

DEMAND NO. 30—FOOD AND NUTRITION

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,31,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1977 in respect of 'Food and Nutrition'."

DEMAND NO. 31—ELECTRICITY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,29,37,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 1,41,85,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1977 in respect of 'Electricity'."

DEMAND NO. 32—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,53,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 1,14,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1977 in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

DEMAND NO. 33—LOANS TO GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,20,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1977 in respect of 'Loans to Government Servants'."

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA (Marmagao): Sir, I want to raise a point of order. Sir, if you look at the statement made on 8th March by the Deputy Minister of Finance, you will see that in paragraph 3 a deficit of Rs. 7.88 crores will be met by grants-in-aid by the Government of India and further on a deficit of Rs. 3.69 crores on capital accounts will be met by loans from the Government of India. As you are aware, Pondicherry is a Union Territory and as a Union Territory distinct from a State, it is not open for it, not having separate personality, to have any public debt. It must always have a balanced budget and the manner in which that balance is achieved is by funding, the source of which is the Central Budget.

We have not yet either received, considered or passed the Central Budget. My submission is, it would be financially improper, in fact illegal, for the budget of a Union territory to be passed before the Central Budget is presented and before the Consolidated Fund of India is operated. If you look at the Pondicherry Account in the Explanatory Memorandum, you will find that at the end of the revised estimates for 1975-76 the balance in the Consolidated Fund is nil. This is how it is every year in a Union territory because whatever deficit there is, it is made up by the Central Government and that is how you come to 'nil'. By its very definition, the budget of a Union territory is deficit. So, it would be improper, illegal and financially impossible for us to appropriate any money out of a fund that has no money to begin with until such time as our own fund is operated and that money accrues to the Union territory.

MR. SPEAKER: There is nothing for the Speaker to say. It is for the House to decide. There is nothing illegal and improper. The House is sovereign and it can decide everything. There is no infringement of any rule.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA** (Serampore): Let the minister clarify it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The submission made by the hon. member is that it is improper and illegal for a union territory budget to be considered before the Central Budget is presented. There is no question of illegality. The House is seized of the matter. I have given my ruling.

**SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA:** You have ruled and I have to bow to it!

**\*SHRI JAGADISH BHATTACHARYYA** (Ghatal): Mr. Speaker, Sir, while rising to speak on the budget of Pondicherry I would like to put a question to the hon. Finance Minister. I would like to know from her how many returns of this unfortunate day will fall to her lot when she will have to come before this House for securing approval for the budget of Pondicherry. I may remind you Sir, that President's rule was imposed in Pondicherry on the 24th March, 1974. In other words it is almost two years now since the State is under the President's rule and during this period the people have been denied the right to express their views about the nature of economic development that they require or the amount that they would like to be sanctioned for such activities. They have also been denied their say in this administration of their State. It appears to be very strange to me that we the Members of Parliament coming from the different States should be called upon to vote a budget which will benefit the people who are nearly a thousand miles away from us. It is also very unfortunate that the Minister while introducing the budget could not give an indication as to when elections would be held in this State. The whole situation remains as uncertain as before. I cannot really understand why elections are being postponed. After all it is a very small State. The total area covered by the State is little over 400 sq. kilo-

metres and the population is little over 4 lakhs. Needless to say that administrative difficulty cannot be the ground for postponing the elections. It only indicates the contempt with which this Government deal with the principles of democracy and show their lack of faith in peoples verdict.

Now, coming to budget proper we find that the total receipts would be to an order of Rs. 10.44 crores and the expenditure would be to a tune of 18.32 crores. Thus there will be a deficit of Rs. 7.33 crores. This will of course be met by the Central Government as grants-in-aid. I cannot help mentioning in this connection that this policy of the Central Government to meet the deficit of the State Budget has never remained consistent. If any State has a deficit budget and has at the same time a non-Congress Government the deficit is hardly met by loans not to speak of grants-in aid

Coming to the specific provisions in the budget I find that an expenditure of Rs. 89.45 lakhs has been made for agriculture while under the head Police we find that an allocation of Rs. 94.69 lakhs have been made. For a small State like Pondicherry the expenditure on Police is rather extraordinary and it is indeed pitiable that it should be given priority over agriculture which means priority over food articles. I am reminded of a sarcastic remark of a friend of mine who describing the situation stated that when these people wanted for eating they certainly got it with an additional 'b' before it. That is they got "beating" for "eating"

Let us have a look at the provisions made for education. Under this head we find that a sum of Rs 76.94 lakhs has been made for Government Higher Secondary Schools while the non-Government schools have been given only Rs. 2.50 lakhs. It is not only in Pondicherry but in almost all the States ruled by the Congress Party the private