

Prime Minister (Opening Government Speech)

Opening Statement

Madam Speaker, Honourable Adjudicators, and Members of the House,

The motion before us today is: "This House would withdraw pensions for government employees." As the Opening Government, we assert that this reform is a necessary and pragmatic step toward securing India's fiscal stability, promoting equity across the workforce, and reallocating resources to prioritize the public good. Today, I will demonstrate why this motion is essential, focusing on economic sustainability, equity and modernization, and resource reallocation.

Economic Sustainability

Let us first address the harsh reality of the Old Pension Scheme (OPS). This is a defined-benefit system where government employees are guaranteed a pension equivalent to 50% of their last drawn salary. While this may sound generous, it has become a fiscal time bomb for our state governments.

- According to Reserve Bank of India reports, pension obligations now consume **15-20% of state revenues annually**. This means one-fifth of a state's financial resources are locked in fulfilling promises made decades ago, leaving little room for today's pressing needs.
- **Take Punjab as an example:** Nearly **25% of its annual expenditure** goes to pension liabilities. With such a huge burden, there is minimal flexibility to allocate funds for welfare projects, infrastructure development, or even disaster relief.

A **transition to the National Pension Scheme (NPS)** offers a sustainable alternative. This is a defined-contribution model where both employees and the government contribute towards retirement savings. NPS ties benefits directly to savings, ensuring fiscal discipline. Unlike OPS, it is forward-looking and affordable for the state treasury.

Equity and Modernization

The second pillar of our case is **equity and modernization**.

Government employees represent a **minority in India's workforce**, yet they enjoy benefits far beyond what the vast majority of private-sector workers can dream of.

- The **NITI Aayog** reports that over **90% of India's workforce** is employed in the private sector or informal economy, where pensions are either minimal or nonexistent. Why should a small fraction of workers, simply because of their employment with the government, have access to such disproportionate retirement security?

- This creates a clear **inequality** that cannot be justified. If we withdraw pensions for government employees, we create a **level playing field** for all workers, whether they serve in public or private sectors.

Moreover, the **NPS aligns with global best practices**. In countries like Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, similar market-linked systems empower employees to manage their retirement savings and generate competitive returns. India must modernize its approach if it wants to remain globally competitive.

Reallocation of Resources

Finally, withdrawing pensions is not just about balancing budgets; it is about **reallocating resources** to where they are needed the most.

- Pension obligations are a **zero-sum game**: Every rupee spent on pensions is a rupee not spent on health care, education, or infrastructure.
- The **World Bank's 2022 Report** highlighted that targeted investments in these sectors could lift millions out of poverty and accelerate India's development goals.

Imagine a scenario where the billions saved from pension liabilities are instead used to build **modern hospitals, smart schools, and roads connecting rural communities**. The benefits would extend to millions of Indians rather than a privileged few.

Conclusion

Madam Speaker, this motion is not about **undermining public servants**. They have served our nation with dedication, and their contributions are respected. However, we must balance this respect with **responsibility to the public at large**.

Withdrawing pensions for government employees is not only a **necessary reform** but also a **moral imperative** to secure India's future.

For these reasons, the Opening Government stands firmly in support of the motion. Thank you!

Leader of the Opposition (Opening Opposition Speech)

Opening Statement

Madam Speaker, Honourable Adjudicators, and Members of the House,

The Opposition firmly rejects the motion: “This House would withdraw pensions for government employees.” This proposal is not only short-sighted but also undermines the welfare and morale of public servants who dedicate their lives to serving our nation. Today, I will focus on three critical aspects: the importance of employee welfare, the exacerbation of economic inequality, and the inherent risks of the proposed National Pension Scheme (NPS).

Employee Welfare and Morale

Let us first consider the people at the heart of this debate—our government employees. These individuals dedicate decades of their lives to public service, often choosing it over private-sector jobs that offer higher salaries and greater perks.

- **Government employees accept these lower salaries** in exchange for the promise of job security and a **guaranteed pension** that provides a dignified life post-retirement. This pension is not a luxury—it is a **crucial financial safety net**.
- The **Indian Administrative Reforms Committee 2019** emphasized the importance of retaining pensions as a means of **attracting and retaining talent in public service**. Without this guarantee, the government risks losing skilled professionals to the private sector, leaving critical public services under-resourced and inefficient.

Now, let’s imagine the **psychological impact** of this motion.

- Removing pensions sends a clear message to public servants: *Your decades of dedication are no longer valued*. This will undoubtedly **demoralize employees**, reducing their motivation to perform and deterring future talent from joining government service.

A demoralized workforce leads to inefficiency, and inefficiency in public service harms every single citizen.

Economic Inequality

Second, we must address the broader implications of this motion on economic inequality. This proposal does not level the playing field—it makes it worse.

- The **International Labour Organization (ILO)** estimates that over **75% of India’s private-sector workers lack retirement benefits**. Yes, this is a problem, but the solution is not to strip protections from government employees. Instead, we should focus on **strengthening retirement systems across the board**.

- Removing pensions for government employees only widens the gap between those who have some retirement security and those who have none. It is a **regressive step**, punishing those who have worked within the system rather than addressing the broader structural issues in our economy.

India has always prided itself on a commitment to **inclusive growth**. This motion, however, turns its back on that principle. True inclusivity means ensuring financial security for all workers, not pulling the rug out from under government employees to balance budgets.

Risks of the NPS

Finally, let us examine the alternative being proposed: the National Pension Scheme (NPS). While it may seem modern and market-driven, it is fraught with **significant risks**.

- Unlike the OPS, which guarantees a stable income, the NPS ties retirement savings to **volatile market performance**. This introduces a level of uncertainty that is simply unacceptable for retirees.
- Consider the **COVID-19 pandemic**: Global stock market crashes wiped out a significant portion of retirement savings for those dependent on contribution-based systems. Such volatility undermines the financial security and dignity of retirees, leaving them vulnerable in their old age.

The **dignity of our retirees** should not hinge on the ups and downs of financial markets. Government employees, who have faithfully served the public, deserve better than a retirement spent worrying about stock market trends.

Conclusion

Madam Speaker, this motion is fundamentally flawed. It jeopardizes the welfare and morale of public servants, exacerbates economic inequality, and introduces unnecessary risks into retirement systems.

Our government employees are the **backbone of our administration**. Their pensions are not a handout but a recognition of their lifelong contributions. If we want a strong, motivated public sector that continues to serve the people, we must protect their financial security.

The Opposition firmly believes in building a more equitable and sustainable system—not by tearing down protections but by lifting everyone up. For these reasons, we oppose this motion. Thank you.

First Speaker (Closing Government Speech)

Opening Statement

Madam Speaker and Esteemed Members of the House,

As the Closing Government, we reiterate our unwavering support for the motion: “This House would withdraw pensions for government employees.” Building on the Opening Government’s case, I will introduce fresh perspectives on global practices in pension reform, intergenerational equity, and the empowerment and flexibility provided by the National Pension Scheme (NPS). Together, these arguments underscore the necessity of this reform for India’s progress.

Global Practices and Fiscal Prudence

Let us begin with a global perspective. Many developed nations have already recognized the financial strain of defined-benefit pension schemes and transitioned to sustainable, contribution-based models.

- **Australia and New Zealand** are prime examples. Both countries have implemented systems like **Australia’s Superannuation Fund**, where individuals actively save for their retirement, reducing the fiscal burden on the state.
- The **International Monetary Fund (IMF)** has issued repeated warnings to India about the **long-term risks** posed by growing pension liabilities. Ignoring these warnings could lead to a crisis that destabilizes public finances.

Now, let’s consider the implications at home.

- In **aging states like Kerala**, pension liabilities already exceed ₹33,000 crore annually. Continuing with the **Old Pension Scheme (OPS)** in such states is not just unsustainable—it is reckless.
 - Fiscal prudence demands that we prioritize stability over nostalgia for outdated systems. The NPS provides a viable solution that aligns with modern economic realities while safeguarding the country’s financial health.
-

Intergenerational Equity

Next, let us address the issue of fairness across generations. The **OPS creates an unjust burden on younger taxpayers**, forcing them to fund generous pensions that they themselves will never receive.

- According to a **2021 study by the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (NIPFP)**, reinstating the OPS nationally would disproportionately harm India’s youth. They would inherit unsustainable debt levels, compromising their economic prospects.

- This violates the principle of **intergenerational equity**, where each generation should contribute to and benefit from public resources fairly. The NPS corrects this imbalance by ensuring that every individual saves for their own retirement.

For too long, we have asked younger generations to pay for the promises made to older ones. It is time to break this cycle and promote a **fairer, self-reliant system**.

Flexibility and Empowerment

Finally, let us consider how the NPS empowers employees and modernizes India's retirement system.

- Unlike the rigid OPS, the NPS offers **flexibility**, allowing individuals to choose investment options and manage their savings according to their risk appetite. It is also **portable**, meaning employees can carry their retirement savings across sectors if they change jobs.
- This is not just theoretical. The **Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (PFRDA)** reports that **NPS accounts have grown by 30% annually**, reflecting its growing acceptance among Indian workers.

More importantly, the NPS shifts the focus from dependency to **empowerment**. It encourages employees to take control of their financial futures, a philosophy that aligns with the aspirations of a modern, self-reliant India.

Conclusion

Madam Speaker, this motion is not about abandoning government employees. It is about creating a sustainable and equitable retirement system that serves both individuals and the nation. By withdrawing pensions and transitioning to the NPS, we modernize our policies, ensure fiscal stability, and promote fairness for all generations.

The future of India's workforce and economy depends on this critical reform. The Closing Government firmly supports this motion. Thank you.

First Speaker (Closing Opposition Speech)

Opening Statement

Madam Speaker, Honourable Members of the House,

The Opposition steadfastly opposes this motion. The Government's proposal to withdraw pensions for government employees disregards the sacrifices and contributions of our public servants, while exposing them to financial insecurity. In my speech, I will draw from lessons within India, highlight the dangers of market-dependent retirement schemes, and emphasize the social unrest and inequity this motion will inevitably cause.

Lessons from Indian States

Let us begin with insights from the experiences of Indian states that have grappled with this issue.

- **Reversion to OPS:** States like **Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh** have reverted to the Old Pension Scheme (OPS) due to widespread dissatisfaction with the National Pension Scheme (NPS). These governments were compelled to act in response to overwhelming public demand.
- **Employee Protests:** In these states, government employees launched **extensive protests**, citing inadequate returns and insecurity under the NPS.
- **Survey Evidence:** The **All India State Government Employees Federation** conducted a survey revealing that **over 80% of employees prefer the OPS** over the NPS. This clearly demonstrates that the contribution-based model has failed to meet the needs of retirees.

When employees—those who dedicate their lives to public service—feel let down by the system, it reflects a failure in governance. Instead of compounding this failure, we must address these concerns and enhance the OPS, rather than abolish it.

Market Volatility and Vulnerability

Next, let us examine the inherent vulnerabilities of market-dependent systems like the NPS.

- **Retirement Security Risks:** Placing retirement security at the mercy of unpredictable financial markets is both unethical and imprudent.
- **Historical Evidence:** The **2008 Financial Crisis** and the **COVID-19 pandemic** exposed the fragility of market-dependent systems, wiping out savings for millions.
- **Consequences of Market Downturns:** Consider the devastating impact on a retiree who loses their life savings due to market downturns. This would not just harm the individual but would destabilize families and communities.

The government's role is to provide stability and security—not to transfer risk onto its employees. By removing pensions, the government is abdicating its responsibility to those who serve it.

Social and Political Unrest

Finally, let us discuss the broader societal consequences of this motion.

- **Political Instability:** Attempts to eliminate pensions have already led to political instability in several regions. For example, in **Karnataka**, unions fiercely opposed proposed pension reforms, resulting in widespread unrest and disruption.
- **Nationwide Risks:** A nationwide withdrawal of pensions would alienate a significant voter base, eroding trust in governance and democracy itself.
- **Social Unrest:** Removing this safety net could lead to **mass protests**, strikes, and long-term instability—outcomes that are entirely avoidable.

These risks are not hypothetical; they are unfolding realities. This motion jeopardizes the social contract between the government and its employees, undermining trust and triggering unrest.

Conclusion

To conclude, this motion is a step backward. It threatens financial security, deepens societal inequality, and risks political instability. Instead of withdrawing pensions, the government must strengthen them to ensure dignity and security for public servants.

Madam Speaker, the Opposition stands resolute in rejecting this motion. Thank you.

Second Speaker (Closing Government Speech)

Opening Statement

Madam Speaker and Honourable Members of the House,

The Closing Government stands resolute in supporting the motion: “This House would withdraw pensions for government employees.” In my speech, I will respond to concerns raised by the Opposition and further substantiate why this reform is essential for fiscal prudence, fairness between public and private-sector workers, and the broader welfare of our nation. The time for change is now.

Fiscal Realities

Let us begin with the fiscal implications of the Old Pension Scheme (OPS).

- **OPS as a Fiscal Time Bomb:** The OPS is unsustainable and represents a **ticking fiscal time bomb**. As per **CAG (Comptroller and Auditor General) reports**, pension liabilities are expected to grow at a rate of **8-10% annually**, which will crowd out crucial investments in infrastructure, healthcare, and education. This exponential growth will soon reach a point where the government will not have enough resources to meet other essential needs of the population.
- **A Sustainable Alternative:** The **National Pension Scheme (NPS)**, on the other hand, provides a sustainable and future-proof model. The NPS is a **defined-contribution** system where the government is no longer liable for fixed pension payouts. Instead, individuals contribute to their own retirement fund, which grows based on market returns. This aligns with **India’s limited fiscal space**, ensuring that funds are allocated more efficiently and equitably across the economy.

The OPS may have served its purpose in the past, but it is no longer a viable option. The NPS is the solution for a **fiscally stable and sustainable future**.

Fairness Across Sectors

Now, let us consider the issue of **fairness**.

- **Private-Sector Lack of Pension Guarantees:** Over **90% of India’s workforce** is employed in the private sector, and they do not have the luxury of guaranteed pensions like government employees do. According to a **2022 report by the Ministry of Labour and Employment**, a vast majority of private-sector workers are **outside formal**

retirement systems. They are left to fend for their own future, without the support system that government employees have under the OPS.

- **Creating Parity:** By transitioning government employees to the NPS, we ensure **parity** between the private and public sectors. No longer will we have a system where a small proportion of the workforce enjoys disproportionate benefits. With the NPS, everyone—whether in the public or private sector—will have access to a similar framework for retirement savings. Moreover, this shift encourages **self-reliance** by enabling employees to have more control over their own retirement planning.

We are advocating for fairness, equality, and a level playing field where no one is unfairly privileged in their post-retirement security.

Broader Public Benefits

Next, let us look at the **broader public benefits** of this reform.

- **Funding Public Goods:** Resources that are freed up by transitioning from OPS to NPS can be better used to fund essential public goods. For example, redirecting just **5% of pension expenses** could fund **universal healthcare coverage** for rural populations—a vital necessity in our country. A **study by the Public Health Foundation of India** found that reallocating pension savings to health could drastically improve public health outcomes, especially in underserved rural areas.
- **Societal Benefits:** These savings will benefit millions of Indians, not just a small subset of government employees. We have an opportunity here to redistribute resources to improve the well-being of the broader population, ensuring **education, healthcare, and infrastructure** become priorities. The shift from pensions to more productive investments will enhance the quality of life for all, reducing disparities and creating long-term social benefits.

This reform is not just about financial prudence; it is about **investing in the collective future of our nation.**

Conclusion

In conclusion, this motion is crucial for ensuring a **sustainable and equitable future.** The Old Pension Scheme, with its growing liabilities, is a financial burden that is increasingly difficult to sustain. The National Pension Scheme offers a sustainable, equitable, and fair alternative, which ensures that both government and private-sector employees benefit from similar retirement security. Moreover, the resources saved by shifting away from OPS can be reallocated to funding critical public goods like healthcare, education, and infrastructure.

This motion prioritizes the long-term growth of India, fosters equity across sectors, and ensures that our resources are used in the most productive manner possible. I urge you to support this reform for the betterment of our nation's future.

Second Speaker (Closing Opposition Speech)

Introduction

Madam Speaker and Honourable Members of the House,

The Opposition remains firmly against this motion. By proposing the withdrawal of pensions for government employees, the Government undermines the dignity of public service, destabilizes financial security for retirees, and erodes the foundations of India's welfare state. My speech will demonstrate why this motion is not only unjust but also socially and fiscally irresponsible, and why we must reject it.

Moral Responsibility of the State

Let us begin by recognizing the **moral responsibility** of the state to its citizens.

- **State's Duty:** The state has an **inherent duty** to ensure that retirees live with dignity. Our government employees, who dedicate their lives to serving the public, deserve to retire with a sense of financial security. Pensions represent more than just financial support; they symbolize the **social contract** between the state and its citizens. They are a recognition of years, if not decades, of hard work, sacrifice, and public service.
 - **Undermining Service:** Stripping away this benefit is an affront to the decades of dedicated service rendered by public employees. It is a **disservice** to those who have spent their careers working to improve the lives of others, often at lower salaries than their counterparts in the private sector. The decision to eliminate pensions sends a message that their efforts are no longer valued.
 - **NHRC Recommendation:** The **National Human Rights Commission (NHRC)** has repeatedly stressed that adequate retirement support is not just a fiscal matter but a **fundamental right** of workers, and a cornerstone of any welfare state. Taking away pensions goes against these values and violates the trust placed in the government by its employees.
-

Hybrid Models as Alternatives

However, the Opposition does not reject reform; we seek **progressive solutions** that balance fiscal concerns with employee welfare.

- **Reforms Need Not Be Absolute:** Reforming the pension system does not require the complete dismantling of existing benefits. There are **alternative models** that can meet both fiscal and welfare objectives. For example, **capping high-end pensions** or gradually introducing contribution-based models for future employees can help address financial concerns without stripping retirees of their security.
- **Parliamentary Recommendations:** The **Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel** has recommended such **hybrid models** as a middle ground. These models

ensure that the fiscal burden is eased, while also protecting the financial future of our workers. Such **gradual reforms** can help manage the system's sustainability without making drastic cuts that harm retirees.

Legacy of Welfare

India's **welfare state** has always been built on the principle of **protecting the vulnerable**—and retirees, especially government employees, belong to this group.

- **Protecting the Vulnerable:** Government employees, many of whom have worked in the most challenging and demanding conditions, depend on pensions for their security in old age. By removing pensions, we create a vulnerable class of citizens who could be left destitute in their retirement years, unable to support themselves due to health issues, lack of employment opportunities, or the rising cost of living.
 - **Dangerous Precedent:** More importantly, removing pensions sets a **dangerous precedent**. If we remove pensions for government employees today, what is to stop us from dismantling other vital welfare schemes in the future? **Social safety nets** such as healthcare, unemployment benefits, and other forms of public assistance are critical to maintaining a just and equitable society. This motion does not only affect government employees; it signals an intention to erode the foundational pillars of India's welfare state.
 - **Social Failure:** This motion is not just a fiscal choice; it is a **social failure**. It undermines the values of fairness, compassion, and solidarity that our nation has long championed. India's welfare system has been built over decades, and it has **helped millions** escape poverty, ensure healthcare, and achieve basic financial security. By stripping pensions, we risk undoing much of the progress that has been made in this area.
-

Conclusion

Madam Speaker & Honourable Members,

This motion is not only a threat to the financial security of government employees but also to the very fabric of our welfare state. We believe that reform is necessary, but it should not come at the cost of the dignity and well-being of those who have dedicated their lives to public service. The removal of pensions sets a dangerous precedent that could unravel much of India's welfare legacy.

Instead, we propose **hybrid solutions** that strike a balance—reforms that address fiscal concerns while preserving the security of our public servants. We must protect our vulnerable citizens, and in doing so, we must preserve our nation's commitment to social justice.

I urge this House to reject this motion, and safeguard the values of equity, justice, and welfare that have always defined India's progress.

Thank you.

Prime Minister (Final Summations)

Madam Speaker, Esteemed Members of the House,

As we draw this debate to a close, I reaffirm the Government's unwavering position on the necessity of this motion: transitioning from the Old Pension Scheme to the National Pension Scheme (NPS) is a critical reform for the future of our nation. The Old Pension Scheme, while once suitable, has become an unsustainable relic that burdens our fiscal resources, perpetuates inequality, and undermines the broader public good.

The NPS represents a modern, contribution-based approach to retirement, empowering employees with greater financial control and fostering individual responsibility. It aligns India with global best practices, ensuring fiscal sustainability while promoting long-term savings and equity. Far from being a burden, the NPS is an opportunity for employees to take charge of their financial futures, supported by a robust and flexible framework that mitigates risks through diversification.

The concerns raised by the Opposition, while acknowledged, fail to address the larger picture. Morale challenges and market fluctuations are manageable transitional hurdles, whereas clinging to the outdated Old Pension Scheme jeopardizes the fiscal health of our nation and burdens future generations. Prioritizing the privileged few at the expense of taxpayers and critical public services is neither just nor sustainable.

This reform is not merely about numbers—it is about ensuring fairness, equity, and the responsible allocation of public resources for the benefit of all citizens. By adopting the NPS, we are securing a stronger, more sustainable future, where every Indian benefits from a modern and equitable retirement system.

I urge this House to support the motion and take a decisive step toward a fiscally responsible, fairer, and forward-thinking India.

Thank you.

Leader of the Opposition (Final Contentions)

Madam Speaker, Honourable Members of the House,

As we conclude this debate, the Opposition strongly rejects the motion to withdraw pensions for government employees. This proposal is a betrayal of the trust that public servants have placed in the state and poses a grave threat to the foundations of India's welfare state. Allow me to summarize our arguments.

Pensions are not merely financial benefits—they represent the state's recognition of the dedication and sacrifices made by its employees. Removing them would severely demoralize public servants, breaking the bond of trust between the government and its workforce. It would exacerbate inequalities between the public and private sectors, stripping government employees of the dignity and security they rightfully deserve.

The National Pension Scheme (NPS) shifts retirement savings into the uncertainties of the stock market, exposing retirees to unnecessary risk. History has shown that market-based systems are vulnerable to economic crises, leaving retirees at the mercy of volatility. The state has a moral obligation to provide stability and predictability, which the NPS fails to guarantee.

The withdrawal of pensions has already led to protests in states like Karnataka and Himachal Pradesh. A nationwide implementation of this policy would amplify unrest, alienating a significant portion of the population and jeopardizing the morale of public servants who form the backbone of our governance.

Pensions are a cornerstone of India's welfare state, embodying fairness, equity, and dignity. To dismantle this system is to undermine the principles upon which our nation was built and to erode the social contract that ensures the state's responsibility toward those who have served it faithfully.

Pensions are not entitlements; they are a moral obligation—a recognition of decades of service by public servants. This motion threatens to unravel this social contract and sets a troubling precedent for dismantling other critical welfare measures.

The Opposition urges this House to reject this motion. Let us uphold the moral responsibility of the state to protect the welfare and security of its employees. Cutting costs at the expense of dignity and social justice is a dangerous path that will destabilize our social fabric, deepen inequality, and fuel unrest. India must remain a nation that values fairness, security, and its people above fiscal expediency.

Thank you.

Rebuttals for the Government

1. **On Employee Morale and Trust:** The Opposition argues that withdrawing pensions will demoralize public servants. However, it is important to recognize that **trust in the system** can be rebuilt over time, especially when the transition to a more sustainable system like the NPS is done with sufficient safeguards. **Employee morale** will ultimately improve when the focus shifts from a burdened, outdated system to a modern, **self-reliant pension model** that empowers individuals to control their own financial futures. The government can provide **financial literacy programs** and ensure **secure transitions** to mitigate any temporary dissatisfaction.
 2. **On the Social Contract:** The Opposition claims that removing pensions undermines the **social contract** between the state and its employees. However, this notion assumes that the **Old Pension Scheme (OPS)** is the only form of commitment the state can offer. Transitioning to the National Pension Scheme (NPS) **does not break the contract**, but rather updates it for the **current economic realities**. The state's responsibility should not just be to honor outdated systems but to ensure **fiscal sustainability** while still offering a robust retirement framework. The shift to NPS ensures fairness for both public and private sector employees, while OPS **discriminates** by only benefitting a select group.
-

Rebuttals for the Opposition

1. **On Market Volatility and Risk Exposure:** The Opposition argues that the **National Pension Scheme (NPS)** exposes employees to market risks. While market fluctuations are a concern, the NPS allows for **diversified investments** and **long-term growth** opportunities. Unlike OPS, where the government takes on all financial risks, the NPS enables individuals to **diversify their portfolios**, thereby minimizing risk. Furthermore, **market-based systems** have shown to outperform fixed-benefit schemes over long periods, especially in economies with growth potential like India's. The claim that the NPS is volatile ignores its **adaptive structure** and the **security measures** in place to protect investors.
2. **On Political and Social Unrest:** The Opposition warns that removing pensions will lead to widespread **social and political unrest**. However, it is important to note that many states, such as **Rajasthan** and **Himachal Pradesh**, have already made the shift from OPS to NPS with **minimal unrest** when proper communication and transition plans were followed. The government can ensure smooth transitions through a phased approach, **gradual implementation**, and **consultation with employees**. Political instability should not be a reason to maintain an unsustainable system. Rather, it should drive us to adopt reforms that ensure **long-term stability** and equitable solutions for all citizens.