

## **Roles of Finance Commission and 15th FC**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- 15th FC's terms of reference (ToR) is gaining significance with states' demand for more equity and fairness in resource allocation.

\n

- In this context, it is essential to look into the roles and responsibilities of Finance Commission and the ToR of 15th FC.

\n

\n\n

### **Why is FC's role so significant?**

\n\n

\n

- **Unity** - Article 1 of the Constitution of India recognises India as a Union of States.

\n

- Real fairness and equity in the matter of devolution of powers and resources to the States is essential to preserve this stated unity.

\n

- The foremost objective of the FC is thus an equitable distribution of financial resources between the two units of the Union.

\n

- **Resources** - The fundamental tasks relating to income growth, human development, livelihoods, environment, etc are entrusted to the States.

\n

- At present, the States do not have adequate resources as well as the right to raise such resources to fulfil these tasks.

\n

- FC's role gains significance in equipping states with adequate resources to take up these major tasks of nation-building.

\n

- **Federalism** - The Centre's capacity to mobilise resources is far greater than that of the States.

\n

- But states are required to undertake development expenditures that far

exceed their revenue generating capabilities.

\n

- The Constitution entrusts FC with the responsibility of addressing this anomaly and asymmetry in India's federal system.

\n

- **Recent developments** - The finances of States have received a double blow due to demonetisation, and Goods and Services Tax.

\n

- Post-GST, states have hardly any major tax left with them to make a difference to State resources.

\n

\n\n

### **What are the concerns with 15th FC's ToR?**

\n\n

\n

- **Demographic differences** - From 2001 and 2011 many states have successfully reduced their rate of population growth.

\n

- This does not mean less expenditure for these states.

\n

- These have incurred huge fiscal costs to achieve a lower population growth and healthy demographic indicators.

\n

- They have made substantial investments on education, health and directly on family welfare programmes.

\n

- Moreover it creates new commitments by the States to those in labour force and especially to senior citizens.

\n

- Thus using the population data of 2011 as the base for tax devolution should not reduce the allocation to these States.

\n

- **Caring elderly** - Many States have achieved a replacement rate of growth of population or have gone below that rate in a short span of time.

\n

- An immediate effect of this is a sharp rise in the proportion of elderly population.

\n

- The enhanced costs for states for caring them must be considered by the FC in allocation and in deciding the population criterion.

\n

- **Revenue deficit** - It is specified that the 15th FC may also examine whether

revenue deficit grants be provided at all.

\n

- Revenue deficits are offshoots of the path of development followed by States.  
\n
- It cannot be brought down in the short term.  
\n
- To discontinue post-tax devolution of revenue deficit grants would go against the principle of cooperative federalism.  
\n
- **Approach** - The FC should not take a “residual approach” of distributing what is left over after providing for Centre's requirements.  
\n
- However, the 15th FC's ToR explicitly privilege the “committed expenditures” of the Centre.  
\n
- **Policy domain** - The 15th FC is asked to consider proposing performance-based incentives.  
\n
- This grant is proposed beyond those relating to fiscal responsibility, population and devolution to local bodies.  
\n
- States see this as an attempt to micro-manage their fiscal domain.  
\n
- This is because states have set their own agenda for development.  
\n
- The sectors may include health, education, forest management, public distribution of food, agricultural production, etc.  
\n
- This development resulted not necessarily because of Central incentives.  
\n
- It was rather the effect of the best practices followed by the states depending on their regional needs and demands.  
\n
- Thus, FC proposing “measurable performance-based-incentives” would affect the liberty and flexibility of the states' policy realm.  
\n
- It is not the duty of the FC to venture into the realm of day-to-day governance of the states.  
\n

\n\n

\n

- **Fiscal space** - The 14th FC recommended an increase in devolution to states from 32% to 42%.

\n

- It is argued that the fiscal space available to the Centre had shrunk due to this.  
\n
- However, when implementing this, the Union government cut allocations to several Centrally Sponsored Schemes in 2015-16.  
\n
- The cutback was almost equal to the amount received by the States as a whole on account of the rise in share of taxes and duties.  
\n
- Thus, there is evidently no squeeze of the fiscal space available to the Union government.  
\n
- In fact, the total resources devolved from Union to all States put together has been declining as a share of GDP for some years now.  
\n
- There is thus no ground for reducing the share of States in the vertical devolution.  
\n
- **Diversity** - To recognise India's diversity is also to recognise the States' diverse paths of development.  
\n
- The FC must facilitate diversity and a democratic path of development.  
\n
- Respecting principles of equity and fairness in allocating resources between the Centre and States is essential for this.  
\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

