

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I do not challenge any letter.

*(Interruptions)***

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed

*(Interruptions)***

MR. SPEAKER : I never question that, it is not my job. I am only protecting the privileges of the House, I am protecting this House.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am with you, Sir. No problem.

*(Interruptions)***

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed.

*(Interruptions)***

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. I have explained everything.

[*Translation*]

Professor Saheb should also note that the ruling which I give is based on past rulings. I am not going to change my stand. I do not want to protect anybody. To me, all are Members.

[*English*]

Including the Prime Minister every one is a Member to me and I never differentiate between them. Please sit down.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : We are also Members.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, that is what I am saying. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I will listen to you when time comes and when you are on pro-

per order. But I am not going to listen to this. Because I have disallowed, I am not going to listen at all. This is my firm ruling. I am not going to allow the name of the President to be dragged in any way. That is my view. And on this subject which the Professor is raising time and again, I do not question the authenticity of your letter which you are going to authenticate or which you have already authenticated. I am not going into the *pros* and *cons* of it. I am saying that this subject which I have disallowed, if we allow it, the President's name will be dragged in, and it cannot be separated. Therefore, I have disallowed it.

(Interruptions)

At this stage, Prof. Madhu Dandavate and some other Hon. Members left the House

12.13 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET, 1987-88—
GENERAL DISCUSSION
AND
DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS
(GENERAL), 1984-85—*Contd.*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : We shall now take up Items 12 and 13—Further discussion on the General Budget and the Demands for Excess Grants.

Shri Rajiv Gandhi may speak.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank all the Members who have participated in the debate on the budget. I thank them for their constructive suggestions and many interesting points that have been raised during this debate, and I commend the high level of debate that has taken place this year on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the economy is strong and it is buoyant. The growth rate has been 5 per cent as per the plan target. Industries have expanded approximately 8 per cent, average over three years. This is the highest in 20 years. Much of this expansion has taken place in the small scale sector. The small scale sector gives a lot of employment

**Not recorded.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

So, it is not just industrial growth which is limited to certain large industries. But it is very broad-based in going down to the people, going down to the workers. The infrastructure is doing well—9 to 10 per cent increase, third year in succession. Again this is a very major achievement. Agriculture has been resilient in spite of bad weather and drought in many parts of the country. Our food stocks are burgeoning and our production should go to above 150 million tonnes again this year. Inflation is under control and the trade deficit has been reduced by a thousand crores.

Some Members talked about direction in the Budget. Let me reiterate that direction is not something that we would like to give annually in every Budget. Direction is something that Panditji gave in the '50s that we are continuing today. Direction is what Indiraji gave in the '70s and '80s that we are continuing today. Our idea and concept is not to change direction every year. It is the basic policy which has been developing from the freedom movement, throughout our independence and it is continuing along this road that this Budget gives us direction. So, those that are looking for new direction, of course, will be disappointed. But those that are looking for a continuing direction, a continuing direction for self-sufficiency, a continuing direction of standing on our own feet, a continuing direction of a stronger, more independent India, well, they have got that direction in this Budget. We have also done a number of things during the past two years which have perhaps made the Budget a little less exciting. But that is a very deliberate thing. We have looked at sectors and rectified the problems in particular sectors as we have taken them up. For example, we have taken up electronics. We have taken up the cement industry earlier. In this Budget, I have said that we will be taking up capital goods. Other areas which, we feel, need immediate interest are housing, the food processing industry because more needs to be done for the farmers. So, we have been looking at particular sectors of industry, rationalising the tax structure, the rules, the control in that sector, and then not trying to destabilise that in the coming Budget. Let that stability prevail because only with

stability, industry will be able to grow and expand, and the effects of development will flow to our people.

The long-term fiscal policy and the Seventh Plan again give strength to this direction that we have got from Panditji. This could not be said for many of the Budgets that we saw in the years 1977-1980—unfortunately I have to keep referring to those years because the direction in other years has not changed; it has been a very steady direction. It is only in these three years, 1977-80 where we had rolling plans...

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
(S. BUTA SINGH) : Rolling direction.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : ..where during this period when the economy was meandering meaninglessly that new direction was given every month perhaps, not even every year. And it is that that we have changed after that. It is a steady direction that we have been giving. That is important. But referring to their economy and their economic policies of those days, I did say just now that we got a new direction every month perhaps, but even that is questionable. For, if I remember, it was mentioned at that time, somebody had said that there was a drift in policy during those periods and the question was raised that even drift has direction and they lacked even that much direction.

So, we have totally reversed this tendency of switching directions and we are giving a steady direction to the country, a direction which comes from the foundations laid by Panditji and Gandhiji and we will continue along that road even if it disappoints some of our friends about the directions that they are expecting.

The Budget offers stability, stability that avoids ad hocism, that avoids uncertainties, a stability which will give it direction in antipoverty plans and programmes, a stability which will give it direction in education because we feel this is one of the roots of removing poverty, a stability which we hope will help build the housing sector because this is one sector which has been neglected for too long and now that we are strong

enough in other basic sectors, it is time we turned our attention to the housing sector, just as we have done to the other basic sectors in earlier times.

The Budget is aimed at growth. It is aimed at rationalising the tax structure in a number of areas, like I mentioned, we have done in electronics, cement earlier; computers, other areas will be taken up.

This Budget has a major overhaul in the indirect taxes, full-scope MODVAT has now been brought in perhaps most of all, the thrust in this Budget is for self-reliance in industry, in the capital goods sector. We have developed this sector over a long period of time. It has got its strength. But, at the same time, it has got its weakness and one of our problems has been that we have been pushing the whole sector and not really making enough progress in the whole capital goods sector.

We would like to identify. While supporting the whole capital goods sector, we will pinpoint and identify those which we think are most critical to the phase of our development today and then give them very special benefits so that they can really push ahead and be competitive with capital goods industry anywhere.

One major point which has been raised by many is that of defence expenditure. While agreeing with some of the Members, not with all the Members, in the fact that we have to streamline defence expenditure, we have to see that wastage does not take place and that it is utilised in the best possible manner, I would refrain from listening to the other Members who have suggested that there must be a cut in defence expenditure and defence must be compromised to build our economy in other areas. In the present international environment where India is under tremendous pressure, India is under tremendous pressure not because people just want to pressurise India. India is under pressure because we stand on our own feet. India is under pressure because we stand to walk along our own path. India is under pressure because we are independent and the defence protects this independence. It protects our economic independence. It

protects our political independence. There can be and there must be no compromise in defence specially at a time when we have been put under severe pressure by all the anti-Indian forces around us and in other parts of the world.

Today is the time when we have to re-think. We are again looking too much and, I have said this on a number of occasions in the House, outside the House, we are looking too much at economic or monetary or financial benefits. There is more to building a nation than just counting the numbers in the economy. That is why we are going down to the foundations of nation-building which is human resource development, which is building our people. That is why we have to have a strong defence force to protect what we are building. We cannot allow monetarist policies, monetarist feelings or industrialist lobbies to deviate us from this course. We will not allow that to happen.

The size of the deficit has been commented upon by a number of members. But, perhaps, before any of the members commented on it, I myself commented on it. And, I made my position very clear that the deficit is too high and we will not allow it to go higher this year. There have been some fears expressed in the House that we have a deficit of about, approximately, Rs. 5700 crores and by the end of the year, it will go to some vast numbers. But I have made it very clear and there is no going back on that statement—I have made the statement on the floor of this House and I am reiterating that statement that we will not allow that deficit to increase.

As I have just spoken about Defence, Defence is a very critical area. There may be a problem. If the environment around the nation changes and, there is a requirement for giving additional funds to Defence. We will be forced to give it. But we will not allow the deficit to go up. I am still sticking to that. We have got provisions in the long-term fiscal policy to apply taxes for Defence purpose if so required and we will use those provisions if it is necessary. But we do not think it will be necessary. We think we will be able to hold the deficit without going to any additional mobilisation.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

I have also made it clear to the individual Ministries that any supplementary demand must be matched by supplementary cuts. The cuts should not be in the Plan; they should not be, perhaps, even in certain productive areas of non-Plan; they should not be in the targets of the Plan, they may be in the outlays. And this is where we must change our attitudes. We are locked on to measuring our performance by the amount of money we spend. We do not really bother to see what happens at the other end of the pipeline. We keep pouring it in from this end from the Ministry. The Minister says: "Rs. 20000 crores down this one and my work is done". He does not see that nothing is coming out of the pipe the other side. And, we have created jobs right down the pipe to push it down the pipe and it is all consumed in pushing it down that pipe. So, this basic attitude must be changed. And that is why I am leaving this flexibility. I do not know what we will be able to achieve in one year. I myself feel that it is going to be a much longer exercise because it is the basic ethos that we are trying to change. What we have to do is to make the Government machine much more efficient in its delivery of our programmes. If we can do that, then we will achieve the same targets by lesser inputs. There will be no need to ask for supplementary grants. And those inputs which are released because of more efficiency in particular areas can be used for new programmes. It is not that it cannot be done. Certain basic industries, certain infrastructure industries have done it in these last two years. They have shown us that it can be done. So, Government has done it. So, there is no excuse. It is only a question of how efficiently and how quickly we can do it and to what degree we can achieve it.

There has been some comment on the inflationary pressures of the deficit. We ourselves feel that there will be no inflationary pressure from this deficit, although the deficit does look high, and there is no cause for disquiet in the House or outside on this point. The inflation rates are well under control. The food stocks are very good. The foreign-exchange situation is comfortable and there is no reason for inflation to be there,

And in fact if we look at the price situation today, the essential commodities are well under control. It is some other areas which are causing concern and we are looking at those concerns. One particular commodity which is edible oil which is causing problems in the price; but the fact is that that is deliberately done to support the farmers, to see that they get the right prices for their oilseeds produce and also to have a shift from a major oilseed importing country to a country which is self-sufficient in oilseeds or at least self-reliant in oilseeds in the first stages, we will have to see later for self-sufficiency. So, there is no real cause for any disquiet or worry on this front.

Two years ago, when this Government came in, we had said that we were going to take very strong measures on the second economy, the black economy, and we have done that. We have fulfilled and kept our promise to a very great degree. The task is a very long task. So, for me to claim that we have finished the task is not possible and I don't think anybody can claim that. But we have very definitely gone along the road that we have charted during the 84 elections and post-84 elections. We have not only gone down that road, we have achieved results on that road.

We have said that our tactics for handling black money, the second economy, would be on two levels. On the one hand we would make it easier to be honest. There would be a premium on honesty as opposed to a premium on dishonesty.

When some of my friends, specially some of our leftist friends who should know better, talk of only increasing tax rates because it gives them good copy to shout about—as opposed to good resources to redistribute amongst the poor because that is what we are trying to do. We are looking for resources to distribute amongst the poor—not slogans; we can make slogans, we don't have to do more to just generate slogans. We are looking for how we can actually have programmes to help the poor.

Incentive on honesty. The second which must go with it was very tough measures and

very strong disincentives for those who are then not honest. Now we have gone down both these paths. We have simplified the tax system. We have reduced the taxes. We have made it easier to pay taxes. This job is not complete. We have done it to a great degree. It will be continuing next year. This budget completes it in one whole area of MODVAT. So, the steps are being taken, they are taken rapidly and there is a lot of change taking place.

We have reduced the taxes, to make it easier to pay. And we have then—after doing all this, because we thought it is only fair that we must do the positive first—taken the negative action which is strong measures against those who have chosen than not to be honest. Our income from these rationalisation measures has gone up 36 per cent a very substantial amount.

The collections are from income-tax and corporate tax. Let me at this point reiterate that there is going to be no reduction on the harsh measures that are to be taken against the defaulters. There is going to be no let up and there is going to be no going soft. What we have done during these past two years—and this again needs a little emphasizing—not only have the number of searches gone up—if I remember correctly, in these last couple of years we have had over 20,000 searches—well above, higher than, what has happened before. But what is more important than just the number is the quality, the amount that we are getting. The average amount is much higher now. So these searches are not targeted at the smaller men. They are very clearly targeted at the bigger fish and that is what is giving results. So, the policy has been on the one hand to put a premium on honesty, to give some incentives for going by the rules and to get tough on those that have not. This has given very great results not only in our collections but we have also opened out a number of other areas. The revenue has increased but so has the stock market, so has the public sector bonds that have been issued. This is all money which was not in the normal circulation being brought out in to the open circulation and being productive.

We are collecting more revenue to distribute more resources. The opposition

unfortunately, they are not here otherwise I could have told them in stronger words. It is always easier to tell them in stronger words when they are here—are collecting more slogans perhaps because the elections are close by.

The long-term fiscal policy has clearly established that it is not a pro-rich policy that we are targeting. It is an anti-poverty policy. Here again I will differentiate for a minute between an anti-poverty policy and a pro-poor policy because our friends in the Opposition keep talking of a pro-poor policy. We talk of an anti-poverty policy. Anti-poverty means the removal of poverty. Pro-poor implies that poor will always remain there so that they can remain pro-poor. As long as you are pro-poor you always have to have poor; otherwise how will you be pro-poor? So there is this basic difference in our attitude and the Opposition's attitude and we should realise that they are keeping alive poverty by their policy whereas we are alleviating poverty by our policies.

Our tax strategy in this Budget has been aimed at simplifying the tax laws, making the rates more reasonable and increasing the collection with strict compliance. This year we have reduced the taxes on mass-consumption goods. MODVAT relief on the food sector covers a very large number of items—too many for me to cover here. In other specified sectors also we have given relief by giving MODVAT. The packages for specific industries will give a new thrust in these areas. The capital goods, the plastics industry, the export industry which is a continuing exercise and the electronics industry which is very special because one, it is a very high growth industry; and two, the type of employment it has really goes down to the lowest levels and to very large numbers. So it is an employment—oriented industry and even more than that it gives a lot of employment to women. So our giving a push to the electronics industry is not just because electronics is a fancy gadgetry that we are trying to push but electronics is becoming the key to almost every industry. It is getting more and more involved in every production process and it is giving employment to women who have the most difficult time in supporting themselves and in really making their position in our society.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

We have not increased taxes on capital goods and we have not increased taxes on basic intermediaries which means that there will not be an across the board price rise as there has been after many Budgets. This is a very important step that we took. Now that I have talked about everything that we have given and we have this year given approximately Rs. 595 crores as relief on taxes, all on those areas which affect mainly the poor and the lower middle class, mostly on essential items and items that are used by everybody. Now to get resources back, we have taxed those areas which are non-essential areas and luxury areas and mostly those areas which involve people who can afford to pay very easily. We have taxed the prosperous—expenditure tax on hotels for example, minimum tax on companies and the foreign travel tax.

I would like to say a couple of words here because some points have been raised on this. Some points have been raised on the minimum tax on companies. We have made note of those points and we are looking at them. And if we find that they are valid, we will bring in the required amendments at the right time.

On foreign travel tax, there is no question of removing this tax. But we think that there is a case to exempt pilgrimages from this tax. And we will definitely do that. We will have to, of course, be a little careful in defining what a 'pilgrimage' is, because, firstly, we will, of course, limit it to pilgrimages to holy places. But perhaps there will have to be some more rationalisation in that. But we will not see that it affects those who are going for genuine pilgrimages.

We have taxed luxury items—the expensive colour television sets, cars, expensive shoes while giving relief to the cheaper shoes, expensive soaps while giving relief to the cheaper soaps. So, we have done this rebalancing in each system to give benefits to the poorer people and let the richer pay for those benefits that we are giving to the poor. We have widened the tax net in this budget very much. This will reduce the black money. The direction that has been given

is very clearly egalitarian and progressive and we will keep up that direction.

I had mentioned that we are transferring Rs. 23,000 crores to the States and some Members said that this is nothing actually because interest payments have to be made and other complications. But the fact is interest payments are made on what they borrow. Those with less discipline and higher borrowings will obviously pay higher interest. Those who are more disciplined will have less interest payments. So, we should not get confused with interest rates and the transfer of funds to the the States. This year we have transferred Rs. 23,250 crores and just because the figure has not been appreciated, let me compare this with recent figures. In 1979-80, the transfer to the States was only Rs. 6,797 crores. So, it has gone almost four times between 1979-80 and 1986-87. In 1984-85, which was Indiraji's last year, the transfer had increased from Rs. 6,797 crores to Rs. 14,720 crores. She had doubled it in five years. We have redoubled it, almost redoubled it, in two years. So this is no small amount that is being given to the States. And this is being given to the States not because we are taxing more, but because we are taxing more efficiently. The machinery is more efficient. Those that should have been paying taxes are paying taxes. And when the States complain about certain constraints being put on them that they are not allowed to do this, they are not allowed to do that, it is totally incorrect because vast areas are open to them. But apart from the fact that vast areas are open to them, the extra amount that we have transferred to them is much more than they could have ever imagined or planned for. Unfortunately what we are not able to see is that this large sum of money goes for productive development. Unfortunately, too much is being still distributed on politically advantageous schemes as opposed to schemes which really help the poor come out of their poverty and we must really look at this aspect again.

This year also in our Budget the taxes that we have brought in are largely in the excise sector where the distribution is to the States. The increase in collections in the income-

tax sector again is distributed 85 per cent to the States. So, we are giving a lot more to the States. Overall, we have not increased customs duty much. We could not have played a dirty trick by balancing excise, by cutting excise and taxing those areas where we get hundred per cent and the States get nothing, but we have refrained from taking this step because we know that the development process is a joint exercise with the States and us. It is not something that only we do or only they do. And unless we work as a team, it is not going to work and we want to work as a team and we would appreciate if the State Governments also wanted to work as a team and worked as a team.

The public sectors performance has been commendable but still leaving a lot to be desired. They have increased their contribution from Rs. 7610 in 1984-85 to Rs 9053 in 1985-86, which is a very good increase, but our investments in the public sector, specially in these last two years, have been very high. If I remember correctly, we have almost done a fifty per cent increase in our public sector investment in these two years. This level of investment has never taken place before and it is necessary that we see that this gives proper return. Here, I would like to qualify proper return, because I do not believe that we can tie down all public sector to give only monetary and financial return because we are giving them more tasks to perform. If they are given only the task of giving financial return on the investment, then perhaps we need not even need public sector so much; we could do it in many other ways. But the whole role of the public sector is much deeper than that; it is to develop certain directions in our industry, it is to develop certain expertise, it is to do some training of our people, develop manpower, it is to give us certain strategic stability. So, there are many areas. We are using it as a basic tool to fopen up the remoter areas, the backward areas. So, when we are asking them to perform so many tasks, there is the cost on each one of these tasks and when we pay a little bit for each one of these, then we cannot expect the profit to be that high. The role of the public sector has to be defined better and perhaps the roles of different public

sectors have to be defined differently so that each public sector knows. There will be certain public sector industries whose role it should be only to give us good return, but that role cannot be stretched to all public sector industries. There is a social aspect to it, there is strengthening the nation aspect to it. There is a much broader prospective in which we must look at the public sector.

Our allocations for rural poverty have been increased and our thrust for poverty alleviation has been the highest that it has ever been. Now, the first step is allocating the funds. The much more important step is seeing that the Government machinery is now made efficient so that these funds really get down to the roots and we are going to see this. We have already started two years ago with a sort of fine tuning it. Upto last year we have already got a very good monitoring system for the IRDP programme. The reports are available to all Members and I hope you are getting these reports. They are available in my office. Any M.P. who wants to pick them up can just walk into my office and ask for one and he will be given a copy.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur) : They are being sent to all of us ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We are sending them to the senior members and not to the other members. Because otherwise, we would be just sending out vast copies and we would not know whether everyone would really be interested or they would only be stacked on a shelf somewhere. If someone has that much interest to be able to come upto the Prime Minister's office in the 'Anti-Poverty Programme', it is available.

Another major direction that we are looking at in this year's Budget is the setting up of the National Commission on Rural Labour. This is an area where a whole section of our society has got left in a sense and now it is time we concentrate on them. I had raised this issue first in the ILO when I spoke in the ILO in 1985 and it is continuing from that process. We are doing this.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

Once again I would like to reiterate that the thrust of the Budget is anti-poverty. It is very much pro-growth, not only pro-growth but targeting at growth in core areas such as the capital goods industry. The Budget gives stability and it continues the direction that the Congress has given the nation since before Independence, that it has continued giving the nation during these 40 years of Independence. We will press forward in fulfilling these policies and promises that were made at Independence.

One of the areas that we are looking at and which is related to the growth of the economy is jobs for the youth. We have looked at it from a larger perspective. We can and the easier way is to just create lots of jobs which are not required and are not productive. But that does not really help the youth because the job which is not productive cannot be fulfilling to the person who is doing that job. It will only cause frustration and cause more problems. We have to look at employment starting with education. And that is what we have started. We have started at the primary level because that is most important. But the primary level will take time to give dividends for the youth and to the nation. So we have also started at the upper level where dividends for the youth will come immediately, and where the nation will start getting the benefits from this input immediately. We have to dovetail that with the growth in our industries, with the growth in our agriculture and see that we create the right type of individual who will fit into the job. Too many times we are creating individuals who cannot fit into the requirements of our nation and they fulfil the requirements of some other nations who find it easier to pinch our brains and use them. In some ways I do not consider that a loss because we will develop and we will bring that brain back and use it in a higher developed form. But immediately it is a loss. We have invested in their training which is lost. So, we must invest in training which is more relevant to our growth needs and to our strategic and development perspectives. This again we are doing through the Human Resources Development Ministry. Employment must also be linked with

the growth in industry and growth in agriculture and this is what we are achieving by our policies.

One more point was made about tax deduction on 194-E. There are certain very definite problems on this and we are having a review of this provision. Again we will bring this out at the appropriate time. It is not all bad. There are some definitely positive aspects to it. We do not want to kill those while looking at the negative aspects.

I thank all the members who participated in the debate once more for the quality of their participation. Thank you Sir.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichettipalayam) : Any rise in the Income Tax exemption limit—are you going to raise it from Rs. 18,000 to Rs. 25,000 ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I thought that it had already been made clear in the House yesterday.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU : It may be raised at least to Rs. 20,000.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We have no intention of raising the I.T. limit. I can be absolutely clear about that, because all the Pay Commissions and everyone that took into consideration what should be given, had also no intention of asking us to raise the limit. Otherwise, they would have given different numbers.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the Demands for Excess Grants (General) for 1984-85 to vote.

The question is :

“That the respective excess sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to make good the excess on the respective grants during the year ended 31st day of March, 1985, in respect of

221 *Genl. Budget 87-88— PHALGUNA 22, 1908 (SAKA) D.G. on Account (Genl.) 222*
Genl. Dis. & D.E.G. (Genl.) 84-85 87-88

the following demands entered in the second column thereof :

Demands Nos. 17, 20, 39, 57 and 59".

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : The Demands for Excess Grants (General) for 1984-85 are passed.

Demands for Excess Grants (General) for 1984-85 Voted by Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant Voted by the House
		Rs.
I EXPENDITURE MET FROM REVENUE		
20.	Defence Services-Navy	22,15,38,252
39.	Currency, Coinage and Mint	3,41,61,165
57.	Chandigarh	12,00,15,368
59.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	40,78,334
II. EXPENDITURE MET FROM CAPITAL		
17	Capital Outlay on Posts and Telegraphs	20,22,80,919

Demands for Grants on Account (General) for 1987-88 Voted by Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on Account Voted by the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	2	3	4
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE			
1.	Agriculture	42,10,00,000	2,06,00,000
2.	Other Services of Department of Agriculture and Cooperation	36,17,00,000	21,63,00,000
3.	Department of Agriculture Research and Education	28,82,00,000	...

12.56 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT (GENERAL), 1987-88

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the Demands for Grants on Account (General) for 1987-88 to vote.

The question is :

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the third column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India, on account, for or towards defraying the charges during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1988, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the fourth column thereof against Demands Nos. 1 to 15, 15A, 16 to 25, 27, 28, 30 to 84, 86, 88 to 92".

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : The Demands for Grants on Account (General) for 1987-88 are passed.