है, तो कीजिए।

(Interruptions)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आकर बताइए मुझे। पांच घण्टे तो बहस करवाई, अब कोई और तरीका हो तो आकर बताइए।

(Interruptions)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या अच्छा लगेगा।

(Interruptions)**

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA (Pali):
You use your power under Rule 374.
Why don't you use them?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे पता है।
I know my powers.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record without my permission, as I told you. All irrelevant.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : माननीय सदस्यगण सोचें कि डिस्टर्बर्डर से आर्डर क्रिएट नहीं होता।

We cannot create order out of disorder. We have to be patient; we have to adopt certain means which will lead you to some solution. There is only one question; we have to discuss ways and means; we have already discussed that for five hours and I am not against any more discussion on the subject. But do you think that this will lead us anywhere? If the Members are very much happy to do this, I am ready to sit in my chair and be a spectator. This is not the way.

(Interruptions)**

[Mr. Speaker].

Nothing is going on record.....
There are certain rules.

(Interruptions)**

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): It is quite true that only recently we had a 5-hour debate on the situation in Gujarat. What hon. Members and all of us are very much concerned about—I hope they also and you, Sir, of course—is the fact that even after that discussion, this so-called anti-reservationist agitation or anti-Harijan attacks have spread to the adjacent State of Rajasthan. It is not only in Jaipur. Many things have happened in Khetri also, where the copper project is situated. There also, Harijans are humiliated and tortured, and atrocities are committed. So, I would suggest to you humbly that before this is allowed to spread to other States roundabout Gujarat, I thought he would have made some statement about it, because Government should try to prevent it from spreading. But nothing has been done. I would suggest humbly to you that if the Government is going to sit quiet on this matter, and these events go on happening every day, the Members naturally get agitated, then you must find time for this matter to be debated again.

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I said. Mr. Gupta, if somebody would listen to me. I said: "Give me another motion." Then I can do something.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That we can give you. (Interruptions) There is total unconcern on that side.....(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं यही तो कह रहा हूँ। पासवान जी, मैं आप से यही बिनती कर रहा हूँ कि आप क्लक 58 का 5 पढ़िए, फिर मेरे पास आइए।

श्री राम विश्वास दासदान (झारखपुर): सरकार चिन्तित है या नहीं? अगर सरकार चिन्तित है.....

.. (अध्यक्ष) ..

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसा करने से कोई फायदा नहीं है।

.. (अध्यक्ष) ..

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM (Sasaram): Sir, you have repeatedly said that the question has been discussed for about 5 hours. I am sure you read the newspapers. Has not that spread to Rajasthan? Is not that a new development; and what is the idea of repeating "Five hours' discussion, five hours' discussion"?

MR. SPEAKER: Babu Ji no, no. That is not my point. My point is: let there be a discussion. I am not barring any discussion. That is why I have said.....

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: I know you are occupying the Chair, and I have to submit to you.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. I don't want submission, Sir.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: But this is a matter of commonsense, Mr. Speaker. A new situation...

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, I am lacking in that.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: And you have said.....(Interruptions) It is an important development in the country and a *suo motu* statement..... (Interruptions) Now, is this the way of the Government? I want the Government through you, Sir.....(Interruptions) I want to appeal through you to the Government... (Interruptions) that on such an important item, there should be a *suo motu* statement from the Government. (Interruptions)

श्री राम बिलास पालवान : प्राय
सरकार को कहिए ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सरकार सामने
बैठे है, बहरो तो नहीं है।

श्री राम बिलास पालवान : आप
कहते हैं, सरकार गुनती नहीं है।
आप सरकार को कहिए कि वह स्टेटमेंट
दे।

... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: If only
the Home Minister stands up and gives
an assurance in the House, that would
ensure... (Interruptions) If the Home
Minister takes that step.... (Interrup-
tions) Let the Home Minister share
our anxiety.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You can discuss it
again. What is holding us?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That he
can get up and say.... (Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: I
want to make a submission. I want
to bring to your notice that everybody
in the House knows that we have dis-
cussed this now once. But now the
trouble is escalating.

MR. SPEAKER: You can discuss it
again.

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: What
I want to bring to your notice is, if
there is a railway accident, even with-
out anybody demanding that there
should be a statement, there has been
a convention that a *suo motu* statement
is always made by the Minister con-
cerned.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Who says we
would not have done it?

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: Sir,
kindly restrain the Minister. With
your permission, I am on my legs.
Therefore my humble request is, that
you please give a direction to the
Minister to come and make a *suo motu*
statement. Babuji has rightly said that
it is a new situation that has develop-

ed. If you direct him, I think the
situation can be stalled.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not barred
a discussion. We can do it again, I
have said it. What is there about it?

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: You
can direct him to make a *suo motu*
statement.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not in my
discretion. Why don't you have a
Calling Attention?

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: This
is a specific suggestion we are making.
.... (Interruptions)

श्री राजनाथ सोनकर शास्त्री (संदपुर):
ये बड़ी देर से समय मांग रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने नहीं देने
दिया।

... (व्यवधान) ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : न अब समय देने
दे रहे हैं और न तब देने दिया।

... (व्यवधान) ...

एक माननीय सदस्य : इस तरह
से हाउस नहीं चलने देंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मत चलने
दीजिए।

How does that help me?

... (व्यवधान) ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं सुनना चाहता
हूँ लेकिन कोई सुनने तो दे।

... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI N. KUDANTHAI RAMALIN-
GAM (Mayuram): Mr. Speaker, I am
standing for the past one hour.
(Interruptions)

SHRI N. KUDANTHAI RAMA-LINGAM: Mr. Spaker, Sir, please allow me. The rule is very clear. Please see rule 378.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी (हिसार) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप हमारे बात सुनिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय आप का व्यवस्था का पत्र है क्या ?

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी मैं आप के सामने एक बात रखना चाहता हूँ । यह जो सदन है, यह सारे राष्ट्र का सब से उच्चतम सदन है और इस का सब से ज्यादा शक्ति है और यह बहुत शक्तिशाली है । . . (व्यवधान) ।

SHRI N. KUDANTHAI RAMA-LINGAM: I have one submission. Please listen to me.

अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं आप को भी एलाऊ करूंगा ।

.. (व्यवधान) ..

श्री (कृष्ण चन्द्र पांडे) : (खलीलाबाद) . आप ने वित्त मंत्री जी को बुलाया है, ये कैसे बोल रहे हैं । . . . (व्यवधान)

....

SHRI N. KUDANTHAI RAMA-LINGAM: I have one submission. Please listen to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Under what rule?

SHRI N. KUDANTHAI RAMA-LINGAM: The rules are very clear. A limited number of members are continuously obstructing the business of the House. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu got up earlier. . . (Interruptions) They are always going on shouting and shouting. The rule is very clear. Rule 378. . .

MR. SPEAKER: I know the rules.

SHRI N. KUDANTHAI RAMA-LINGAM: You have the powers; you are armed with powers. That rule says "if he deems it necessary, name a member who disregards the authority of the Chair". You can ask such a member to withdraw from the House or he could be expelled.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bagri, do you seek the permission of the Chair?
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He has sought my permission.
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He has sought my permission.
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He has sought my permission. I have given the permission. Now please sit down. He has sought my permission now.
(Interruptions)

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष जी, (व्यवधान) ।

MR. SPEAKER: I have given my permission.
(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप सब बैठिए, मनोराम जी आप भी बैठिए । देखिए, मेरी बात सुनिए, मेरी बात सुनिए । (व्यवधान) यह एसी समस्या है कि मेरे ख्याल से जितने थोड़ी-सी भी सज्जनता होगी, लेजिस्लेशन भी देश प्रेम होगा, कामनसंस है, वे सारे आदमी इस बात से विचित्र हैं. इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती । मैंने पहले भी कहा था, आज भी वह रहा है । मेरे ख्याल से जितने भी सज्जन यहां बैठे हैं, प्लीज सिट डाउन ।

श्री मनोराम बाबू : ये हलिंग पार्टी के लोग ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरे लिए तो हलिंग पार्टी और आप दोनों बराबर हैं और यही समझ कर के मैं चल रहा हूँ। मैं इसमें डिस्क्रिमिनेशन नहीं करना चाहता हूँ।

I have got only one duty in this House to carry out to the best of my ability, whatever is enshrined in these rules. I am also very much perturbed about what events are taking place. Babuji also referred to, why are you referring to that. I only referred to that. I had allowed a discussion of 5 hours.

That does not mean that we cannot have another discussion.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: Gujarat.

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I am saying, that is what I am coming to. There are other motions pending before me. I had not barred them. I am going to have another discussion. Why do you do like this?

मैं आपकी बात को भी, मनोराम जी, समझता हूँ। अगर ऐसा हो जाएगा तो देश की पीढ़ियों पर सब से ज्यादा कुठाराघात यही होगा। इसको हम सब को मिल कर करना है। (व्यवधान) मेरी बात सुनिए। सरकार यहाँ बैठी है, आपकी बात को भुन रही है। इधर मेरे अख्तियारत हैं कि कोई भी मोशन मैं रूल के अधीन, यानून के अधीन एडमिट कर सकता हूँ। मुझे किसी ने बांधा नहीं है। आप सारे मिल कर अगर इस तरह से चिल्लाइयेगा, इस तरह से करते रहियेगा तो न तो एजीटेशन को रोकने में कोई मदद होगी, न हाउस चलाने में मदद होगी। फिर आप बताइए क्या करें? (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइए। मैं खड़ा हूँ, आप बैठ जाइए। आपको थोड़ा-बहुत भी ध्यान नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप इतने उतावले या उत्तेजित हो जाते हैं।

(व्यवधान)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, मेरी बात तो सुनिए।

(व्यवधान)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कभी आग से आग बुझी है? कभी आग से आग बुझती देखी है आपने? कभी आग से बुझाई है?

(व्यवधान)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई लैंडर है, कोई आदर्मी है इस हाउस में जो इनको समझा सके?

(व्यवधान)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : देखिए, अगर आपके उतावलेपन से कुछ हो सकता है तो आप और कुछ कर लीजिए, उत्तेजना से कुछ नहीं होगा। उत्तेजना को शांत करके ही कुछ करना पड़ेगा। आप चाहते क्या हैं? मैं तो कह रहा हूँ।

(व्यवधान)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं तो कह रहा हूँ। आप क्या चाहते हैं? जब मैं कह रहा हूँ कि डिस्क्रिशन देंगे तब मेरी समझ में बात नहीं आती।

(व्यवधान)**

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बाहर लोग क्या कहेंगे, आप यह नहीं समझ रहे हैं। आपको इतना भी ध्यान नहीं है कि मैं खड़ा हूँ और आप भी खड़े हैं।

(व्यवधान) **

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइए। इस पर डिस्कशन मैं करवा दूंगा। हां जो आप कहिए क्या कहना चाहते हैं।

(व्यवधान) **

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने मनीराम जी को अलाऊ किया है।

I have allowed Mr. Mani Bagri. What others are saying should not go on record.

(व्यवधान) **

MR. SPEAKER: Why can't you have some sense? Nothing is going on record. You are speaking without my permission.

(Interruptions) **

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप प्रजातंत्र-प्रणाली का गला घोटने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं; प्लीज सिट डाउन।

(व्यवधान)

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पक्ष-विपक्ष की बात नहीं करता। आप कम दोषी हैं या हम ज्यादा दोषी हैं, इस बारे में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन कम से कम इतनी ताकत हम में नहीं है कि हम देश में शांति स्थापित कर सकें। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक सवाल करना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब से शक्तिशाली संगठन है, लोक सभा देश का सबसे शक्तिशाली संगठन है। अगर इस लोक सभा के पास कोई इलाज देश में शांति स्थापित करने का नहीं है या लोक सभा उसका इलाज नहीं कर सकती है तो लोक सभा चल नहीं सकती।

(व्यवधान)

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी (हिसार) : लोक सभा इसलिए है कि हमारे देश में जनतंत्र है। जनतंत्र इसलिए है कि लोक सभा के माध्यम से आपके माध्यम से सारे देश की समस्याओं का हल निकाला जा सके। इससे लम्बी चीड़ी किसी की प्रतिष्ठा नहीं बढ़ रही है। प्रतिष्ठा या अपमान का सवाल नहीं है। अगर अपमान की ही बात है तो इससे बड़ा और कोई अपमान हो नहीं सकता है कि गांधी के प्रदेश में, जिन्होंने नोवाखली तक में जा कर शान्ति स्थापित करने की कोशिश की थी, कल्लेग्राम हो रहा है। यह हम सब के लिए शर्म की बात है। एक प्लान है, एक बहुत बड़ा षड्यंत्र है और वह यह है कि होली के बाद सारे देश में इस आन्दोलन को चलाया जाएगा। मैं सरकार को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ। होली के बाद सारे देश में

(व्यवधान) **

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever he has said or they are saying will not go on record as they are speaking without my permission.

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी : हम सबको सोचना होगा, ज्ञानी जी आपको सोचना होगा। अगर ऐसा होता है तो इसमें कोई नहीं बचेगा।

आपके माध्यम से, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि सदन का काम रुका है और भले ही सदन का रुके लेकिन राष्ट्र की, गुजरात, राजस्थान लखनऊ आदि की जो समस्या हैं, जो जातीयता का विष फैल रहा है, इस पर हम सब लोग इकट्ठे बैठकर कोई इपका हल निकालें। सारी पार्लियामेंट लोक सभा प्रस्ताव पास करे। मेरी पार्टी का कोई मैनबर जिम्मेवार है तो मुझे बताएं और हम उसको अपनी पार्टी से निकालें, उधर का कोई हो तो वे निकालें। बैठकर हम इसका हल निकालें। मजाक से काम

बलने वाला नहीं है। इस तरीके से बात बलने वाली नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक बात है।

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ज्ञानी जी की खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि समय की कीमत को समझे। एक घंटा जो समय गया है इसको हम ने खोया नहीं है, गंवाया नहीं है। यही हमारा काम है। आम लोगों की बात यहाँ पर चली है। कायदे कानून एक तरफ रह गए हैं और मजबूर हो कर हम को ऐसा करना पड़ा है। लोगों के खून और गांधी की आत्मा को अभिव्यक्ति मिली है। राज नारायण जी वहाँ गए हैं आमरण अनशन करने के लिए। उनका जिन्दगी की रक्षा हो।

MR. SPEAKER: We shall discuss this thing in a very proper manner.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am on a point of order regarding arrangement of today's business. As I see it, it violates Direction 2.

MR. SPEAKER: But there it is mentioned 'unless the Speaker otherwise directs'. We announced it in the House yesterday. Well, that is my discretion.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am pointing out that it was not quite proper.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब अगर अब भी समझ में नहीं आई तो किसको बुलाऊँ समझाने के लिए। आप तीनों नहीं समझ सकते तो मैं क्या समझाऊँ। मैंने कह दिया हम इस बात को डिस्कस करेंगे।

श्री राजनाथ सोलंकर शास्त्री : कब डिस्कस करेंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हे भगवान ! ...

You cannot do like this. Please sit down. When I say a thing; I mean the thing.

यह तरीके की बात नहीं है। आप बैठिये राजनाथ जी। मैं आपको बता दूँगा, आप मेरे पास आ जाइये। आप मुझे मजबूर न कीजिये मैंने बहुत सुना है, सारा कुछ सुना है और मैं आपकी हर बात को सुनता रहा।

Now, Mr. Venkataraman.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I am grateful to this House. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing of what is said without my permission should go on record. (Interruptions)

[Shri Mani Ram Bagri and some other Members then left the House] (Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Why do you do it now? Can I give you an assurance on behalf of (Interruptions). Can I give one assurance that I am going to see that this House takes care of it? Nothing is to be recorded without my permission.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: आपके कहने से कोई फायदा नहीं because there is not a single word that is going on record. It is not going to be reported outside. (Interruptions)**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND ELECTRONICS (SHRI C. P. N. SINGH): Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I draw your attention? After all, in this House for one hour Mr. Bagri kept standing and you, as the Speaker, gave him permission because he did not ask permission under the Rules of Procedure, but in defiance of this Chair. Is this going to be permitted this waste of money of the people?

MR. SPEAKER: I did not allow him. When he asked my permission, then I allowed. That is on the record.

SHRI C. P. N. SINGH: Mr. Bagri has been standing for at least an hour....

MR. SPEAKER: He might have been standing, I did not allow, not a single word was recorded.

SHRI C. P. N. SINGH: But he was given permission. Similarly after that, if Members are going to keep talking, defying the Chair, are you going to conduct the House under certain procedures and rules or is this going to be permitted? That is all. I want a clarification from you....

... (ब्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आपकी तरह से सारे कहने लग गए, सारे अधिकार का इस्तेमाल करने लगे 544 मेम्बर जो यहाँ बैठ हुए हैं तो कौन किस को रोकेगा, कैसे हाउस चलेगा ?

(ब्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप अपनी बात कहें या नहीं कहें या क्या करें, अगर आपकी तरह से सारे कहने लगे, आपकी तरह से सारे अपने अधिकार का इस्तेमाल करने लगे, 544 मेम्बर यहाँ बैठे हैं, तो कौन रोकेगा, किस को रोकेगा, कैसे हाउस चलेगा ?

(ब्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : फिर मेरी क्या जरूरत है ?

Should I leave? (Interruptions)

This is irresponsible, I say. (Interruptions) This has been discussed and I have given an assurance. (Interruptions) Is there any party or member here? There should be some party. (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): I shall begin again. I am grateful to the House for the very valuable contributions they made to the discussion. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I have been going through all this. He has not even said 'thanks' (Interruptions)

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN to the Budget of 1981-82... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sixtysix Members have participated in the discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Sixtysix?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Very good.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: And I think it is a record. I am really grateful to the Members for having taken all the trouble to go through the Budget papers and made very valuable suggestions in the course of the debate. My tasks of replying to the debate has been rendered easier by the contribution which the stalwarts of my party made particularly Prof. N. G. Ranga, Shri K. Brahmananda Reddy, Sukhadiaji and others. I am also strengthened a great deal by the spirited defence of the Budget coming from younger Members like Shri Kamal Nath, Shri Mukhopadhyay, Shri Mahajan, Shri Arskal, the irrepressible orator Shri Lakshappa, Shri Patel, Shri Girdhari Lal Vyas, Shri Namgyal and a host of others, whom I cannot continue to read. I should also make a special mention of the invaluable contribution made and the solid support given to me by the lady Members of the House particularly Dr. Rajendra Kumari Bajpai, Prof. Nirmala Kumari Shaktawat, Shrimati Usha Verma. In fact they reinforced the house wives support to the Budget.

My colleague Shri Magabhai Barot is a minister of great talents and great promise. In fact he called on the Opposition to join in the common task of pulling this mythical and mystical car of Jagannath. I do not know whether all of them are going to join me in this task, but I must acknowledge that he has lent his hefty arms to my fair ones to stimulate and active the Department traditionally known as immobile, the Ministry of Finance. I am reserving my comments on the members of the Opposition when I deal with their points, one by one.

I may dispose of one or two matters which are not very relevant to the Budget debate before I proceed to discuss the actual issues before the country. There was a spirited debate as to whether the Janata, Lok Dal Party did better or the Congress during their respective terms of office.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): There was never a joint Government of the Janata Party and the Lok Dal Party.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I stand corrected because I never had been able to unveil the mysterious relationship between these two parties.

MR. SPEAKER: Professor is only against forced marriages.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I thought, this debate was irrelevant because this debate has been settled once and for all by the sovereign people of India who have to decide and they have decided in 1980, after having seen the performance of both these Governments, that it is the Congress—I that should be entrusted with the responsibility of administration in the country. When Shri Ram Jethmalani continued to argue with some force that his Government or the Government of his party had done better than the Congress, he reminded me of a lawyer who after losing his case in the court, shouts with the client the greatness and importance as well as the justice of courts.

I may also tell a small incident just for relieving the tension through which the House has gone. I had the privilege of practising in the High Court of Madras at a time when there were stalwarts and giants like Sir Aladi, Sir S. Vardachariar and others. One lawyer who thought that he had a cast iron case and was so convinced, he strenuously argued even after the judge went on shaking his head. Ultimately, the judge, without calling the other side, dismissed the appeal. The lawyer was naturally perturbed. In despair, he asked, 'Lord, what shall I tell my

client? The judge coolly said, 'Tell him that the judge was a fool and, tell him, there is an appellate court.'

There will be an appellate court in 1985 which we will all face.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Bombay North West): I am glad for that assurance.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I would have made a little joke about my hon. friend, Shri Biju Patnaik. But in his absence, it may be misunderstood. Therefore, I do not want to make it.

The debate on the Budget falls into two parts, one relating to the taxation proposals, the imposition of taxes as well as the reliefs given and the other relating to the state of economy and the economic strategy of this Government. So far as the first part relating to the tax proposals is concerned, I presume I would be justified in saying that there has not been any bitter criticism either here or outside. Nobody has suggested that there has been a heavy dose of taxation nor has anyone suggested that it has adversely affected any particular section of the community. On the contrary, the reception has been uniformly welcome and every section of society felt that it has received some relief or other. Therefore, I shall not spend more time on the taxation proposals and the reliefs given in the Budget. I shall, therefore, proceed to deal with the points which relate to the state of economy about which there has been a considerable amount of very thoughtful and very valid criticism. It is my duty to explain the various aspects and I shall endeavour to do so in my own humble way.

The first criticism emanated from my old and esteemed friend Mr. Ravindra Varma. He paid me a very handsome compliment which I thought was more appropriate to a lady than to a man. He said that I have some-

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

what misled the House by taking 1979 figures for comparison which were certainly favourable to me and omitting the 1978 figures which were not so favourable. In fact, he described me as a doctor and said that I had administered anaesthesia on the people and I have performed a major operation without their knowledge. May I carry the analogy a little further? The patient that was delivered to me was the 1979 patient with a delirium of 22 per cent spiral in prices and Rs. 2,700 crore deficit and also an infrastructure which was admittedly very poor and below even the average. I was not given the 1978 patient. Actually, what was delivered to me was a person in delirium in 1979. But, Mr. Ravindra Varma says in 1978 he was hale and hearty. In 1978, he was a gladiator who could fight you in the arena and why do you compare him to 1979 and why do you take only the 1979 figures? I had to treat the economy as it came into my hands and he himself has admitted that the economy in 1979 when it came to me was in such a delirious condition. He may have derived satisfaction *inter se* between himself and his colleagues sitting on the opposite side but the patient whom he delivered to the party to those people in 1979 was a better healthy patient but in 1979 he (Interruptions).

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: You kidnapped the patient.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I have to deal with an economy which has become really a very poor one, which had all the weaknesses, which had no power, which had no coal, in the sense that it does not have enough diesel and transport, which was in a bad shape and added to that all these things. Therefore, my submission is that, in taking the 1979 figures, I have not done anything which is wrong or which anybody could cavil at. (Interruptions).

Mr. Ravindra Varma also mentioned that I had told the House that, if I exceeded the deficit of the previous

Government or exceeded the inflation of the previous Government, I would resign, and he thought that the occasion had arisen for me to resign.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: You are the best man they have, you should not resign; that is what I said.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: You said that, I know. That is why I was speaking very cautiously. I said, you thought that the occasion had arisen for me to resign...

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: That is up to the conscience, ultimately..

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I am now going to say that it is not so. What I stated was, apart from its factual error, "I am following a different philosophy from the one which the classical economists always advocate in times of inflation" and I added, "If that philosophy fails, then I will go". I did not say anything about deficit, I did not say anything about inflation.

But, at the same time, I want to show that you are wrong even on facts. The deficit of 1979 was Rs. 2,700 crores, and I told this House that I would endeavour my utmost to see that this great record set by the Opposition was preserved for eternity and eternity. And, in spite of the fact that, in the year 1980-81, I gave a larger allocation to the States for their Plan, I met an additional Defence need and met also an additional requirement in respect of drought in the States, I have been able to manage to keep the deficit around Rs. 1,975 crores. Therefore, factually, you are incorrect.

13.29 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Secondly, take the inflation also. You must compare only likes, you cannot compare non-comparables. Now, let us take this period from 13th January, as weekly figures are published in the wholesale price index: on 13th January, 1979, the index of wholesale prices was 186; on the 16th January, 1980, it was 231.7. If you calculate, the rate of increase was

24.6 per cent. We assumed office on the 14th January, 1980. From the 16th January 1980 to 14th January 1981, the index figures rose from 231.7 to 267.7 which is 15.5 per cent.

Some of you take the figures from different periods and then try to compare. I am willing for any comparison during the period when you were in office. You should not combine the period when you were in office and we were in office. From January 1980 till March 1981 we have been in office. You should compare any period in the year 1979 when the Opposition were in office with the same period in which this government has been in office. I can tell you and I can assure you that the rate of inflation is lower than what it was in 1979. Therefore, even on this I submit my esteemed friend who has a very facile and fluent expression, has been factually wrong.

Having disposed of this question of inflation, I shall now deal with another point which has been repeated by a large number of Members, namely, that the hike in the prices of administered commodities amounts to taxation. This is a new concept in economics which I have learnt for the first time. The rise in the prices of administered commodities is a tax? If Tatas increases the price of steel, it is not a tax but if SAIL increases, it is a tax. It is an argument which is often put forward by the opponents of the public sector...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): If SAIL loses money, who pays? It comes from the Consolidated Fund. If the Tatas loses, the money does not come from the Consolidated Fund of India...

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: So it is a tax?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It is a tax.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Yes, I said I am learning economics from you...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No, it is a burden on the consumer.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: You said that it is a tax... (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Substantially they are correct.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: You are not a Judge. You are only a lawyer. I cannot take any judgment from you, You may be putting forward your case effectively.

Sir, in 1950 I came to this House and my esteemed friend, Mr. Bhagat also came to this House. At the same time we were both together. We were supposed to be students of economics at that time and supposed to have made very powerful contribution for the public sector in our Indian economy because at that time even to mention public sector was considered to be a blasphemy. Now it is certainly an argument which is used by others saying that it is a tax and it is another way of doing it. If you carry this argument further, it will lead to *reductio ad absurdum*—that public sector must produce and sell free; otherwise they are levying a tax. This would be the final analysis...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We have never said that.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: In fact I am reducing it to an absurdity. That is what I said. I am reducing your argument to absurdity... (Interruptions) Now, theoretically; it is possible that where the State has complete monopoly of production and where the State, by its deliberate policy, loads the price of the commodity higher than the cost of production for the purpose of generating resources for the State; it could be a tax and that is what is done in some of the socialist countries. (Interruptions). Even there I will tell you that:

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

it is not so. In the present context, in petroleum, we are subsidising, in naphtha, we are subsidising and in fertilisers we are subsidising. In coal we are losing. We are losing in every in every one of the things. (*Interruptions*). When we are selling at a loss, we are not taxing; we are subsidising the sales. Therefore, I want to make it clear that by raising the prices of these administered commodities, Government have not resorted to tax. I ask you to look into my budget papers and see whether any credit is taken for amounts from these items as surplus emanating from it for the general budget. I want you therefore to consider whether the criticism is appropriate or proper. I am now told you that it was not meant as a tax but it was meant as a burden. Here also I want to meet the point. Sir, it is an elementary principle that the consumer or the user must pay the reasonable cost of the goods and the services. If the consumer or the user does not pay for it, then it has got to be met by somebody else. In this case, if it is a public sector, it will have to be met by the State and the State has to meet it only by levying taxes which is very often by taxes on commodities. Is it right or is it proper that a person who uses the railway travel should be subsidised by a person who consumes these articles and who never sees a railway station at all and who lives in the village? Is it proper that a man who uses steel for construction should subsidise the steel of those who use it for building mansions and factories? Should not the man who uses these commodities pay the cost of the goods which he uses? Is it fair, I ask you? Everybody says now you must reduce the cost; you must reduce this. But, if you reduce it, what is the consequence? The consequence of reduction of the prices below its cost of production is a burden. After all, a State does not get money from anywhere. It collects it from the poor people and mostly gets it by way of excise duties and customs duties; the

excise being the largest duty is paid in a very large measure by the poorer sections of the society, therefore, I say, even there, it also the criticism is not valid. This is my view and this is the view of this Government that the users of all these commodities will have to pay fair price for the commodities and services which they use and any attempt to give them the benefit by lowering the prices will be at the cost of the poor persons who may not be using these commodities and services.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is why...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No running commentary, Mr. Bosu. You must take my permission and then speak. It is not proper, Fiftysix hon. Members have already spoken and participated in this discussion. Should he not reply? You must help him. You are a very senior Member.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: My friend, Shri Bhagat also stated that our steel prices had increased by 60 to 70 per cent. I do not know if it is correct.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Sitamarhi): I said that in certain items.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Actually in the administered prices, it is only 20 per cent. There are certain articles which are not controlled and, in the articles, which are not controlled, they are governed by market forces.

So, Shri Bhagat has tried to give the figures in respect of those caused by the increase in administered prices. I want to correct that. The administered prices have increased only by 20 per cent but those governed by market prices have increased because they are not controlled.

The next point which I would like to deal with is the budget deficit. This is a matter which everybody has dealt with. As I have already pointed out, Sir, the budget deficit of 1980-81

has been pegged at 1,975 and when I actually move the Finance Bill I would have the figures upto March and I will be able to give you even helpfully a smaller figure than 1,975. Here I would like to reiterate the philosophy which underlies the Budget. Shri Bhagat was right in saying that in conditions of inflation you must have a rather hard and harsh budget than a soft one and that I have opted for the soft one which is not good. This is the view of the classical economist and last year itself all the people who were advising me said that at a time when the inflation is very high you cannot give up surcharge of 10 per cent on Income Tax and you cannot raise the exemption limit to 12,000. You cannot give these various concessions and so on.

It is in that context that I said inflation can be handled from two angles. One is the demand management and the other is the supply management. I am opting for supply management in which goods and services will be produced in larger quantities so as to absorb the liquidity which is in the country. And, as I said, therefore, I have taken the risk. It is in that context I said that if my philosophy fails I will have to go.

Now, the results of last year have not been completely satisfactory but they show a trend that if I persist with the same philosophy it might succeed. If I had not raised the exemption limit to 12,000 last year I could not have raised it to 15,000 this year because a single jump from 8,000 to 15,000 would have meant a greater step. Similarly, if I had not given up the surcharge of 10 per cent on Income Tax last year I would not have given 5 per cent rebate in the Corporate Tax this year. This is a package which I have in the mind of trying to encourage. I will come to Shri Indrajit Gupta later because we differ fundamentally on this issue. This is the package which I want to put forward in which the supply management will get a priority and

it will see to it that the supply of goods and services are so generated that it absorb the liquidity in the economy. Here, Sir, I would like to say that the results have not been satisfactory. I will give the figure in the course of my speech.

Here I am also happy that two of my colleagues belonging to my Party—Shri Kamal Nath and Prof. Ranga—have supported this approach in the Budget. Prof. Ranga, many of you may not know is one of the earliest students of Economics in our country. He took his M.A. degree from Oxford and when I was a student I used to hear his delectable Oxford accent when he used to speak in colleges and particularly in Madras College. He has a background and he comes from a discipline which is his, namely, Economics and, therefore, his views are entitled to carry weight. I think it is an appropriate occasion when I can deal with the points raised. What are the ways in which I am going to deal with inflation? The credit policy will be so adjusted that while every facility will be allowed for production, credit will be restricted for hoarding, blackmarketing and cornering of goods. The rates for the commercial transactions will be higher and will be limited while the rates of interest for productive purposes will be lower and liberal. There is, as I said, a large liquidity in the economy and I have to absorb that. In order to absorb that liquidity I have come forward to issue the Bearer Bonds. There is no other way of absorbing the liquidity. Even if you demonetise the liquidity will not be absorbed. Our experience, as you know, in the last demonetisation of one thousand rupee notes is this. Out of Rs. 150 crores worth of notes of thousand rupees and above, nearly 130 crores worth of notes were surrendered and were cashed. The only amount which did not surface was 20 crores. Therefore, even that has not yielded very great results. In our Indian culture there are four ways of winning the enemy:

सम, दाम, भेद, दण्ड ।

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

We are trying the second. That means, if it does not succeed, the third and the fourth are in reserve.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): Is it in permanent reserve?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: If you want it.

Connected with this is a point made by Mr. Bhagat that public sectors have run into a loss of 74 crores and how on earth did you take credit for 2300 crores in the Plan. Well, I want to clarify that there is a Company law governing the declaration of profits for declaration of dividends. Even though public corporations, they are corporations governed by the Company Law. Applying the Company Law provisions the 'after-tax' position is a loss of Rs. 74 crores. But they also generate resources, that is, by way of depreciation and retained profits. Not all public sector is running at a loss; some of them are running at a profit; some of them are running at a loss.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Which one?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I am surprised that the Chairman of the Public Undertakings Committee is so ignorant of it. I am surprised myself.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What is the quantum?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Put a Short Notice Question. I will answer. If he sends me a Short Notice Question, I will accept it.

श्री आनन्द गोपाल मुखोपाध्याय
(आसनसोल) : तावत् शोभते मुख्ये,
शाकत दिञ्चित् नवाषत :

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I want to nail your mistake and that is why I do accept, Mr. Deputy-Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The main point is, if hon. Jyotirmoy Bosu does not go to a public undertaking very often it will be in profit!

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, that is an insinuation!

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, the retained profits and the depreciation together last year were, in spite of the loss, about 1500 crores. This year we estimated that these resources will be 2300 crores and therefore this will be available for reinvestment within their own industry, within their own establishment, for expansion, renewal, replacement etc. Therefore, it is a source. These two are different concepts. That is why I wanted to clarify the position that in spite of the fact that there is a loss of Rs. 74 crores...

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Is it as a result of price mechanism or the rising of prices that you will raise this amount of Rs. 2300 crores? I did not say tax. That is a new way of budgetary resources, that is, by way of non-tax revenue.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: This is not the budgetary resource. It is an internal resource for the public sector undertakings. I hope you understand the difference between the two. If I get Rs. 10 to my budget, then it is a budgetary resource. If it is an internal resource for the public sector undertaking, I say it is the internal resource for the public sector undertaking.

There are some criticisms that the non-development expenditure is very high. It was pointed out that the non-plan expenditure in 1981-82 would be Rs. 15,100 crores as against Rs. 13051 crores in 1980-81. I will give the break-up and you will see that the administrative expenditure is almost negligible. The difference between the two is Rs. 2049 crores. Out of this Defence accounts for Rs. 600 crores. I think everybody will agree that in the present context the Defence expenditure is unavoidable. Then we are giving subsidies in respect of food fertiliser etc. I am going to deal with it later on. Nobody will cavil at the food and fertiliser because the mainstay of our economy is agriculture and we have to sustain the population. It is Rs. 426 crores.

Then the interest on charges goes up to Rs. 536 crores. The non-plan assistance to the State goes up to Rs. 101 crores making a total of Rs. 16.53 crores. So, the net increase in respect of other items is Rs. 396 crores. It gives an impression as if Rs. 2000 crores of additional expenditure is being incurred in the non-plan. Actually the amount is only Rs. 396 crores and I am sure the Members would not say that the non-plan expenditure has been not out of proportion. And even in non-plan I want to correct an impression that may prevail, that is, the expenditure of the previous plan becomes the non-plan expenditure of the present plan. Likewise, the expenditure of the present plan will become the non-plan expenditure of the next plan and those who have dealt with this in the respective Ministries know this. Therefore, not all non-plan expenditure is again administrative or wasteful expenditure or avoidable expenditure.

My esteemed friend, Mr. Biju Patnaik has said that we have not done one thing for the rural poor. Sir, I accept his statement. I have not done one thing, but I have done multitudes of things for the poor. The national rural employment programme is there in which the programme has been split between the State and the Centre, the Centre contributing Rs. 180 crores and the State contributing Rs. 180 crores. The integrated rural development programme again in its Rs. 198 crores from the Centre will be matched by the State. Then there is the Special Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes programme of Rs. 110 crores. Then there is the rural water supply scheme for 35,000 villages to be supplied with water, drinking water, in the current year of Rs. 110 crores. Among many others are all programmes for the benefit of the rural poor. That is why I have said that I have not done one thing, I have done multitude of things for the rural poor.

I will now go to the question of subsidies. Some Members said that we

must reduce the subsidies and most of them said that. But I think, they did not understand the implication of their own statement. The subsidy on food is Rs. 650 crores and if I completely eliminate it, I will have to raise the price of wheat by about 74 paise per kilogram and of rice by 64 paise per kilogram. I do not think, anybody in this House will support me if I came forward with this proposition in my budget.

AN HON MEMBER: Never, only Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu will support.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have seen the inside of many things.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: What I said was: subsidies should not be used to provide immunity for managerial inefficiency."

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: But, this is what the other Members had said. Shri Ravindra Verma did not say that it should be reduced, but what he said was that there should be no subsidy on account of the inefficient management. But most other Members who spoke said that I must reduce the subsidy. Even Shri Bhagat was saying that I must reduce the subsidy.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I said that there was lack of coordination between the thinking of the Finance Minister and the Sixth Plan. The Sixth Plan provides for a reduction of subsidy of Rs. 200 crores in food, fertilisers and exports, while the Finance Minister talks of increasing subsidies as a whole. That is the point I made. I am in favour of keeping subsidies on food.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: And on exports also.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I am glad for the clarification. When the Finance Minister is faced with the problem of inflation and rising prices and he is faced with the problem of a large section of people living below the poverty line, would he care to go by what is said in the planning document, or would he care to go by what

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

is needed by the poor people of the country?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): This is a reflection on the plan.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: What the Planning Commission says is a principle. The principle has got to be applied in relation to the circumstances. You cannot blindly by the rule of thumb apply the principles in every thing. Then, somebody else might say that you could have a computer in that case.

It was after a due consideration of the pros and cons that we decided to keep up the subsidy and we have retained it at Rs. 650 crores.

The next important subsidy is the fertiliser subsidy. If I remove completely the fertilizer subsidy, the price of urea will go up from Rs. 2000 per tonne to Rs. 2700 per tonne. Will the agriculturists and the Members representing their interests agree to this? Somebody was saying that we charge more for petroleum, this is the answer. The naphtha price is high and we are subsidising the naphtha price and that is why we are selling urea at Rs. 2000 per tonne, while the actual cost of production without subsidy will be Rs. 2700 per tonne.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What about the export subsidy?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I never shirk issues. There are some people who evade issues, but I do not do that.

The third subsidy is the export subsidy, and it is for Rs. 400 crores. It is, in fact, not a subsidy. It is really a drawback of the various taxes and cesses which they have paid and which if it is not given back will make these commodities non-competitive in the international market. After calculating the international prices and then the competitiveness of our product against international prices, this is arrived at. There are some people who say, why do you want to export?

Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu may say this. There are people who say that you need not export at all. Well I do not belong to that philosophy. When they they come to power, they may then practise a philosophy which they preach. Sir, they have a philosophy of their own. I respect them for it. But I am committed to a different philosophy. I have gone to the people with an election manifesto in which my philosophy is a mixed economy for the country. Therefore I must provide certain incentives for the private sector, which, in my opinion, has a role to play in our country, subject, of course to the parameters which we have fixed the MRTP Act, the FERA and others. We have limited their area of activity; we have controlled them and regulated them. We have passed several laws regulating them. But subject to those laws and within the parameters fixed, it is my view and it is the view of my party and it is on the basis of this that we have been returned to power that the private sector has a role to play and must be given adequate facilities for playing its proper role. Once you accept this, then you will find that my party is consistent; if you don't accept it, you will find that my party is totally inconsistent.

14 hrs.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: This is Swatantra Party's philosophy.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: May be. Whatever names you give, we went to the polls with this manifesto. You cannot deny it and the people have endorsed this. Therefore, I have given a number of facilities which will enable the Private Sector to play a role. You may ask me whether the various facilities which we have given have yielded results? I will give you some figures. I assure you Jyotirmoy Bosu that I will get not only Rs. 1,000 crores, but a little more, let the case be decided.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quite a lot will come from foreign countries.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: And there will be a contraction in the

liquidity of the economy and it will go a long way to revive the national economy.

Now, they ask me what facilities did I give them during the last year and what facilities during this year. As against the number of sanctions totalling Rs. 513 crores given by the IDBI for new enterprises in 1979, sanctions in 1980 were of the order of Rs. 626 crores. Similarly, disbursement for 1979 was Rs. 257 and in 1980 it was Rs. 358.

This gives me hope that we are on the right lines and that the industry will pick up.

I will come to the next point about the newsprint. A number of speakers have said that the levy on newsprint is a levy on education, or that it had a sinister or ulterior motive. I honestly want to tell you: I got the idea from this newspapers. I don't want to mention the name. It is not proper. In a supplement of 8 pages—it was a paper with 20 pages that day; 12 pages main, and 8 pages supplement—5½ pages were for advertisements, and in 2½ pages here were some piffles.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay—North East): National Herald.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I wish it were. Rs. 150 crores are being spent on import of newsprint and every year it is going up. I don't think this country can afford it.

AN HON. MEMBER: They can afford it.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: But we cannot afford the foreign exchange. So, it is that we have thought: 'one way of restricting the use of newsprint would be this. If you say it is a tax on education, are 5½ pages the education that we expect our people to get?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Venkatarman, Mr. Indrajit Gupta wants a tax on advertisement.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I know; I am coming to it. A number of States

have written to me; and they have also asked me, during the National Development Council meeting to levy a tax, under Article 269 of the Constitution, on advertisements in newspapers and pass it on to the States. If I had a sinister motive, I would have preferred it, and put the blame on them. But I did not have that motive. Therefore, I want to tell you that this is purely for saving foreign exchange; and if people want to read anything more in it, I have only to say: "A guilty conscience needs no accuser."

I am also flooded with representations about small newspapers. A person who has done so much for the small scale industries, both in the last as well as in the current budget, I will not give up the interests of the small sector. I shall take it into consideration when I present my Finance Bill. The interests of the small papers, I will keep in mind.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Your Information and Broadcasting Minister already indicated that outside the House.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I don't know that. I have not indicated. I only said I would consider. You also used to say the same. When you were the Railway Minister and I came and told you: "I represent the Madras City constituency and all the commuters are saying that you have raised the season ticket fares", you said: "I will consider."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He reduced it to half.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I will also do something like that.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Don't reduce the newspapers to half.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: A number of small matters have been raised. I am very grateful to the House. I must express my sincere thanks for the cordiality and the kindness they have extended to me. And now, I move that it may be taken into consideration.