



International Journal of Financial Management and Economics

P-ISSN: 2617-9210
E-ISSN: 2617-9229
IJFME 2022; 5(1): 89-94
Received: 22-11-2021
Accepted: 25-12-2021

Jyotsna
Associate Professor,
Shyama Prasad Mukherji
College for Women, University
of Delhi, Delhi, India

Public expenditure on schedule caste and schedule tribes (SC- STs) welfare

Jyotsna

Abstract

India has witnessed a relatively higher economic growth rate during last three decades, as compared to the 1980s. Since the persistence of economic and social inequalities the economic growth could not have touched majority of the population. The economic growth is not in the human face. With the growing importance of planning on poverty eradication and upliftment of the socially and economically backward people, a number of plans and schemes are being implemented both by the centre and the states directly and indirectly through various agencies and corporations. In view of the massive expenditure incurred on these schemes it was felt to analyse the trends and patterns of public expenditure on SC-STs welfare major head of social sector expenditure from 1980-2015, to assess their impact on the socio-economic conditions of the beneficiaries belongs to SC-STs group.

Keywords: Social sector, public expenditures, SC-STs welfare

Introduction

SC-STs welfare is one of the major head of social sector expenditure. Social sector is often considered more as welfare providers and not only as economic growth contributor. Despite this in eight plan which target human development as an “ultimate goal,” public expenditure to this sector have been low. The poor expenditure on basic social services implies that their use is constrained to the weaker and vulnerable sections of society. Public spending on basic services improve in last decade but still not satisfactory as a big magnitude of the problem. (GOI, 2010).

“After five decades of planned development, roughly 260 million people of the country are still living below the poverty line” (Planning Commission, GOI). Health, nutrition, education indicators are very peculiar. Mass of the people have no means to afford a reasonable standard of living. In this scenario, the status of social sector development across the states, particularly poor states may not be expected to be of the satisfactory standard norms. The critical determinants of social sector performance are its trends and patterns of expenditures, the developmental gaps and access to the existing basic services across section of the society. There are positive externalities associated with public expenditure on social development. (GOI, 2010). In spite of this, across the states we observe a considerable variation in public spending on social infrastructure, both in terms of composition and the level of spending. Moreover, “public investment in social and physical infrastructure is observed to play a complementary role in crowding in private investment, particularly in the case of developing economies, and it needs to encompass both growth and equity considerations” (Pattnaik *et al.*, 2005; Erden and Holcombe, 2005) [12, 14].

We observe that Social development and removal of poverty have been the major focus points of our planning and development policies since independence. There are number of schemes meant for poor in general, there are specific schemes for rural poor and the socially deprived castes and tribes mainly SC-STs. The concepts of reducing poverty and providing minimum levels of living was first talk about in the pages entitled “perspective of development 1961-1976. Implication of planning for minimum levels of living“. (Planning commission of India, GOI).

It was felt that the growth process had not been able to ‘trickle down’ to the poorest section of the society and there was need to focus on trend and patterns of public expenditure on SC-STs welfare major head.

Corresponding Author:
Jyotsna
Associate Professor,
Shyama Prasad Mukherji
College for Women, University
of Delhi, Delhi, India

The development strategy found expression in the target group oriented programmes and area development programme since 1980's, and this was a powerful tool to tackle poverty problem directly.

The focus on approaches has been shifted over the period of time. Initially it was community, then shifted to targeted group, then employment and finally to the welfare approach. Besides, the many targeted and welfare focus schemes, many states government in India adopted their own poverty alleviation and employment generation schemes particularly for SC-STs group but still the result are unsatisfactory.

The trends and patterns of expenditure show a poor picture of the public expenditure on SC-STs welfare major head of social sector. Market failure on this major head investment reveal that public expenditure play a crucial role for the welfare of marginalised section.

The expenditure on SC-STs welfare, by various department routed through social welfare, has been 47.5% so far. (The Hindu, Jan 31, 2021, Sharath. S. Srivatsa). Hence the present study makes an attempt to analyse the patterns and composition of social sector expenditure, mainly on SC-STs welfare public expenditure across the 17 major states from 1980 to 2015 and assess their impact on the socio-economic conditions of the beneficiaries belongs to SC-STs group.

Methodology and Data Source

For calculating the aggregate social sector expenditure, we follow the procedure adopted by RBI. Therefore, social sector expenditure includes the sum of expenditure on education, art and culture, health, family welfare, water supply and sanitation, housing, urban development, the welfare of SC/ ST welfare, social security welfare, labor and employment, nutrition, others expenditure and expenditure on rural development, food storage and warehousing and loan and advance by states governments for development purpose only, as mentioned in state public finance report (SFR, 2006). Aggregate public expenditure in our case is equal to total development plus total non-development expenditure, plus other expenditure in the form of a grant in aid, discharge of internal debt, and repayment of the loan to the center. Data of Gross Domestic Product both at current and constant prices, the base year being 2004-05, is taken from the RBI's Handbook of Statistic on Indian Economy. Deflator used is of 2004-05 base year. The data source is the Handbook of statistics and State finance report, RBI (various issues).

Trends and patterns of public expenditure on social sector on SC and STs Welfare

Table 1: Total Expenditure on SC and STs Welfare as percent of Net State Domestic Product (NSDP) of across 17 major states in India: 1980 -2015. (5-year average figures in percentage)States/years

	1980-85	1985-90	1990-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	2005-2010	2010-2015
Andhra Pradesh	-	2.30	1.63	1.17	1.28	1.32	1.80
Gujarat	-	0.28	0.38	0.35	0.35	0.30	0.34
Haryana	-	0.15	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.09
Karnataka	-	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.46	0.55	0.86
Kerala	-	0.31	0.26	0.34	0.29	0.29	0.42
Maharashtra	-	0.23	0.24	0.26	0.33	0.50	0.58
Punjab	-	0.16	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.19
Tamil Nadu	--	0.23	0.38	0.39	0.35	0.34	0.33
Rajasthan	-	0.12	0.17	0.14	0.18	0.23	0.24
Madhya Pradesh	-	1.23	1.29	1.33	1.08	0.86	0.77
Odisha	-	0.55	0.60	0.57	0.49	0.53	0.75
Bihar	-	0.27	0.35	0.29	0.16	0.24	0.57
Uttar Pradesh	-	0.31	0.29	0.45	0.45	0.61	0.55
West Bengal	-	0.23	0.19	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	-	1.48	1.24	0.79
Uttarakhand	-	-	-	-	0.26	0.40	0.27
Jharkhand	-	-	-	-	1.94	0.71	0.65
All India	-	0.39	0.39	0.37	0.37	0.41	0.47

Source: State Finance Report: A study of Budget, RBI for different years. *Uttarakhand is special category state. (-)= Not available

Total SC-ST welfare expenditure out of NSDP stagnated from 1985-90 to 2000-05 at all India level. Furthermore, it declined after the economic reforms 1990-2000 in most of the states though it increased in some states such as Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Odisha, Bihar, and Uttar Pradesh. All India level average reached 0.39% out of NSDP in 1985-1990. After 2005-10 it increased and touched 0.47% only in 2010-2015.

In this regard it is note that "the Scheduled Caste Sub Plan (SCSP) and Tribal Sub Plan (TSP), planned in 1979, are among the major schemes initiated by then Union government in the interest of the SC- ST community. However, nothing substantial has been done for the scheme by all previous government till UPA came into the power. In the UPA government a separate budget statement for the allocations assigned for SCs- STs was made public. But,

unfortunately the total extent of plan allocations assigned both for SCs and STs are far below from SCSP and TSP norms) (CBGA, 2009). If we analyse the expenditure pattern in major states, it was less than 1% of NSDP in all major states from 1980-85 to 2010-2015, except Andhra Pradesh. We also observe that LYS were spending higher than HYS and all India average on SC-ST welfare as a proportion of their NSDP.

Mapping the Patterns of SC-STs welfare Expenditure, as a Percentage of Aggregate Public Expenditure (Capital Disbursement +Revenue). Across 17 Major States in India during 1980- 2015 (table 2)

Trends of Aggregate public expenditure (APE) on SC-ST welfare had slowly increased from 1985-90 to 2010-15 in most of the states though it slightly declined during 2000-

2005. (Table 2)

Haryana (0.57% to 0.89%), Odisha (1.85% to 2.48%), Rajasthan (0.76% to 1.08%), Uttar Pradesh (1.94% to 2.41%) had increased during 2000-05 to 2005-10 and in 1995-2000 Madhya Pradesh (5.97%), Tamil Nadu (2.42%) were spending a significant amount on this expenditure head. During 2010-2015 Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Odisha, Bihar, Gujarat improve

their expenditure on SC-STs welfare out of their aggregate public expenditure. All states average almost remain constant around 2% or improve very slowly during the period (1980-85 to 2010-15). During and after the neoliberal reforms the states aggregate public expenditure on SC-ST welfare had remained constant, when health and education, labor welfare had significantly decline. LYS were spending higher than HYS and all-states average, except 2010-2015.

Table 2: Total SC and STs Welfare Expenditure as ratio of Aggregate Public Expenditure of 17 major states in India: 1980 to 2015 (5-year average figures, in percentage).

States/years	1980-85	1985-90	1990-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	2005-2010	2010-2015
Andhra Pradesh	-	6.28	5.18	3.78	3.58	3.59	5.30
Gujarat	-	1.39	2.08	1.99	1.57	1.89	2.10
Haryana	-	0.74	0.62	0.32	0.37	0.58	0.62
Karnataka	-	2.47	2.73	2.91	2.21	2.71	4.15
Kerala	-	1.59	1.44	1.95	1.51	1.66	2.15
Maharashtra	-	1.30	1.54	1.81	1.86	3.43	4.21
Punjab	-	0.83	0.60	0.42	0.23	0.37	1.11
Tamil Nadu	-	1.29	2.02	2.42	1.86	1.92	1.84
Rajasthan	-	0.58	0.83	0.72	0.76	1.08	1.25
Madhya Pradesh	-	5.22	5.79	5.97	4.64	3.50	2.91
Odisha	-	2.73	2.63	2.60	1.85	2.48	3.17
Bihar	-	1.44	1.72	1.47	0.77	0.80	2.08
Uttar Pradesh	-	1.65	1.38	2.31	1.94	2.41	2.13
West Bengal	-	1.50	1.21	0.88	0.71	0.79	0.89
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	-	8.05	5.64	3.31
Uttarakhand	-	-	-	-	1.15	1.59	1.30
Jharkhand	-	-	-	-	3.85	2.72	2.83
All States	-	2.03	2.06	2.10	1.85	2.18	2.55

Source: State Finance Report: A study of Budget, RBI for different years. *Uttarakhand is special category state. (-) = Not available

Patterns and Composition of Social Sector Expenditure Major Heads in Real Per capita expenditure terms from 1980 to 2015, across the 17 major states. (Five years

average figures in rupees, all Tables are in appendix (Table 3) show that it was just 68 rupees per person during 1990s and 173 during 2010- 15.

Table 3: Component wise Patterns and Composition of Social Sectors Expenditure Major Heads in Real Per capita expenditure from 1980-2015. At all states level. (5 year average figures, in rupees)

Major heads / years	1980-85	1985-90	1990-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	2005-2010	2010-2015
Education	387	524(35)	521(-0.6)	552 (6)	646 (17)	816 (26)	1108 (36)
Health	208	179 (-14)	160 (-11)	132 (-18)	149 (13)	195 (31)	256 (31)
Labour and Labour Welfare	18	18 (0)	14(-22)	13 (-7)	13 (0)	19 (46)	25 (32)
Family Welfare	-	NA	NA	25	25 (0)	29 (16)	43 (48)
Water Supply and Sanitation	-	83	73(-12)	79 (8)	97 (23)	133 (37)	116 (-13)
Others	26	9 (-65)	8(-11)	8 (0)	13 (63)	21 (62)	21 (0)
Rural Development	-	162	163(06)	125 (-23)	146 (17)	209 (43)	188 (-10)
SC-ST Welfare	-	66	66 (0)	68 (3)	81 (19)	125 (54)	173 (38)
Social Security and Welfare	101	50 (-50)	45(-10)	44 (-2)	65 (48)	146 (125)	252 (73)
Nutrition	13	17 (31)	17(0)	28 (65)	27 (-4)	51 (89)	75 (47)
Housing	17	23 (35)	17(-26)	19 (12)	22 (16)	37 (68)	58 (57)
Urban Development	-	21	22(5)	28 (27)	48 (71)	131 (173)	153 (17)
Relief on Natural Calamities	31	-	-	-	-	-	-
Loan and Advances for Social Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* 0 means less than 1 rupee real per capita expenditure insignificant head. Figures in brackets are the growth rate in percentage on previous five-year average basis.

Source: State Finance Report: A study of Budget, RBI for different years. *Uttarakhand is special category state. (-) = Not available

Composition and Patterns of Total Social Sector Expenditure (Capital + Revenue, plan + non plan) as a share of SC-STs welfare across the Major States, during 1980-2015. (Table 4)

TSSE (Total social sector expenditure) on SC-ST welfare has improved over the period in all major states of India. After 2000 onwards, it has increased almost 1%. During and after neoliberal reforms in SC-ST welfare program remain

in priority area of states expenditure out of their total social sector expenditure (C+R). In high-income states, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Punjab, Tamil Nadu had significant increase from 1985-2015 while in low-income states Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal declined, and in Bihar, UP, Odisha it has improved. All states average also increase 5.34% to 6.61% from 1985-90 to 2010-2015. (Table 4)

Table 4: Total expenditure on SC and STs Welfare as the percentage share of Total Social Sector Expenditure in 17 major category states in India: 1980 to 2018. (5-year average figures in percentage) States/years

	1980-85	1985-90	1990-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	2005-2010	2010-2015
Andhra Pradesh	-	14.65	13.31	9.71	10.81	10.49	13.93
Gujarat	-	3.79	6.16	5.88	5.05	5.45	5.38
Haryana	-	2.59	2.21	1.23	1.36	1.72	1.58
Karnataka	-	6.67	7.31	7.58	6.78	7.47	10.90
Kerala	-	3.64	3.52	4.68	4.15	5.06	6.32
Maharashtra	-	3.63	4.16	4.89	5.69	9.17	10.19
Punjab	-	2.87	2.44	1.84	1.09	1.79	4.13
Tamil Nadu	-	3.11	4.99	6.04	5.30	5.20	4.73
Rajasthan	-	1.42	2.20	1.87	2.01	2.59	2.97
Madhya Pradesh	-	13.66	14.35	14.48	13.89	10.05	7.81
Odisha	-	7.16	7.03	6.50	5.79	6.77	7.58
Bihar	-	3.64	4.17	3.46	2.04	1.90	5.12
Uttar Pradesh	-	4.72	4.21	6.96	6.78	6.84	5.62
West Bengal	-	3.55	2.82	2.27	2.32	2.38	2.18
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	-	19.00	11.77	6.60
Uttarakhand	-	-	-	-	3.27	4.20	3.14
Jharkhand	-	-	-	-	8.32	5.95	7.10
All States	-	5.34	5.61	5.72	5.69	6.10	6.61

(-) = Not Available. Source: ibid

It is evident in the above table 4, that low-income states are spending some higher amount during 1985- 90 to 1995-2000 out of their total social sector expenditure as compared to high-income states on SC- ST welfare, even though the increasing trend was very slow in same period. From 2000-05 to 2005- 2010 there was a good jump in SC-ST welfare expenditure in both LYS, but in HYS we have a continuous declining trend in expenditure from 1990-95 onwards. From 2000-05 onwards HYS were spending a higher amount as compare to LYS, but for the same period expenditure in LYS had declined on SC-ST welfare. During 2000-05, LYS were spending highest as 7.05% and lowest during 2010-2015 as 5.35%, in apposite of this HYS were spending lowest during 2000-05 as 5.03% and highest as 7.15% during 2010-15 (on 5-year average basis), at all state level there was also a slightly increase in spending after 2000-05 onwards. It again showed a change in composition of states spending on major heads of social sectors out of their TSSE after 2000-05 onwards, as LYS started spending less on SC-ST welfare, while HYS increased their spending.

As Kannan (1995) pointed out “the social reforms movements have aimed at social enrichment of backward classes and the demand of such movements for access to education and government jobs lent an explicitly distributive thrust on official policy. On the part of the state and civil

society, UP, MP, Bihar than represent the result of inaction and worst in term of agrarian structure, social relation and the quality of governance”. As Dreze and Sen (1997,p.ix) argue, the iniquitous economic structure infers that “... the education of children of disadvantaged social groups and fewer privileged classes and caste can be fairly comprehensively neglected without this becoming a politically explosive social scandal, as it would have unsightly become had more powerful people been at the neglected end”. He also pointed out that the relatively well-off western UP had not recorded better education or health achievements (Dreze and Gazdar, 1997). Because of this current patterns of expenditure and even we succeed in attaining inclusive growth, “there are several social groups that may still remain marginalised such as tribal groups adolescent girls, the elderly and the disabled, children below the age of three and other who do not have influential lobbies to make sure that their rights are assured” (Dreze and Gazdar, 1997). The government must pay devotion to these groups.

The vision of inclusiveness must go beyond the conventional approach of poverty eradication to cover equality of opportunity, as well as economic and social mobility for all sections of society, with favorable action for SCs, STs, OBCs, minorities and women.

Table 5: Patterns and Composition as a percentage share of Social Sectors expenditure (capital + revenue), from 1980 -85 to 2010 -2015. At All States Level. (5 year average figures in percentage)

Major heads/ year	1980-85	1985-90	1990-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	2005-2010	2010-2015
Total Social Sector Expenditure (C+R)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Education	47.36	42.32	44.48	46.16	45.57	40.05	42.47
Water Supply and Sanitation(WSS)	-	6.73	6.18	6.63	6.81	6.62	4.33
Family Welfare(FW)	-	-	-	2.17	1.77	1.41	1.64
Medical and Public Health	-	-	-	11.08	10.5	9.6	9.74
Health All	25.34	21.37	19.83	19.88	19.08	17.63	15.81
Labour and Labour Welfare(LLW)	2.29	1.48	1.23	1.12	0.92	0.92	0.95
Others	3.14	0.73	0.69	0.68	0.92	1.03	0.82
Relief and Natural Calamities(RANC)	3.84	3.34	2.19	2.52	3.32	3.04	2.28
SC-ST Welfare	-	5.34	5.61	5.72	5.69	6.1	6.61
Social Security and Welfare(SSW)	12.27	4.16	3.86	3.73	4.5	6.83	9.60
Housing	2.09	1.87	1.47	1.57	1.53	1.79	2.18
Urban Development(UD)	-	1.71	1.93	2.32	3.35	6.04	5.87

Nutrition	1.52	1.39	1.48	2.46	1.86	2.41	2.89
Food Storage and Ware Housing(FSW)	-	0.4	0.88	1.14	0.97	1.57	1.54
Rural Development (RD)	-	13.35	13.97	10.57	10.2	10.37	7.50
Loan and Advances for Food Storage and Ware Housing (LABSFSW)	-	-	-	0.11	0.11	0.43	0.26
Loan and Advancesfor Rural Development (LABSRD)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Loan and Advances for Social Services. (LABSSS)	3.67	2.54	2.38	2.01	1.97	1.79	1.21

*during 1980-85 scientific services and research were included in education, after that it becomes a major head in economic services. In 1980-85 urban development was included in other services major heads, after 1980-85 it becomes a separate major head. In 1980-85, WSS and FW were included in health so we name it health all. (-) = Not Available.

Source: Calculated by author by using State public finance reports, handbook of statistics data. Above figures are at all state level.

On the another hand, housing, urban development, nutrition, SC-ST welfare, social security and welfare, FSW had an increasing share in total social sector expenditure as a percentage of TSSE (capital + revenue), at all state level, when health and educations share was declining. Rural development has 10% share in TSSE over the period. It shows a shift in states priorities in social sector expenditure at all states level, as from health, education, labor welfare to other major heads such as urban development, rural development, SSW, nutrition, SC-ST welfare etc. To maintain their revenue expenditure state government reduce their spending on health, education, labor welfare to housing, urban development, etc. Beside this the outcome of social services are still not satisfactory, particularly on SC-STs welfare point of view. (Shariff, ghosh; 2002) The analysis have revealed that social services, like rural development, WSS, education, sports, art and culture, and Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes welfare had paid greater attention as compared to the other services on public expenditure front. However, in 1990s, overall restraint in the social sector expenditure (TSSE /GDP) has been observed, but despite this, key social services, viz., education, sports, art and culture, rural development and medical and public health prolonged to receive a comparatively higher allocation of expenditure till 2000-05. After 2005-05, the state's priorities has been shifts to the other major heads of social sector expenditure. Public, medical health and health all, labour welfare had a continuous declining trend in expenditure either it is out of NSDP or Aggregate public expenditure. Share of these social services had declined in total social sector expenditure when during the same period 2000-05 onwards there was an increasing trend in expenditure on urban development, rural development, SC-ST welfare, social security's welfare, and nutrition (Table 5).

These trends and patterns of the analysis show that role of development expenditure and ensuring socio- economic progress is different in different income categories states (HYS, LYS). It is evident in the previous analysis that development spending has a decisive role in influencing the human development indicators and achieving all social sector attainments. (Jyotsna, 2019). In this study I am not just limiting my observations to expenditure trends and patterns on human development indicators but to whole social sector. So this observation is more comprehensive, and multidimensional, with the link of higher economic growth and PCY in major 17 states of India. However, in the case of HYS Gujarat, Haryana, Punjab, Maharashtra, the role of development spending is not encouraging, similarly in Odisha and Rajasthan. When Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, is commendable in terms of spending pattern of development spending on the social sector.

Thus, the analysis brings valid inputs for public policy decisions. Allocation of resources will not automatically

lead to the improvement of development indicators unless there is a change in governance mechanism and the delivery of public services. There is also a realisation of the fact that the per- capita income alone is not a sufficient condition to raise HDI and social attainments. Inadequacy of PCY in Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, proved that despite these states having higher PCY but HDI and social attainments in these states has not changed significantly. Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh are adjusting as the states that have achieved rapid PCY growth in last three decades, but it's human development and social attainments are not satisfactory. When real infrastructure investment was very low in all social services, the decline in capital expenditure for managing fiscal deficit is not desirable because it hampers the long term investment and growth opportunities in the economy and intra sectoral growth.(Dev and mooij; 2002) During 2005-10, 2010-2015, we observe that the growth on revenue account would mainly come through lower growth rate of revenue expenditure. That directly affects the revenue expenditure on basic priority services. Therefore, improvement in revenue account along with lower growth in capital outlay would be reflected in lower GFD (gross fiscal deficit) absolute and as a ratio to GDP (SFR - GOI 2013-14).

Moreover, capital expenditure is seen to have a long standing multiplier effect and capital spending, mainly on housing, health and welfare has positive effect on growth. So there is need to prioritise capital investment. (Bose and Bhanumurthy, 2013; Jain and Kumar, 2013). But it was observe in Indian context that state government cutting back on social services (in terms of revenue, capital and loan and advances expenditure), that impacts in many ways (as in terms of TSSE, TSSE/NSDP, TSSE/APE as we discussed in previous section).

We can say that social services may be beaten if the FRBM discipline is stipulated upon with the current meaning of revenue deficit. However, as this would include specifically the schemes targeting on social inclusiveness, it may not be easy to do except non plan revenue expenditure (mainly subsidies) is severely cut.

It is also observed that almost half of the states are spending less on capital component as compared to all India average in almost all years (SFR-GOI, 2005-06). This shows the states apathy towards the investment in social sector development. Another important feature that is to be considered is that Indian states differs a lot in term of their per capita income, demographic composition, geographical location, as well their political commitment towards overall welfare, and the same can be reflected in their level of expenditure on social development. Hence it is important to study the trends and patterns of social sector expenditure across the states in India. There is an urgent need of moving up social sector expenditure and more capital investment on priority service such as health, education, labour welfare.

Conclusion

India is a development state and committed to inclusive welfare of its people particularly SC-STs and vulnerable section of the society. The government has taken several initiatives through institutional and policy framework that needed to enhance and ensure the welfare of SC-STs. Generally the programme and schemes are related with the broader area of education and employment of SC-STs and backward group of states. As we observe, TSSE expenditure, especially on health, education, labour welfare has drastically declined (Table 5). Even capital expenditure is also very less in these basic services. So the mass of the poor people suffers from the delivery of these public services and poor quality, because of the lack of investment in terms of public expenditure. We also observe, that in the same time period capital expenditure on urban development, SSW, housing improve. That means, it's a change in government spending priority from health, education to other major heads of social sector in terms of revenue and capital expenditure also.

References

1. State Finances: A Study of Budgets. Reserve Bank of India. <http://www.RBI.Org.in/scripts/AnnualPublications.aspx>.
2. Planning Commission, Government of India: Five Year Plans. New Delhi. <http://planningcommission.nic.in/plans/planrel/fiveyr/welcome.html>
3. CBGA India: Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability <https://www.cbgaIndia.org/>
4. The Hindu, Jan 31, 2021, Sharath. S. srivatsa Kannan, KP. Declining incidence of rural poverty in Kerala. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1995, 2651-2662.
5. Kannan KP. Growth without inclusion: the Gujarat model for India's development exposed. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*. 2015;58(4):653-676.
6. UNDP. Human Development Report 2010.
7. Government of India: Economic Survey, Ministry of Finance, Economic Division. (Various issues) Dreze, J., & Sen, A. India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity, 1995.
8. Drèze J, Sen A. Democratic practice and social inequality in India. *Journal of Asian and African studies*. 2002;37(2):6-37.
9. Drèze J, Gazdar H. Uttar Pradesh: The Burden of Inertia in Jean Dreze and Amartya Sen (eds), op cit. Jyotsna (2019) How India spends on Social sector? An Analysis of Trends and Patterns: 1980-2015, Is accepted for publication and will be published in. *Journal of Economic and Social Development*. 1997;15(2):2019. ISSN- 0973-886X
10. NITI Aayog. Report of the Sub-group of Chief Ministers on rationalisation of centrally sponsored schemes. New Delhi. Retrieved 12 February 2015-2017, from <http://niti.gov.in/writereaddata/files/Final%20Report%20of%20the%20Sub-Group%20submitter%20to%20PM.pdf>
11. Shariff A, Ghosh PK, Mondal SK. Indian public expenditures on social sector and poverty alleviation programmes during the 1990s. London: Overseas Development Institute. 2002.
12. Patnaik P. The economics of the new phase of imperialism. In International Conference: Acts of Resistance from the South against Globalisation. 2005, August.
13. Dev SM, Mooij J. Social sector expenditures in the 1990s: analysis of central and state budgets. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2002, 853-866pp.
14. Erden L, Holcombe RG. The effects of public investment on private investment in developing economies. *Public Finance Review*. 2005;33(5):575-602.
15. Bose S, Bhanyamurthy NR. Fiscal Multipliers for India, Working Paper No. 2013-125 September, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy New Delhi. 2013, 2013-125pp. Retrieved from, https://www.nipfp.org.in/media/medialibrary/2014/02/WP_2013_125.pdf
16. Kumar AS. UNDP's gender-related development index: A computation for Indian states. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1996, 887-895.