

by all over agencies. So this should be investigated fully.

**(iv) SPREADING OF JAUNDICE IN AN EPIDEMIC FORM IN HILL DISTRICTS OF UTTAR PRADESH**

**श्री हरीश रावत (अलमोड़ा)** : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं नियम 377 के अन्तर्गत लोक महत्व की बातों की ओर मानवीय रक्षा मंत्री, गृह मंत्री और स्वास्थ्य मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

उत्तर प्रदेश के पर्वतीय जिलों में पीलिया नाम का रोग भव्यकर रूप से फैला हुआ है। रानीखेत व उसके निकटवर्ती ज़ोलों में इस रोग से कई लोगों की मौत हो चुकी है। इन महामारी को रोकने में स्वास्थ्य विभाग बिल्कुल असफल रहा है। इन रोग का पर्वतीय ज़ोलों में भव्यकर रूप से फैलने का कारण स्पष्ट रूप से जात नहीं हो पा रहा है। ज़ोलीय जनता को शका है कि इस रोग का कारण विगत वर्ष पर्वतीय क्षेत्र में हुए कुछ विस्फोटों से सम्बन्धित है। ये विस्फोट उस समय हुए जब कि कुछ विदेशी नागरिक इस सीमान्त ज़ोल में शकास्पद रूप से घूमते हुए पाये गये हैं।

ज़ोलीय जनता के स्वास्थ्य के साथ साथ देश के सीमान्त की सुरक्षा का मदाल भी ज़ुड़ा हुआ है। अत केन्द्रीय सरकार अपनी किसी ऐसी ऐजेंसी ड्वारा इस बात की निपटना से जाच करवाये।

**(v) REPORTED CASES OF CRIMINAL ASSAULT ON WOMEN IN BIHAR AND MADHYA PRADESH**

**SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura)**: Under rule 377 I want to raise one matter. On 13th of March the Patriot has reported two incidents of rape from two states under President's rule viz. Bihar and Madhya Pradesh. In Bihar, a young Harijan woman of Bijwania village in Champatia block under West Champaran was criminally assaulted by a co-villager. The police have registered a case. No arrest has been made so far. At Jabalpur in Madhya Pradesh two young sisters, one of them married, were raped at the point of knife and forced to cook food by about a dozen drunk men who besieged their house in the thinly populated locality on the 11th March. Such news of rape are often reported in the Press now-a-days. Many more incidents take place which are not reported. In view of the fact that

rape should be considered a crime against humanity, I draw the attention of the government to take immediate steps for apprehending and punishing the culprits in these two cases, as well as to devise more effective mean in the legal, administrative and social fields to curb this evil effectively in all parts of the country.

**SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh)**: Under rule 377 such cases are brought to the notice of the House. The whole nation feels concerned about such serious cases. Would you ask the Minister to tell us what steps are being taken so that we may know.

**MR. SPEAKER**: It is brought to the notice of government.

**SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV**: The Minister should make a statement.

**MR. SPEAKER**: We cannot do it. Action has to be initiated by them.

12.20 hrs.

**GENERAL BUDGET, 1980-81—GENERAL DISCUSSION, DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (ON ACCOUNT), 1980-81, AND SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1979-80—Contd.**

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN)**: Mr. Speaker, I have heard with great interest and attention the contribution made by all sections of the House. In the concluding part of my address I invited the House to offer constructive suggestions for framing the regular budget for the year 1980-81. A large number of suggestions have been made on the floor of the House such as expanded expenditure on some of the projects like irrigation, industries, rural development, support to village and rural industries, etc. I am thankful to all the Members for the various suggestions they have made. I am sure that in the revamped budget which will come up in the course of the year these suggestions will be reflected and adequate provisions made therefor.

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

I did not naturally expect any suggestions with regard to increasing the taxes. Therefore, I am not disappointed. However, I expected that there may be some suggestions for reduction of taxes and singularly there was none. I am not going to draw any inference that the House does not want any reduction in taxes. Therefore, I will not presume that, nor will I go on the basis....

(Interruptions)

I only pointed out that I will not draw any inference that the House does not want any reduction in taxes. The relief in taxes will also be before the Government when it comes forward in regular Budget.

I propose to classify the criticism into several heads and then address myself to the items one by one.

A great deal of debate was devoted to the question whether the Congress Government in 30 years did better or the Janata Government in 33 months did better in the service of the country. In my opinion it is a sterile debate. In fact I should say that the debate has ended with the massive mandate which the people have given to the Congress, and the matter has been set at rest for at least five long years. The people have endorsed the policies and programmes of the Congress (I) and have therefore, .....

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum):** In a massive mandate Congress got only 45 per cent votes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** No interruptions please. No discussions.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** The things speak for themselves. We had 352 Members who are sitting on this side. It is an answer to what they grumble about. The point I was making was that at the time when this Government was called upon to shoulder the responsibility of administration, it was faced with the situation which was almost stagnant and this has not been controverted by any-

body—a massive deficit of Rs. 2700 crores, a stagnant industrial production, the GNP declining by 1 to 2 per cent, and above all the price spiral which has been initiated by the last Government. Therefore, when I made the point before the House, I said I am not making it with a view to put a blame on anybody but to make the House and the country fully aware of the magnitude of the problem that we are called upon to face. Therefore, my submission to the House is that it is a purposeless debate to go on saying whether Janata Government did not do in the last 33 months this or that or whether the Congress did or did not do in 30 years. We have to put our shoulder to the wheel and see that the economy starts moving. In this connection I would even mention one or two things. It is possible to quote statistics and misquote them also. Statistics can be used and abused. In fact Shri Agarwal stated that during his period—1978-79, the price index had declined by 0.1 per cent. I can quote another figure that during the prime ministership of Shrimati Gandhi in 1974-76 the price index decreased by 11.6 per cent. What is the use of quoting these figures? (Interruptions). I am speaking extempore and not reading from a text. If you interrupt, my thoughts will get disrupted. If you want to do it you can do it, but if you want to hear me, please do not interrupt. I did not open my lips during the entire debate. Though many things were said during that time which hurt me, yet I did not open my lips. It is part of the game that you should also give me the same kind of courtesy, which I extended to you. I was not going to say that this period was a golden age and the other period is an age in which we all suffered. I only said, It is misquoting the figures and it is not proper to quote these figures. I can give you another instance. The prices had risen in the last week of February and that was also mentioned during the course of the Question Hour today. They said, it had risen by 1.1 per cent. But during the next week, it rose only

by 0.3 per cent. These figures do not prove anything. What you have to take into account is the trend over a period, which you have to watch carefully and see how the prices behave, how the economy behaves and how the country develops. Therefore, I do not propose to spend time on controverting some of the statistics which were given by the other side. As I said, these figures can be controverted, but it will not take you or me or the country anywhere.

The second point of criticism levelled against the Government is that there is no direction, no statement or policy and no indication of what the Government proposes to do in many things. In my budget speech itself, I said that the budget statements do not reflect adequately the present Government's policies and programmes. This is an interim budget for carrying on the administration for another two or three months, within which time we will come forward with a regular budget containing our policy statements, our priorities and so on. In the interim budget you cannot give any indication of the policies without backing it up by proposals for fulfilling them with adequate provision in the budget in figures for carrying out those policies. If I merely enunciate the policies saying, "We are going to do this, that and the other", it would have been easy for anyone on the other side to point out, "You have said you will do all these things, but where is the provision for it in the budget?" Therefore, in the interim budget, we never give policies. It is an attempt to carry on the present administration until we come forward with a regular statement of our intentions and our programmes.

I am sorry I was not here when Shri Satish Agarwal spoke. I was caught up in the other House. I have great regard for his competence and I would have loved to hear him. But I have read his speech and I have got the verbatim record of his speech with me. Mr. Agarwal said that the Go-

vernment has not come forward with an Economic Survey, which should have preceded the presentations of the budget. In fact, he used some harsh words; I do not want to repeat them. I would like to remind him that when, he presented the interim budget in 1977, his Government also did not present an Economic Survey.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat):**  
All in the same boat.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. At least, we should have common standards. We have nonetheless broadly indicated some of the priorities in the Budget speech. For instance, we have said that we will lay emphasis on the 20-Point Programme and particularly its emphasis on the weaker sections of society. Fortunately, I have been able to take a meeting with the nationalised banks and able to secure their concurrence for the increase in the lending to the weaker sections of society from 33.1/3 percent to 40 per cent. We have also mentioned that we will have an apex agricultural bank which will cater to the need of the agriculture as IDBI does for the needs of the industry.

Then the third point which really disturbs all of us is the price situation. Almost every Member irrespective of the side from which he spoke, mentioned about the continuing rise in the price situation in the country. I do not pretend that after this Government came, the prices have not increased. The trend is there but in my opinion the trend is at a lower pace than it was in the last 7 or 8 months of 1979. Here we have to take some concerted measures for the purpose of containing prices. We proposed to do a number of things in this regard. It may be worth taking time of the House to detail some of the steps which we proposed to take in respect of the price situation. Firstly, as far as the money supply part is concerned, we propose to follow the restrictive credit policy with a view to control the expansion of money

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

supply. This is a very important tool in our hands. At the same time, I want to assure the House as well as the community outside that the credit control will be very discriminating. It will be applied only against those who are indulging in storing, hoarding and black-marketing. It will not in any way come in the way of productive enterprises and productive efforts. Already the Reserve Bank is taking action to see that the productive effort should not in any way be effected and they are seeing to it that the credit curb which is absolutely necessary in the circumstances, does not affect the expansion of production in the country.

Then with regard to supply management, we are also going to see that there is some kind of a public distribution system in which the controlled commodities and scarce goods will be supplied through the cooperatives, the fair price shops, the super markets and so on.

**PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur):**  
Village panchayats.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** Well, this is a suggestion which will be taken note of.

Unless there is a two pronged attack, one on the hoarders and black-marketeers and the other, to bring about efficient distribution, it will not really help the people of the country. Therefore, we are going to use rather strongly, rather severely, the Preventive Detention Act against the hoarders and the blackmarketeers. In this, I hope, we will have the co-operation of all sections of the House because, once we take action under the Preventive Detention Act, there is likely to be a hue and cry from several quarters, particularly from the vested interests, saying that the personal liberties are affected. It is very necessary to remember that unless we take some severe action in this regard, we will not be able to unearth and bring into the market the scarce goods which are available within the country.

At the same time, we realise that the supplies in this country are not enough. So, in some vital areas we do propose to augment the supply by imports. We propose to import about 2 million tonnes of cement. We have already taken action to import edible oil. We have taken measures to tie-up the oil requirements of this country for the entire period of 1980-81, and this has been done after this Government came to power; taking advantage of the friendly relations that we have with some of the oil producing countries, we have been able to tie-up with them the oil supply, so that we may be assured that the oil supplies will reach us and we will not be starved of oil. But that does not mean that it will solve the problem. As hon. Members are aware, the price of oil is going up every day, and the price is not determined by us, but it is determined by the OPEC. This increased price of oil is going to cause considerable strain on the resources of the country. But, nevertheless, so far as supplies are concerned, I am very happy that we have tied up the needs of this country and we have been assured of the necessary supplies.

The fourth point which was raised by a number of hon. Members and which caused considerable concern in the House is with regard to planning. Many members said that we are ushering in another era of plan holiday. I want to dispel any such impression immediately. This Government is committed to the principle of planning. It has never accepted the concept of a rolling plan, where the targets are adjusted to achieve them. We are going to set the targets which we want to achieve and, if we fail, we will come forward and confess the failure to achieve the targets. We will not bluff, saying that the targets have been realistically adjusted to suit the needs of the country.

So far as the plan is concerned, even though it is an interim budget, we have made adequate provision to see that the Plan process is not in any way

affected. I will give some figures to reinforce this statement. So far as the Central Plan is concerned, the Plan provision last year was Rs. 6,015 crores. As against that, we have made an outlay, even in the interim budget, of Rs. 6,573 crores, a step up of nearly 10 per cent. We feel that this will have to be revised upwards again, because there are certain vital sectors which need a heavier investment, like coal, transport and power. All these areas do require more investment, and we may have to revise this upwards. But even as it is, the 10 per cent step up must clear any possible misapprehension that the Plan is being given up, or there is going to be a Plan holiday.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Ten per cent at what price level because prices are going up all the time? That 10 per cent does not mean anything.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** If taxes are also raised at the same percentage, would the hon. friend support it? After all, the Plan is according to the resources. If you say that the cost of living index has gone up and therefore the Plan requires greater amount, then the taxes also will have to be indexed in the same way and if it is indexed and collected, would the Members support it?

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** You have no other alternative.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** Therefore, we will have to go by a yardstick and money is the yardstick in which we function. And according to the present yardstick, namely, money, we are saying that we have stepped up central plan outlay by 10 per cent already and we are going to do it further.

So far as the State budgets are concerned, there has been a phenomenal step up of 17 per cent in this interim budget itself. As against Rs. 5,738 crores in 1979-80, the proposed outlays are Rs. 6,723 crores and this will clear any misapprehension

in the minds of anybody that either the plan is being slowed down or that there is going to be any plan holiday.

I would also take this opportunity to mention that the current year's plan will be dovetailed into the total plan which we will form for the years 1980-85 and it will form an integral part of the total plan that we envisage. Naturally our priorities differ and the Plan which has now been framed does not reflect the priorities which we have before us or the programmes which we have set before the people in the Election Manifesto. So, we will have to re-vamp the Plan to suit our priorities and our election manifesto and when this is done, we will dovetail the 1980-81 Plan into the Five-Year Plan which will be framed. I want to disabuse the minds of people that there is any remote chance of the Plan either being given up or holiday being declared in respect of Plan and so on.

I now come to the next one or two points. Mr. Aggarwal in his speech has said—in fact he taunted me—that:

"You have adopted the same customs revenue, you have adopted the same excise revenue. You, as a Member speaking from the other side, attacked the surcharge on income-tax and also the excise duties. Now you have adopted the same thing, and it shows, therefore, that you have adopted the Janata Budget."

Well, I do want to tell him that if he wants to have some temporary satisfaction until I bring the regular budget. I will not grudge it. But I want to know from this criticism whether he now wants that the excise duties should be reduced. That is a Budget which he himself put forward and pushed it very hard in the House against our opposition. I would like to know what his atti-

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

tude is because at that time Mr. Aggarwal very stoutly defended the same excise proposals and in spite of the very strong criticism which was levelled by the other side he got it through. Now he seems to say that this is wrong. If he has second thoughts on it, I welcome it.

Now, I cannot really say what is going to be the shape of the taxation. But Mr. Aggarwal is also a very clever man. He might have thought of taunting me. He was sort of taunting me by saying, "Oh, you have adopted the same thing. Now come forward with your new proposals." If he thought that I would disclose my mind before the regular Budget is brought forward merely because he taunted me, he is very much mistaken. It is not going to come out till the regular Budget is framed and till we present it to the House. Therefore, I do not attach great value to that kind of statement.

He also defended the gold auctions. Therefore I am sorry he did something which is indefensible. All the time we have said that this is a pernicious policy, that we are squandering away the national assets. This is a view which we had taken when we were on the other side. This is the view which we have taken now and we have said there will be no gold auctions at all. Mr. Agarwal, on the other hand, did defend the gold auctions, but since they themselves gave it up, I think wiser counsels prevailed and perhaps wisdom dawned, though a little late in the day. But I want to make it clear to the House that our policy with regard to gold auctions is that we will not have any auction, we will not sell any gold.

A point was made by my esteemed friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, and also by a number of other hon. Members including the elder statesman, Shri Charan Singh, and that is that the monopoly houses have been growing

in this country, that the rich have become richer. Here I want to point out some facts. Not that I am going to say that they should grow, not that I say that they must develop, but certain facts must be brought to the notice of the House and the country. The major part of this so-called growth in assets is due to the inflationary price rise in the country. If somebody in 1956 had Rs. 258 crores and now has Rs. 1,100 crores, it is largely due to that.

Secondly, a significant part of these assets are in the form of shareholdings in these companies by the public sector enterprises like the IDBI, IFC etc.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** That is why I said they are financing them.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** Therefore, when you say that they have increased their assets, actually it is the IDBI, IFC and other public sector institutions which have increased their assets. I will not say you, but your party has a congenital opposition to the classes. We do not share that, and we cannot go the whole length that you go or that you want us to go.

**SHRI BIJU PATNAIK (Kendrapara):** Is that a credit?

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** Credit or discredit, the people have decided on whose side credit is. We are saying what we are. It is for you and for the country to judge, and they have judged. We have said what we are and I say now that the greater part of the assets are held by the Government, by the public sector institutions. Therefore, do not use it as a whipping boy for everything, saying that in this country the assets of some people have gone up and so on.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Are these funds controlled by you also? Funds are given to them, but not controlled by you?

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** Yes, we have on the Board of Directors,

wherever funds have been given by the IDBI, IFC, etc., directors named by them; and therefore you cannot say we have no control. Therefore, this is an argument which is put forward to hoodwink the public, to give the impression that Tata or Birla has become rich. On the other hand, what has become rich is the corporation in which the Government holds a substantial interest, the company in which the IDBI, IFC and all these public sector institutions have increased their investments and assets. Therefore, please do not create a false impression that individuals have become richer. The corporations have become richer partly because—I would not say wholly—of the investments that we have made the financial institutions have made in those institutions.

**SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY** (Calcutta South): You are creating a false impression. I challenge, I can prove that Tatas and Birlas have increased their assets.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** I am a peace loving man. I never accept challenges. I cannot fight.

**SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY:** This is an intellectual challenge.

(*Interruptions*)

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** There are some very valid points made by our elder statesman, Shri Charan Singh. He said that the rural poverty should be removed. Yes, it is. But all that we say is that not only the rural poverty, but also the urban poverty should be removed. Poverty, whether it is in rural areas or in urban areas, wherever it is, must be removed. There is as much poverty in the urban areas as in the rural areas and there is as much distress among the urban middle class as in the rural middle class. Therefore, any policy that we want to frame should be one to relieve the distress among the lower and middle

class whether they are in the rural areas or in the urban areas. To the extent that there must be emphasis on the rural areas, there is no quarrel between us. We have not said that we are not in favour of eradicating poverty in the rural areas. On the other hand, a bulk of our 20-point programme is intended to benefit the rural poor. Therefore, I do not know why he should have made it a charge against this Government that the rural sector has been neglected. On the other hand, our emphasis is equally on the urban and the rural areas.

**SHRI N. G. RANGA:** One is 80 per cent and the other is 20 per cent.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** Just because it is 20 per cent, you cannot ignore them. You cannot say that it is 20 per cent and therefore, poverty in the urban areas should be ignored.

There is another point which he made about the statement I mentioned in my budget speech viz., that we left a considerable volume of food and foreign exchange, which together gave a good start for the Janata Government as against a very poor start for us in 1980. I made a comparative statement. I did not want to take credit for all that we had done in those days. It was only a comparative statement of the situation in which they came to power and the situation in which we have come into power. Mr. Charan Singh said that the buffer stock in food which we had left behind was due to the import of foodgrains which we made. Yes, nobody denies it. Facts are facts. In the past we had imported foodgrains and consumed them. But during that period, that Government had only husbanded those imports and they saw to it that a sizable buffer stock is built so that when the next Government came, they could start with a favourable buffer stock of 18 million tonnes. That was the point I was making and the fact that

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

we imported does not detract from our performance and the fact that we husbanded those resources very carefully and left it as a legacy is a matter for which we should get at least some credit. That is all I am saying.

The last point I will now deal with is about the Asian Games. Choudhry Sahib was rather unhappy that we should spend Rs. 33 crores on Asian Games. I do not know if all sections of the House share that view.

But I must point out that it was the Janata Government which first accepted to hold the Asian Games in Delhi and then they wanted to go back on that. This Government thought that it would be quite improper, having accepted to hold the Asian Games here, to go back on that, for if we did so, we would cut a very sorry and a poor figure in the international world. Therefore, we thought that we should have the Asian Games in Delhi.

I have not touched upon all the points raised by hon. Members. But I will have a fuller opportunity to deal with them when the regular Budget is presented and then there will be more meat for you to attack than now.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put all the cut motions moved to the Demands for Grants on Account for 1980-81 to vote together unless any hon. Member desires that any of his cut motions may be put separately.

की संसदीय वार्ता (वर्षा) में चाहता हूँ कि  
मेरे दोनों संसदों 100 वटा 107 वटा  
से रख लाएं।

MR. SPEAKER: Any other hon. Member? No.

Now, I shall put cut motion Nos. 100 and 107 moved by Shri Ram Avtar Shastri to the vote of the Avatar Shastri to the vote of the House.

Cut motions Nos. 100 and 107 were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I now put all the remaining cut motions together to vote.

Cut motions were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the Demands for Grants on Account for 1980-81 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, 1981, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 1 to 106."

The motion was adopted.

*Demands for Grants on Account (General) for 1980-81 Voted by Lok Sabha*

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on Account voted by the House	
		1	2
		3	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	Department of Agriculture and Cooperation;	1,17,59,000	
2	Agriculture . . . . .	24,82,92,000	299,80,23,000

		Revenue	Capital
		Rs.	Rs.
3	Fisheries . . . . .	6,55,35,000	6,16,65,000
4	Animal Husbandry and Dairy Development . . . . .	40,05,15,000	6,18,97,000
5	Forest . . . . .	4,58,18,000	24,50,000
6	Cooperation . . . . .	8,72,16,000	17,25,60,000
7	Department of Food . . . . .	205,36,60,000	15,67,69,000
8	Department of Agricultural Research and Education . . . . .	6,60,000	..
9	Payments to Indian Council of Agricultural Research . . . . .	30,20,30,000	..
10	Department of Irrigation . . . . .	11,35,93,000	1,93,61,000
11	Ministry of Commerce and Civil Supplies . . . . .	72,81,000	..
12	Foreign Trade and Export Production . . . . .	136,52,12,000	21,73,66,000
13	Civil Supplies . . . . .	2,94,20,000	1,79,08,000
14	Ministry of Communications . . . . .	83,25,000	3,32,00,000
15	Overseas Communications Service . . . . .	5,52,70,000	10,30,44,000
16	Posts and Telegraphs—Working Expenses . . . . .	264,49,51,000	..
17	Posts and Telegraphs—Dividend to General Revenues, Appropriations to Reserve Funds and Repayment of Loans from General Revenues . . . . .	79,81,94,000	..
18	Capital Outlay on Posts and Telegraphs . . . . .	..	148,52,91,000
19	Ministry of Defence . . . . .	40,02,15,000	31,30,53,000
20	Defence Services—Army . . . . .	748,70,54,000	..
21	Defence Services—Navy . . . . .	76,88,15,000	..
22	Defence Services—Air Force . . . . .	287,57,66,000	..
23	Defence Services—Pensions . . . . .	67,08,33,000	..
24	Capital Outlay on Defence Services . . . . .	..	87,84,02,000
25	Department of Education . . . . .	81,23,000	..
26	Education . . . . .	75,32,00,000	1,78,47,000
27	Department of Culture . . . . .	3,93,45,000	..
28	Archaeology . . . . .	2,29,33,000	..
29	Ministry of Energy . . . . .	21,88,71,000	169,52,68,000
30	Ministry of External Affairs . . . . .	45,88,82,000	6,45,72,000
31	Ministry of Finance . . . . .	15,17,83,000	47,13,000

2

3

		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs
32	Customs	16,36,89,000	2,08,33,000
33	Union Excise Duties	20,53,33,000	..
31	Taxes on Income, Estate Duty, Wealth Tax and Gift Tax	21,79,60,000	..
35	Stamps	6,93,40,000	31,14,000
36	Audit	27,36,16,000	..
37	Currency, Coinage and Mint	15,76,32,000	6,11,61,000
38	Pensions	21,51,30,000	..
39	Opium and Alkaloid Factories	23,63,54,000	29,03,000
40	Transfers to State Governments	448,21,05,000	..
41	Other Expenditure of the Ministry of Finance	421,84,55,000	322,66,53,000
42	Loans to Government Servants, etc.	..	31,73,60,000
43	Ministry of Health and Family Welfare	40,62,000	..
44	Medical and Public Health	57,82,45,000	21,37,86,000
45	Family Welfare	51,87,22,000	..
46	Ministry of Home Affairs	1,06,37,000	..
47	Cabinet	41,71,000	..
48	Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms	3,37,68,000	..
49	Police	87,18,87,000	3,29,67,000
50	Census	6,47,40,000	..
51	Other Expenditure of the Ministry of Home Affairs	76,63,60,000	37,83,54,000
52	Delhi	56,61,64,000	32,94,83,000
53	Chandigarh	9,41,77,000	5,25,68,000
54	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	10,20,68,000	6,39,25,000
55	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	1,01,22,000	1,20,91,000
56	Lakshadweep	2,18,47,000	59,78,000
57	Ministry of Industry	1,27,91,000	..
58	Industries	14,13,48,000	89,31,64,000
59	Village and Small Industries	9,84,39,000	71,33,000
60	Textiles, Handloom and Handicrafts	37,05,20,000	20,59,47,000
61	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting	35,10,000	..
62	Information and Publicity	8,09,87,000	36,82,000
63	Broadcasting	26,03,2,000	5,46,79,000
64	Ministry of Labour	33,63,000	..

			Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs
65	Labour and Employment	.	21,04,26,000	5,25,000
66	Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs	.	9,20,22,000	33,000
67	Administration of Justice	.	16,07,000	..
68	Ministry of Petroleum, Chemicals and Fertilizers	.	41,29,000	..
69	Petroleum and Petro-Chemicals Industries	.	44,46,04,000	32,04,57,000
70	Chemicals and Fertilizers Industries	.	1,22,76,30,000	1,10,28,03,000
71	Ministry of Planning	.	1,30,000	..
72	Statistics	.	5,49,50,000	..
73	Planning Commission	.	1,61,44,000	..
74	Ministry of Rural Reconstruction	.	1,10,00,00,000	28,32,23,000
75	Ministry of Shipping and Transport	.	1,35,54,000	..
76	Roads	.	38,39,49,000	31,97,33,000
77	Ports, Light-houses and Shipping	.	27,97,63,000	60,15,51,000
78	Road and Inland Water Transport	.	50,13,000	13,58,48,000
79	Ministry of Social Welfare	.	18,62,40,000	31,00,000
80	Department of Steel	.	5,45,93,000	1,30,76,00,000
81	Department of Mines	.	21,51,71,000	26,21,00,000
82	Department of Coal	.	37,46,58,000	1,78,52,63,000
83	Department of Supply	.	9,90,000	..
84	Supplies and Disposals	.	3,11,48,000	..
85	Department of Rehabilitation	.	8,47,41,000	3,46,37,000
86	Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation	.	20,55,000	..
87	Meteorology	.	5,87,46,000	2,76,24,000
88	Aviation	.	10,10,95,000	14,71,17,000
89	Tourism	.	1,69,09,000	2,51,57,000
90	Ministry of Works and Housing	.	51,44,000	..
91	Public Works	.	38,08,46,000	9,70,93,000
92	Water Supply and Sewerage	.	22,16,30,000	..
93	Housing and Urban Development	.	7,46,96,000	17,97,42,000
94	Stationery and Printing	.	15,86,94,000	..
95	Department of Atomic Energy	.	20,84,000	..

1 2 3

		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
96	Atomic Energy Research, Development and Industrial Projects . . . . .	32,00,45,000	22,44,66,000
97	Nuclear Power Schemes . . . . .	19,64,86,000	19,62,72,000
98	Department of Electronics . . . . .	3,78,00,000	2,16,00,000
99	Department of Science and Technology . . . . .	11,82,02,000	35,00,000
100	Survey of India . . . . .	9,55,75,000	..
101	Grants to Council of Scientific and Industrial Research . . . . .	19,16,60,000	..
102	Department of Space . . . . .	14,66,84,000	12,23,40,000
103	Lok Sabha . . . . .	2,15,17,000	..
104	Rajya Sabha . . . . .	73,05,000	..
105	Department of Parliamentary Affairs . . . . .	8,18,000	..
106	Secretariat of the Vice-President . . . . .	2,10,000	..

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I shall put all the cut motions moved to the Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1979-80 to vote together unless any hon. Member desires that any of his cut motions may be put separately.

Any hon. Member?—No.

So, I put all the cut motions moved to the Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1979-80 to vote together.

All the cut motions were put and negatived.

13.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put all the Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1979-80 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

“That the respective Supplementary 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, to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1980 in respect of the following demands entered in the second column thereof—

Demands Nos. 14 to 16, 18 to 20, 22, 42, 53, 56, 59 and 67.

The motion was adopted.

*Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for 1979-80 voted by Lok Sabha*

No. of Demand	Name of the Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant Voted by the House	
I	2	3	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
14	Ministry of Communications	1,000	..

1

2

3

		Revenue	Capital
		Rs.	Rs.
15	Overseas Communications Service .	1,000	..
16	Posts and Telegraphs Working Expenses .	13,53,75,000	..
18	Capital Outlay on Posts and Telegraphs .	..	1,000
19	Ministry of Defence . . .	7,31,25,000	..
20	Defence Services—Army . . .	13,00,00,000	..
22	Defence Services—Air Force .	10,00,00,000	..
42	Other Expenditure of the Ministry of Finance	35,00,00,000	..
53	Delhi . . .	8,34,31,000	..
56	Dadra and Nagar Haveli . . .	..	32,00,000
59	Industries . . .	..	1,000
67	Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs . . .	11,53,00,000	..

13.01 hrs.

APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL,\* 1980

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of a part of the financial year 1980-81.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I introduce† the Bill.

I move†:

"That the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of a part of the financial year 1980-81, be taken into consideration".

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of a part of the financial year 1980-81, be taken into consideration."

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum): Just now the Hon. Finance Minister

\*Published in Gazette of India Extra ordinary, Part II, section 2, dated 14-3-1980.

†Introduced and moved with the recommendation of the President.