

12.25 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1976-77—
Contd.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1976-77—

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we shall take up further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Now, the hon. Minister, Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that I could not be present in the House throughout the day; I missed the first two speeches but, I came to the third which is also an important speech; I could have the satisfaction of having heard pointedly the views of the Opposition.

I can assure those hon. Members whose good speeches I could not listen to as I was not there, that I have read them very carefully; I must compliment the Members for the quality of the debate and the constructive suggestions they have made in the course of the discussion.

Some Members mentioned here that they did not have an opportunity to discuss foreign affairs but I can assure them that I shall be willing to discuss that as many times as possible. As regards the discussion on the international situation, whenever the occasion arises, there will be no unwillingness on the part of myself or the Ministry of External Affairs to discuss this matter. Naturally, we meet quite often in the Consultative Committee where we have the advantage of listening to the views and suggestions of many of the leading members who are especially interested in the problems of foreign affairs. But I can understand that the debate in this House is much more important because it is not only a debate here but it is a debate that goes to the people of the country as well.

Therefore, Sir, the debate was very useful. The one important point that I always find in the debate—when I say 'always', I mean last time and this time because I have the experience of only two debates—is that the debate on foreign affairs—naturally because of the way the policy has been evolved in the course of last 25 or 30 years—transcends the division of parties in this House and reaches a sort of national consensus as far as the basic features of foreign policy are concerned. That is something very important.

I, therefore, have an easy task, because as far as the basic features of foreign policy are concerned they are not doubted. What are the basic features of our foreign policy? First and foremost is that we pursue an independent foreign policy based on non-alignment; a basic urge emanating from our foreign policy is the ceaseless search for world peace and cooperation—I will explain it further again; we believe in friendship towards all and malice towards none, we have been in the vanguard of the struggle against colonialism, imperialism and racism; we have been active in our support for liberation movement whether in our bilateral relations or in multi-lateral forums. Our approach has always been one of constructive cooperation and not of confrontation or conflict. It is, therefore, very heartening to have reaffirmation of the broad consensus in support of this approach in the course of the debate.

With these introductory remarks I would now emphasise two or three very important aspects. I would not go into every detail—30 tour-d'-horin as they call it—but if we have to see the present status of the war and peace problem, as it is called, at the world level it is better to review the international situation as it is today.

In order to do that one will have to take a synoptic view of the international situation as it has evolved since

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

World War II in terms of its political problems, economic problems and technological development because what is happening today has something to do with progress and developments in these three basic areas.

My friend, Shri Dinesh Singh, referred to the problem of detente and picturesquely stated that we had reached the peak of detente at Helsinki and possibly would be drifting towards the valley. This is a very picturesque assessment. I can tell you that maybe it is a drift towards a valley but a valley perhaps at a higher level.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore):
Higher than the peak!

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN

Yes. I will tell you why. This is so because we believe as a nation that detente is in the interest of humanity; detente is in the interest of the world and detente is in the interest of the developing countries. May be what you say is right, in a way, because under the pressure of electioneering that is taking place in most of the western world, *detente* seems to have become a rather unfashionable word, if not a dirty word. It has come to this stage. But *detente* is not just an accident. That is why I say it is much better to see the developments, the policies, the international situation, as they have evolved in the last 25—30 years.

In the economic field, what we have seen is that both the socialist world and the western world have made tremendous progress in their industrial strength and industrial power. Particularly the western world has seen unprecedented growth of trade. I think nowhere else in the history of the world has it happened. The volume of the trade and the rate at which the trade has grown in the last 25—30 years is completely unprecedented. The unfortunate part of it is that the lion's share of it, more than lion's share of it, has gone to the big powers, the western powers. But the fact remains that this has happened, and this has

created the problem that the division and inequality among the nations has widened with this growing trade, growing economic strength, and growing industrial power. Their concentration in a very few countries' hands has certainly created further exploitation, though we have become free countries and independent countries. So this is one aspect of the economic situation.

Secondly the political situation. What has happened in the last 25 years? We have seen that the classical, colonial powers have lost their power. I think the process started with India and proceeded further and we see today that most of the continents are completely free, except some pockets in South Africa, some pockets in the South Pacific, some islands in the Indian Ocean. But this liberation process has started. We have seen the last empire of Portugal dismantled and we see that it has created some new problems which we are facing and which we will have to face.

So in the political field, we have seen this dismantling of colonial empires as a result of the liberation struggles which started it. I would like to tell my hon. friend Prof. Mukerjee, that I entirely agree with him; when we speak of national struggles, a national struggle without its economic, progressive and political content cannot today be called a national struggle. When we use the words 'national struggle' we use it as a composite term in which all these elements are present. And the peak of this national struggle, as we saw, was in Indo-China. For more than two decades, the people there fought heroically with faith in their national independence, faith in their people's progress, faith in socialism. And it was because of these things that they could succeed against a very big power. So this is the political picture which has emerged in these 25 years and because of this, we see a large number of countries members of the UN etc.

The third aspect, which I think we should not forget, is the impact of technological development. I am not talking merely of technological development in industrial terms; I am talking in terms of the military-industrial complex in the western world or the technological development that has created an impact on the weapons system of the world. At the end of the second world war, we saw that the USA could say that they were the supreme power, the super-power. They thought possibly they could dictate terms. But the other world also was not sleeping. They were also making efforts for their own technological progress. So, a time is reached when they know that they are not alone and they are not the only people to make progress. USSR has made progress in this matter. They have proved that as far as the weapon system is concerned, they are also equally powerful. When they knew that there was a limitation of their power, the process of detente started. These are the technological imperatives political imperatives of detente. If there is relaxation of tension, it is not only detente among the two big powers. There should be relaxation of tensions amongst all the countries of all the continents. But there are the imperatives behind it. They just cannot afford not to have it. This is the basic factor and let us not forget it. This is the background of detente. This is the situation that has developed and this is the world that we live in today. Therefore, we will have to see how we place our relationships, what are our present day challenges and what are going to be our responses to them. When you talk about foreign policy, you have to find out your neighbourhood, you have to find out what are the reactions to the policies that the big powers are following in your area, what are the challenges it has thrown to our country and how you are going to respond to it. I think if I answer these questions, possibly the purpose of my speech should have been served.

Coming to our relations with the big

powers—when I use the term 'big powers', please do not take it in the wrong sense; it is now a routine phrase to describe certain realities. Our relations with the United States were referred to yesterday. Some reference was made to some sentences in the report. May be they are possibly capable of being misinterpreted. But I would like to say that I have made the position very clear. When we say that our relations with USA and USSR are good, we do not bracket USSR with USA, because qualitatively the relationship is different. I have no doubt about it.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jainagar):
But the report contradicts you.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
What I am saying is more important than the report. Possibly it is likely to be misinterpreted and therefore, I am trying to make this point very clear. It is not good to quote oneself, but sometimes it becomes useful for elucidation. I am not making this position clear for the first time. I made the same point last year also. I quote:

"Again Prof. Mukherjee suggested yesterday that by mistake sometimes people try to bracket the two super powers together. I think that is not at least our Government's attitude, because the two super powers cannot be bracketed together. They are not only qualitatively different but they are different from the point of view of our national interests. This is one fact we have to take note of."

So, I think I have made this point very clear. Having said this—and he also concedes that point—even then, naturally, we should certainly try to make our relations friendly. This is exactly what we are doing. Somebody said that we have our national interests. When America's national interests are reflected in their global policy, we come into conflict. But even then we feel that despite that, there are areas where we can cooperate. Therefore, we are making efforts to improve

[Shri Yashwantrao Chavan]

these. You know what efforts have been made. I do not want to go into details.

With USSR, our relations are very good; it is an excellent and a warm relationship. There was a recent reference to it in their Twenty-fifth Congress; and what their Secretary-General then said is ample proof of it. They have stood by India in difficult times. They have helped India in its economic and industrial growth and progress. Our outlook on many international matters is similar. But that does not mean that we follow Soviet Russia in every matter. Our outlook is sometimes different. I can mention specific areas; but this is no occasion to do it. Our relations with Soviet Russia, are certainly very good; and we look forward to improve them still further. Recently, you must have read that the Deputy Chairman of our Planning Commission was in Soviet Russia and they have agreed on new areas of cooperation and patterns of cooperation. I am sure it will strengthen not only our relations, but also the strength of Indian.

In the case of China, Shri Samar Mukherjee said that we should try to make some efforts to improve our relations. We are making efforts to improve relations. I hope there will be some response. I do not want to say anything more than that. That does not mean that China's policy has changed or that its attitude has completely changed or that it is likely to change. But certainly we should make efforts, because these are two land masses living together for centuries. Geography has put us near each other. I do not think we can select our neighbours. In the same manner as they say, "Great men are born", neighbours are also geographically born. One should make an effort to find out whether there are any possibilities of improving the relations. India wants to do it. Prof. Mukherjee said: "Select your friends and find out your enemies." Well, I would say

"Treat everybody as a friend and don't be glibble enough to forget that somebody can be your enemy." I would put it that way. You cannot say that everybody will always be your friend; and that your enemy will always remain so. If anybody wants to be an enemy, we should try to see that he does not remain so. That is why all our leaders from Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Nehru to Mrs. Gandhi have said on many occasions that with those who are our friends, we will try to develop, broaden and deepen our relations. With those who are not our friends, we will try to persuade them to take more interest in us. With those who are hostile to us, we have to work in such a manner that their hostility is lessened and that at least there is some possibility of cooperation. That is what, I think, any wise country would do. This is exactly what we are doing. They say that nations have interests. Yes; nations have interests, but certainly nations also have principles. A nation which does not have any principles, sometimes does not understand its interests. What are our principles? As I have said, our principles are, friendship, world peace and non-alignment. What is the crux of the policy of non-alignment? I was a little pained to hear my friend, Mr. Naik, pained in a sense because he is a person who always makes very interesting speeches; and I always like to listen to him. He talked of "selective alliance". I really do not know what that term "selective alliance" means. Anyway, he said one thing about non-alignment. Since this point has been argued many times here on the floor of this House I do not want to take more time of the House in saying that it is not a negative concept. It is an elementary sort of interpretation to say that because the word "non" is there in "non-alignment" so it is negative. It is a positive concept.

I would like my hon. friend to know what non-alignment really is. Right from the beginning, Jawaharlal Nehru conceived of non-alignment as a composite policy consisting of a number of

fundamental elements. Actually once, in 1958, he said that non-alignment with military blocs "in itself is not a policy; it is only part of a policy". He added:

"The policy itself can only be a policy of acting according to our best judgment and following a particular objective and idea we have...our foreign policy has this positive aspect of peace. The other positive aspects are enlargement of freedom in the world, replacement of colonialism by free and independent countries and a larger degree of co-operation among nations."

For Nehru non-alignment was a composite policy covering the search for peace, the struggle for independence, the fight against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racialism, the struggle for political and economic equality among nations and fight for a new just, peaceful, world order. His conception of non-alignment was such that it remains entirely valid even today, as it included not only non-alignment with military blocs, but also basic questions of politics and economics including the adjustment of relation between developed and developing nations and the current theme of a new economic order.

I am again tempted to quote Nehru. He wrote an article "Changing India", which was published in Foreign Affairs, just a year before he died. In April 1963 he wrote an article, which I am quoting, because it is much better that we know what our policies are and what are the basic formulations of our policy. Nehru said :

"The twin policies which have guided us since independence are, broadly, democratic planning for development at home and, externally, 'non-alignment'. Like the basic policies of most countries, these are not the product of any inspiration or arbitrary choice, but have their roots in our past history and way of thinking as well as in fundamental national exigencies. India's over-riding and most urgent task is to raise the

standard of living of her people, and in order to achieve this, to carry out structural and organisational reforms not only as speedily as possible but with maximum popular support and participation. In foreign affairs, we had no interest other than to cultivate friendly co-operation with all countries and to help to keep world peace as the *sine qua non* of everything else. In our approach to these problems, our attitude and ideas had inevitably been shaped by our own recent struggle for freedom, as well as by the accumulated experience of centuries; and above all by Mahatma Gandhi's teachings." /

I think I have said enough about non-alignment.

SHRI B V NAIK (Kanara): Does it not come in conflict with the Asian Collective Security scheme?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: No; do not confuse the issues. I am coming to the question of Asian identity. It is better I deal with this problem of Asian identity that has been mentioned by Shri Dnesh Singh. I think he is right there because it is a very important concept, a very important issue about which we should constantly be aware at least and it is our responsibility to play our role whenever it is possible. As he knows, whenever any occasion has arisen, we have tried to play our role.

The Government of India has always supported the concept of Asian solidarity. In 1946, India sponsored the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi and subsequently convened a conference of all independent Asian countries to mobilise them against Dutch police action against Indonesia. However, unlike other regions, Asia has to contend with many divisive forces—religious, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, economic and political. Asia is also too vast a continent to be readily responsive to a sense of solidarity which would encompass the entire continent from Beirut to Tokyo.

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

She has also been the cockpit of imperialist rivalries in the era of Western dominance, which has left varying cultural impacts in various regions and, thus destroyed pre-existing links and alienated one region from another. However, there is no doubt that the goal of Asian solidarity, which should express itself in terms of a distinct Asian identity and an Asian voice on international affairs, should not be given up. In concert with other countries and with a sense of cautious realism India should actively pursue this objective through encouraging pan-Asian meetings, inter-governmental or non-governmental, in all fields where the Indian experience and the experience of other Asian countries are relevant and useful to each other. Such an exchange of experience would in due course form the core of the Asian personality. Recent initiatives in economic fields, such as the creation of the Pepper Community, the Cocoa nut Community, the Association of Producers of Natural Rubber and, in a sub-regional context, the ASEAN constitute steps in the right direction. As you know, we are also interested in many other Asian institutions like the Asian Clearing House, the Asian Development Bank etc.

So, I concede this concept but let us not forget the point which I have made, namely that there are some contradictions which we cannot just wish away and hence our present approach which I think is valid and wise and will yield results, is to make efforts for bilateral co-operation both in the political and the economic fields.

Some of the Members mentioned the emergence of Indo-China and our duty towards those countries. I can assure them that we consider the emergence of Indo-China as a landmark, an event of historical significance. They are independent and progressive countries which are facing their own problems on the basis of co-operation with non-aligned countries. The re-unification of South and North Viet Nam is going

to be a very important event, and we welcome it. Whatever co-operation they need and we can give, we will certainly try to give. The same is the case with Laos and Cambodia. Cambodia is called by some other name now. Things are developing there. We have not yet established diplomatic relations though we have relations in the sense of recognising them. They are not in a position to receive foreign missions in that country. Possibly we will have to take our turn.

In South East Asia also, our efforts are to build our relations. There may be contradictions in Indo-China and South East Asian countries, some of the countries, because of outside intervention. We have to realistically take note of it and make an effort for bilateral development in those areas. I think with patience through this instrumentality of bilateralism and keeping our principle clearly in mind—if we pursue with friends—I am sure that a day would come when this idea will be a reality. This is about Asia.

Now I must come to the immediate neighbourhood. As far as the immediate neighbourhood is concerned, fortunately amongst us today is the Prime Minister of Nepal. We welcome him heartily. His discussions with our Prime Minister and other representatives of the Government are going on and I am sure the relations will become more productive, more useful in mutual interest because I think geography has put us together and traditionally, culturally and historically both the countries must find ways to work together.

As far as Burma and Sri Lanka are concerned I do not want to repeat that we have made some efforts at solving our problems and we have succeeded considerably in that. The most important change is in the case of Sri Lanka. I think in the last three or four years, there is a sea of change in the relationship in the sense that a very small problem could have been developed into a tricky issue. But our Prime Minister took a very courageous initia-

tive and at the present moment, whatever those problems were. The Kachativu issue, the question of repatriates more particularly, in the contemporary sense, the question of delineation of the maritime boundary is a very very important matter. It can be a very tricky issue. And in the present context of things, persons who are adversely interested in India—I would not say enemies, but I would say people who are adversely interested in India—can develop some of the small issues into big and intricate issues. But only last month, we succeeded in finalising and completely delineating the maritime boundary with Sri Lanka. So, there is no problem which remains, as far as that is concerned.

There are other countries like Bangladesh and Pakistan. Well, last year, when we discussed this question Bangladesh was a different Bangladesh. Unfortunately, things have changed and a very eminent leader like Mujibur Rehman was assassinated. Though, as a nation, we took it as a shock we conceded and ultimately accepted that it is their internal matter, because ultimately we have to live together as nations. We wish their people well. We continue to make efforts for co-operation, but, unfortunately, the response so far is not positive. I would say, to a certain extent, it is even negative. In the beginning, they said, "India is attempting to make military attacks and is poised for military action." We said, "That is not so. Why do you not please come and see?" They sent a delegation. Mr. Justice Satar came and had discussions. Not only that, we invited their military people. We said, "They should come and see if at all they feel that there is any military preparation or deployment which will lead ultimately to such an action." When they saw that it did not work, they kept quiet.

Farakka has been made an issue of anti-India propaganda. Well, this is an unfortunate development. But in that matter also we have taken unilateral steps and we have told them that it is a matter which can be discussed.

As you know, the real problem in the Ganges is the floods. Every year, we suffer from floods. The problem was that during the fair weather the water of the Ganges comes to its lowest and there the question of distribution of water for Calcutta Port and Bangladesh arose.

As you know, in the last twelve years, we were working on the Farakka Barrage. We spent nearly Rs. 160 crores. Last year, we had discussions with Bangladesh when Mujibur Rehman was there. My senior colleague, Shri Jagjivan Ram, went to Bangladesh and had an agreement with them and the Farakka Barrage was opened. Now, they have taken a position that it is not only during the lean period but every month that water must be distributed. It is a rather difficult situation. We are very firm as far as Farakka is concerned. We have not invested this much money for nothing. We have to look to the future of the Calcutta Port which is a very lively link for India's economic development and other things. At the same time, we took unilateral action and allowed ourselves to take less water so that there should not be any difficulty for them. But we told them, let technicians meet and discuss it. Unless we see the effects, what is use of making unrealistic demands and complicating the entire matter? Their main interest is to internationalise the issue. This is the difficulty.

In regard to some of the smallest issues, some of the countries are encouraged to internationalise them so that an opportunity is given to those countries which are adversely interested in India to exploit the issues. This is the position. I do not think I need spend more time on Bangladesh. I only wish that they respond to us in a mood of cooperation because the people of Bangladesh and the people of India have the same problems of economic development and poverty. We have to fight those problems. Concentration must be given to those problems and not to other non-priority problems that create division among ourselves.

(Shri Yashwantrao Chavan)

Coming to Pakistan, it is a little complicated matter. I am using the words deliberately. For that matter, I must say, we have made a very constructive contribution. Ultimately, for the neighbouring problems, we have evolved a certain policy framework. We had the Simla Agreement. You know how in a difficult situation, the Prime Minister took initiative at the summit meeting and arrived at the Simla Agreement. We have a policy framework for dealing with any neighbouring country. We cannot say that there will be no problems with any neighbouring country. As we are living together, there are bound to be some problems. What is the method for it? The method for it is that both the parties should sit together without the intervention of any third party and decide all the issues. This is the basic approach.

He said, yes; he went back. We took the initiative and sorted out certain small issues, like, travel permits and telecommunications. We signed certain trade agreements also. We also purchased cotton from them worth about Rs. 25 crores. They completely stopped there. Once in a while, we reminded them and they thought that they must do something. They have done some business worth about Rs. 7 lakhs. We told them, it is all right; it is a good beginning and let us try to continue it.

13 hrs.

What is more important today is, and, we must not be unaware of it, to see what is happening in Asia, not only in this region. That is where the problems of Asia must be considered more carefully. Though détente is progressing in Europe, I must tell you, Asian problems are getting more complicated. Prof. Hiren Mukerjee wanted to know as to what is happening in West Asia. The West Asian problem is nowhere near solution today. But, at the same time,

they will have to go by certain principles and those principles are, complete withdrawal from the occupied areas and the acceptance of the national rights of the Palestine people. There, we should try to prevent division. The unity of the Arab world is more important for us. We should not do or say anything, contrary to the concept. I want to make this one point very clear that we should not do or say anything which will go contrary to it. This is exactly what is happening. Now, take the tragedy of Lebanon; it is difficult to explain and we can only express our best wishes that they find a solution for it. Somebody asks what is the Asian approach to it. The Middle East issue is such that it arouses global interest; it is a global responsibility and we cannot really speak of an Asian approach. We find almost all the Asian countries wanting a solution, we are working on these lines in the U.N. and we hope we will succeed some time. But there are other matters also. There are contradictions, as was mentioned, in South East Asia; there are contradictions in the sub-continent—and some of them are being encouraged.

I must mention two things about Pakistan and the continuous anti-Indian propaganda in which the leadership of Pakistan is engaged. Whenever they get an opportunity they have to say that India is expansionist. I don't know what we did to be called 'expansionist'. We supported the liberation of Bangladesh and you know what is happening in Bangladesh now; what is expansionist about it? Mr. Bhutto—I am mentioning his name—recently gave his latest theory about the partition of India. While addressing the National Assembly of Pakistan, he said that united India was a danger to Afghanistan and, therefore, in order to protect Afghanistan from that danger, they had created Pakistan! We wish them good relations; we never wanted any bad relations.

I think the Simla Agreement was going on quite all right but it got halted because sophisticated weapons started coming. This is a curse to humanity. Whenever a country thinks that it can solve its national problems by sophisticated weapons coming from outside, that is the end of the national progress of that country.

The Prime Minister is ceaselessly warning the people about dangers in and around the country, and that is a reality. It is better, in these matters, that every citizen should be made aware of it. Unless every citizen is made aware of it and is conscious of it, it would become difficult. That is the only way in which we have to function in this country; we should not function in isolation. There should be the maximum participation and support of the people. I have read out Panditji's quotation in which he mentioned this as a fundamental aspect. We have to raise the maximum consciousness among the people because these are the challenges to us. Our challenges are that this is the world that is around us, this is the Asia we are living in, this is the neighbourhood we are living. There are some dangers in the Indian Ocean and Diego Garcia. We have said that we are against it. It is not a bilateral issue because the littoral countries have passed a resolution and they have formed an *ad hoc* Committee to try and call a conference. There is no doubt that there is danger to the free countries from the Indian Ocean. How can we be indifferent to it, whether they like it or not? I had discussions with an American representative and we categorically told him that we want cooperation in other matters but we are completely against this. Naturally they did not accept that proposition. But we must be, as a nation, aware of some of these dangers. These are the challenges and dangers, but these are the strengths also. Our strength is our own approach. In this evolving world we could stand on our own

with confidence today because we followed certain basic policies of economic development and planning of our own strength. We do get co-operation from others. But let me make it clear that only seven per cent of the contribution is from other countries; almost 93 to 94 per cent— if I remember my figures correctly from my old Portfolio—93 to 94 per cent of the resources have been raised by us in this country for the development of India. This is the reality. The technical talent, the technical competence that we have built in this country, is the greatest change; the younger generation, a new generation, has come. The discipline, the dedication and the determination that we have shown in the last few months have shown to the whole world that India of 1976 is a new India, a changing India, a different India, a strong India, and it can certainly meet the challenges. Our response to these challenges is the way we are trying to go today; and possibly we will have to pursue the same line, the same approach, in the days to come.

Sir, I have done.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put all the Cut Motions moved to the vote of the House

All the Cut Motions were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1977, in respect of the head of demand entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 32 relating to the Ministry of External affairs."

The motion was adopted

(Demand for Grant, 1976-77 in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs,

which was voted by Lok Sabha, is shown below—Ed.]

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 23-3-1976		Amount of Demand for Grant voted by the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
32	Ministry of External Affairs	15,85,19,000	1,79,17,000	79,23,95,000	6,95,83,000

13.07 hrs

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS, 1976-77—
Contd.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

MR SPEAKER The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos 67 and 68, relating to the Ministry of Labour, for which six hours have been allotted

Hon Members present in the House who desire to move their Cut Motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the Cut Motions they would like to move

Motion moved.

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1977 in respect of the head of demand entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos 67 and 68 relating to the Ministry of Labour"

Demands for Grants, 1976-77 in respect of Ministry of Labour

No of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 23-3-1976		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
67	Ministry of Labour	12,00,000		60,00,000	
68	Labour and Employment	7,33,46,000	1,65,000	36,67,31,000	8,23,000

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.