

plete cooperation with the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, with the leaders of the opposition and with the Members. We must do that. Otherwise, we cannot get on here. But here I have said just now, certain very fundamental constitutional questions have been raised. I must be satisfied that no grave constitutional improprieties have been committed which have gone on into the Supplementary Demands; that is the main point. If certain grave irregularities have gone into it on which the Minister has not been able to satisfy me and the House, then how can we take it up at all? That is the point. The whole thing has to be recast. And if there is a question of time we should have thought about it. If there is the question of time, if the Executive wants us that we should be prepared, then the Executive should be more expeditious to answer the points which Mr. Sezhiyan has asked through the Speaker on the 14th. Today it is 20th and six days have passed. Why did they not do that? Why only this Parliament be rushed through and the Executive goes on in its own snail speed or in its own horse carriage speed? That is the main difficulty.

14.25 hrs.

PONDICHERRY BUDGET, 1975-76  
GENERAL DISCUSSION, DEMANDS\*  
FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT (PONDICHERRY), 1975-76 AND SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS\* FOR GRANTS (PONDICHERRY), 1974-75

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now we go on to the next item—Pondicherry. In this also the same difficulty.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the items Nos: 17, 18 and 19 . . .

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two Demands one is on vote on Account. Which Demand you are referring to?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I will make my submission on the Supplementary Demands for 1974-75 on Pondicherry. I want to make one submission. Whenever I want to make a point, it is not with a view to stall the business of this House; it is for the general benefit of the entire House. As a Member of this House, I want to see that the Constitution and the parliamentary procedures are correctly followed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You must realise my difficulty. I come to this Chair without prior reading of all these papers. I have never seen the papers before I come here. If I have some background reading, I will be able to follow it. Therefore, I have to listen to you very carefully. This is my misfortune.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I prepared this one because I thought that it was my painful duty that I should take up this matter not with a view to stall the business of this House, but probably to help the House; in that spirit, I am making this point. Now, I am taking up the Supplementary Demands for Grants of Pondicherry. Let us take Demand No. 6 on pages 4 and 5. Here, I am particularly interested in item No. (b) on page 5. It reads as follows:

“(b) Consequent on the failure of monsoon in 1974, several drought relief measures have had to be taken in the Pondicherry and Karaikal regions of the Union Territory. These measures are estimated to involve an additional expenditure of Rs. 23.55 lakhs in 1974-75 for which this Supplementary Grant has been sought.”

Again, Sir, we are going back to the same basis on which I contested the Gujarat Demands earlier. This had been due to monsoon in 1974.

These amounts had not been given in the Budget 1974-75.

Sir, If you look at the very drafting at page 5, you will find that this amount of Rs 23.55 lakhs for which the new Supplementary Demands asked for comprises of five items, that is—

- |   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| (1) Public Health, Water Supply and Sanitation (Plan) | Rs. 3.55 Lakhs  |
| (2) Agricultural Facilities                           | Rs 3.50 Lakhs   |
| (3) Minor Irrigation                                  | Rs. 13.50 Lakhs |
| (4) Relief Works and                                  | } Rs 3.00 Lakhs |
| (5) Other Works                                       |                 |

Sir, if you see that asterisk put for all these four items, and if you read the new sub-heads, the Government themselves concede that these are the new sub-heads. That means they are not being taken care of provided for in the Budget of 1974-75. Therefore, these are all new schemes, new services for which—if we see (b) at the bottom which reads as follows: "Consequent on the failure of monsoon in 1974, several drought relief measures have had to be taken in the Pondicherry and Karaikal regions of the Union territory—I am not here to say that we should not attend to those we should have done that."

I am not here to say that we should not attend to the drought areas. We should attend but we should do it in the proper Constitutional way.

You have spent the money on schemes which have not been contemplated in original Budget. You yourself concede that these are all new services, but you have spent the amount on them. That goes against the principle enunciated earlier, namely that without an appropriation made by this House for a specific purpose, if it is not provided in the original Budget, it cannot be spent.

One more point. The Budget Estimates of 1974-75 was presented in March, 1974. Actually we passed it in April after so much of wrangling. There the original grant provided was only Rs. 27.45 lakhs in Demand No. 6. Therefore nothing could have been saved. That means a

new service has been undertaken without the specific sanction of Parliament. The amount has been drawn from the Consolidated Fund, which goes against the very basis of spending out of the Consolidated Fund only after a Budget provision has been made. That is the main point I want to make.

After this comes the vote on Account for Pondicherry. The amount given at page No 2 is Rs 256 lakhs. Here I want to point out a very basic thing which the Government has failed to do. Vote on Account is given to enable the Government to carry on until the Demands for Grants and the passing of the General Appropriation Bill. As the vote on Account is a formal business there is no discussion in the House on it, the idea being simply that the Government's functions should not come to a standstill because of the absence of voting and the House authorising expenditure.

As the purpose of the vote on Account is to keep the Government functioning, it cannot be used as a means to obtain Parliament's approval for new services. It is a well established financial procedure that without getting Parliament's sanction for a new scheme no amount should be spent but Parliament may take sometime to pass the general Demands and the general Appropriation Bill. Even here it takes us to April or May, but on 1st April they should have the amount and, therefore, they come in for a Vote on Account. But when a Vote on Account is passed by this House, an undertaking is given by the Government that the Vote on Account is not intended to be used for expenditure on new services. But that undertaking has not been given here.

If you take the Vote on Account for the expenditure of the Central Government for 1975-76, at page 5 in item No. 4 (1) it is stated:

"Although the provision included in the Vote on Account is shown on the basis of one-sixth of the estimated provision or the whole year, the Vote on

Account is not intended to be used for expenditure on new services."

That is the Vote on Account is given without discussion, and, therefore, whenever a Vote on Account is passed, Government gives an undertaking to this House that the Vote on Account will not be taken recourse to for new services because only after the passing of the entire Demands they can go to new services.

In the Pondicherry Budget the last item reads:

"Proportionate expenditure during the five months, April to August, 1975, is estimated at Rs. 8.25 crores, comprising of Rs. 6.14 crores on revenue account and Rs. 1.61 crores on Capital Account. The distribution of the estimated amount for the various services and purposes is appended".

But they have not given the undertaking that none of the amounts will be spent towards a new service.

This is a grave lapse because we are passing this vote on account for about five months and during this five-months period if they want to use the amounts granted by us under vote on account to new services, the House can not prevent that. Whereas, I think, the Central Government gives undertaking to this effect, but that undertaking has not been given. At this stage, even if the Minister gives an assurance that it will not be spent, it is not enough. My point is that a mere assurance of the Minister is not sufficient that the Pondicherry vote on account bill is passed on these incomplete statements because if we pass the appropriation bill on vote on account, this is based on the other items also, because the Appropriation bill is based on the incomplete statement and the President has already given his recommendation on the 14th March 1975 wherein it is stated that:

"the President having been informed, the subject matter of the proposed bill, etc. etc. . . . and also

the bill will be introduced in the Lok Sabha immediately after the demands for grants on account for expenditure in the Union Territory of Pondicherry for the financial year has been voted."

That means the President on 14th has given his consent for incurring this expenditure on the basis of this demand. If this demand is defective, then the President has not been given the full material on which he could give his recommendation. Therefore, Sir, unless they give the undertaking here and send a fresh bill to the President and get the sanction of the President on the basis of the full complete background given by them, they cannot introduce the Appropriation Bill and get it passed. Therefore, on these two accounts, I feel that the Supplementary Demand is defective and the vote on account based on the defective statement is also defective. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE): Sir, regarding the Supplementary grants I would like to submit, as the hon. Member has mentioned about the new items like minor irrigation relief works and other works, these are not new services and the total grants which was originated as the first Supplementary, that has not been exceeded. Therefore, the point which the hon. Member mentioned that we have spent something for which we were not authorised, does not arise because in the original first supplementary grant for which money was sanctioned, that demand was not exceeded by creating the new service. These are more or less new items which were brought within the purview of the service. These are not the new services which are created. Regarding the vote on account, the undertaking which the hon. Member has mentioned, my submission is that there are no new services in the vote on account and I can give the assurance that no new services will be brought within the purview of the vote on account that may fulfil the requirement of the hon. Member.

Regarding the information given to the President, Sir, the usual practice of giving the full information is that the facts are submitted to President and after getting it recommended by him, these are placed before the House.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Well, I think, I will have to uphold what the Minister has said, because these are only sub-heads. They are not the new services.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN :** Even, within sub-head, if it is not accounted for, they should provide for it. I would also like to know from the Minister whether there has been a saving within the demand. If there is a saving, you can go further on a continuing service but here there is no saving and the service is new.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is why he has come forward with a Supplementary demand.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN :** Supplementary demands are not for the amount already spent but for the amount to be spent. Let him give me an assurance that this amount of Rs. 23.55 lakhs is the one which is going to be spent after the appropriation bill is passed.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is the crucial point.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN :** Because it has been said that consequent to the failure of monsoon in 1974, several drought relief measures have had to be taken, do you mean to say that this going to be taken hereafter. If it means that due to the failure of monsoon in 1974, drought relief measures are going to be taken after the 26th of March, I cannot believe that.

**SHRI H. K. I. BHAGAT (East Delhi):** Personally I entirely agree with the minister's explanation. But hypothetically speaking, even accepting Mr. Sezhiyan's argument that no provision was made in the original budget, the question would be whether the Lok Sabha can vote this grant

or not. I invite your attention to article 116(1) of the Constitution:

"Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Chapter, the House of the People shall have power—

(c) to make an exceptional grant which forms no part of the current service of any financial year."

So, even then the Lok Sabha is entitled to vote it.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Let him come forward with the plea of exceptional grant then. Here it is question of supplementary grant. Let us not mix up the two.

I have upheld the contention of the minister that these are new sub-heads under a service that has already been sanctioned by this House. I would not stretch it further because that would be too much inhibiting the Government. But the only question is whether this amount of Rs. 23.55 lakhs which you mention here has been drawn and spent or not.

**SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE:** This has been spent out of the savings.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** That sounds a little difficult. As far as I am concerned, I will accept what the minister says. But he himself will be responsible for whatever he says. I would draw your attention to the fact that the original grant is only Rs. 27.45 lakhs. Would you say that there has been saving to the extent of Rs. 23.55 lakhs out of it?

**SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE:** The new sub-heads are minor irrigation relief work and other works. Certain items have been spent. I did not say that all the items have been spent. The total amount spent is Rs. 13.7 lakhs.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** There is no saving. Please take the Demands for Grants for



the Union Territory for 1975-76. There you find the budget estimates, the revised estimates etc. If you take pages 6 and 7, Demand No. 6 Revenue, the Major Head is 289—Relief on account of Natural Calamities. What is the grand total for the year? The budget estimates for the year 1974-75 is Rs. 27.45 lakhs and the revised estimate is Rs. 61.98 lakhs. Therefore, there has not been any saving. But the budget estimate for 1975-76 is Rs. 48 lakhs.

Then I will come to the four individual items. The first item is Public Health, Water Supply and Sanitation Plan; the second is Agricultural Facilities Plan and the next is Minor Irrigation Plan. If you take these four items, you will find that none of the items has got any budget estimate. Let me come to the details. Public Health, Water Supply and Sanitation—Accounts for 1973-74 nil, Budget estimate nil; revised estimate Rs. 3.55 lakhs. Agricultural Facilities Plan—1973-74 accounts nil; budget estimate 1974-75 nil; revised estimate Rs. 3.50 lakhs. Minor Irrigation Plan—1973-74 accounts nil; budget estimate 1974-75 nil; revised estimate Rs. 13.50 lakhs. Other Works Plan—1973-74 Accounts nil, Budget estimate 1974-75 nil and revised estimate Rs. 3 lakhs. So, these are not taken out of any savings. They have been treated by themselves as new items for which no budget provision has been there. Though they have asked for Rs. 23.5 lakhs, even if they spent a pie without the sanction of Parliament, it comes against our Supplementary Demands.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : May I give a word of advice to the Minister? If a wrong statement is given to the House—I am not saying this is a wrong statement - if it is inadvertent, even then it needs an apology. If it is deliberate, then it becomes a very serious matter, because it becomes a question of privilege. Now, may I venture to give him some advice? Do not give your answer in a huff "It has been done within savings" or "It has not been done", without consulting your office. Go into the figure and come with something definite.

10LSS/75—8

Why do you unnecessarily get into trouble? Supposing that it is proved by figures that what you are saying is not correct, would it not be better for you to do it that way instead of making a statement here and having to retract it? And then, if you make a deliberate statement, it becomes serious. Take the easy way out; don't get into trouble. Go into the details and satisfy yourself and then come before the House.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : I can reply to this point if you like.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : These are points of order which he has raised and I myself cannot make up my mind here. If you are very strong about it and say "No: this is the correct position", I will take a risk—but it will not be my risk; it will be your risk. If it is proved later on that you have deliberately misled the House, it becomes very serious.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : What I was suggesting . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : These are points of order. We have not started discussions at all.

श्री कृष्णचन्द्र वर्मा उज्जैन : एक घंटे के लिए हाऊस को गृहजन कर दे ।

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will do it with their consent, I will not be arbitrary.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : Sir, in any point of order which is raised, the whole question would be whether it goes to the substance of the matter or not. (Interruptions). Let us consider this question dispassionately. The question is whether this grant forms part of the original schemes or not.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That point has been disposed of.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : I am not arguing on that point. I am arguing on the point of order : I am not touching that point at all—which the Minister has answered and you have upheld. What I am submitting is that the whole question is whether the

Lok Sabha can vote this grant or not. That is the question with regard to the point of order. How the grant is described is not, to my mind, the real question or the crux of the matter; the crux of the matter is whether the Lok Sabha is competent to pass the grant or not. (*Interruptions*).

The Chair may not agree and you may not agree, but please listen to me. I am saying that the substance of the matter is that the Lok Sabha is competent to pass this grant under 116 (c). I would respectfully submit that, when a Section says that the Lok Sabha is competent to do it under 116 (c), the law of interpretation is that we should go to the substance of the matter. The carts go to the substance of the matter, whether competence is there or not. They go to the substance of the jurisdiction and not the mere form of it. (*Interruptions*). That is the law of interpretation, whether in substance the jurisdiction of the court or the House exists or not. If in substance, the jurisdiction exists, I think, there should be no question of point of order.

SHRI H. N. MUKHERJEE (Calcutta—North East) : I am provoked by what Mr. Bhagat has said in regard to the point of order which you are trying to dispose of and which you have virtually disposed of. You are only being held up:

We are not discussing the theoretical question of the rights of the Lok Sabha. Since yesterday, you have been repeating in your several rulings that the methodology of the exercise by the Lok Sabha of its jurisdiction specially in regard to financial matters is defined in the Constitution in a manner which we have got to follow if we are not to stultify ourselves. That being so, if the methodology cannot be pursued on account of a certain lack on the part of the Government, this matter has got to be postponed. You have very rightly pointed out Mr. Sezhiyan having written an earlier letter on the 14th of this month to which no answer was vouchsafed to him or to the House, through the Speaker. The Government has had an

entire opportunity of examining this matter and satisfying you and the House about it. They have not succeeded in doing that. Therefore, this is a question where the satisfaction of certain methodologies preparatory to the Lok Sabha exercising all its sovereign jurisdiction rights are concerned and, since those things have not been satisfied, you are right in setting up a kind of precedent that you are laying by giving a ruling that you have already indicated.

MR. DEPUTY SPFAKER : Now, let me first deal with Mr. Bhagat's point of order.

SHRI H. K. I. BHAGAT: A submission.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is right. You have made a submission to me. I must respond to that.

I should not be misunderstood. I have heard the substance of your submission. What is the substance of your submission? The substance is that this House has the supreme right to vote any grant. That is the substance I uphold.

Secondly, I also uphold that this House can give an exceptional grant. You have pointed out the relevant provision of the Constitution. But my difficulty here is that we are not discussing the exceptional grant. We are discussing a supplementary grant.

Now, let me explain that a supplementary grant can be given in two ways, firstly, by way of additional money for a service that is already in operation because the money is not enough and, secondly, for a new service which will be voted for by this House. The substance is also that not a single pie, more than what has already been appropriated by the Appropriation law can be spent. Therefore, even if it is a supplementary grant, it must first be voted by the House before you can spend. This is a position that we are concerned with.

This is what I was trying to advise the Minister, not to rush in with these figures because I am myself getting confused. Now,

accepting that this House has that supreme right, it is also my duty, as the servant of this House, to see that everything is put before the House in the proper order so that the House knows what it is doing. If from the submissions of the hon. Members, it appears that there is something which is not quite in order, how can I say to the House, "Close your eyes and go ahead"?

**SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE:** Sir, the hon. Member's contention is that we have spent more than what we are given. My contention is not that. The original grant was Rs. 27.45 lakhs; the supplementary grant is Rs. 9.75 lakhs and 24.78 lakhs grant is what is being asked for. The total comes to Rs. 61.98 lakhs which has been shown by the hon. Member as the revised estimate. Out of that, the amount which has been spent is 13.7 lakhs. Therefore, it is not a fact that we have spent more than what actually we are given. We are actually given Rs. 27.45 lakhs plus Rs. 9.45 lakhs and this we have already intimated to the hon. Member when he wanted to have this information.

15 hrs.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** When ?

**SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE:** I think, it was on the 18th March.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** I have not received the letter. What about the new Services ?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Let us be very clear. About new Services, I have said that these are only sub-heads and I uphold what the Minister says that these are sub-heads under the Services that the House has already sanctioned. We should not go into that extent to tie the hands of the Government that within the Services they have been granted, they cannot do this and that.

Here is a letter, a copy of which has just been brought before me, in which the Government has given a reply and this has been passed on to Mr. Sezhiyan; this

is what they say. This letter is dated 18th March, 1975 from a Deputy Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance. They have enclosed the information, and have said:

"On drought relief measures, for which the Supplementary Grant of Rs. 23.55 lakhs has been sought in Grant No. 6, the expenditure incurred in the current year so far has been as follows:—

	Lakhs
(1) Public Health, Water Supply and sanitation . . . . .	1 66
(2) Minor Irrigation . . . . .	10 76
(3) Relief works . . . . .	1 21
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13 63</b>

Well, this is what the Minister has contended that the total grant, original and supplementary came to Rs. 61.98 lakhs.

**SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE:** Including this Supplementary Demand, it will be 61.98 lakhs.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Already there is Rs. 27.45 lakhs and Rs. 9.75 lakhs. That is the total grant already given. And he says that he has spent Rs. 13.63 lakhs out of the saving. This is his submission.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** if it is true that saving is there, why are they coming for this supplementary grant ?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I think, the points are clear. Point number 1 is that the money that has been spent, has been spent out of the saving and that is what he says. I will accept that.

Secondly, if they come for more money because they think more money will be needed, how can we object to that ? It is quite in order.

About the Vote on Account, I would take a lenient view. Although it is necessary that the Government should have given the undertaking that no new Service will

be undertaken by this, as they do elsewhere, I would take this as a clerical error and accept what the Minister says on the floor of the House as part of the assurance and we can go ahead with the Pondicherry budget

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): I would request that at least in your ruling you may not say that this is a clerical error, because it is a matter of considerable significance and ought not to be allowed to occur again. Therefore ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Therefore I said that I will take a lenient view. ...

SHRI H. M. PATIL: But not as a result of a clerical error. It is an oversight of a very serious nature.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): It is a ministerial error.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: ... which they must rectify.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope in future we shall keep this in mind that invariably we shall get this assurance ... (Interruptions) You know what is the definition of a Secretary to the Government of India—a glorified clerk.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: That is true of the Minister. He is only a glorified servant.

## Demand No. 1

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,06,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Legislative Assembly'."

## Demand No. 2

## ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Administrator'."

## Demand No. 3

## COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,33,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Council of Ministers'."

## Demand No. 4

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,08,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

## Demand No. 5

## ELECTIONS

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,84,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Elections'."

## Demand No. 6

## REVENUE

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,02,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Revenue'."

## Demand No. 7

## SALES TAX

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,19,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Sales Tax'."

## Demand No. 8

## TAXES ON VEHICLES

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 68,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry

to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Taxes on Vehicles'."

## Demand No. 9

## SECRETARIAT

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,73,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Secretariat'."

## Demand No. 10

## DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,20,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 4,29,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'District Administration'."

## Demand No. 11

## TREASURY AND ACCOUNTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,86,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Treasury and Accounts Administration'."

## Demand No. 12

## POLICE

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 32,92,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Police'."

## Demand No. 13

## JAILS

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,68,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Jails'."

## Demand No. 14

## STATIONERY AND PRINTING

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,21,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

## Demand No 15

## MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,65,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Miscellaneous Administrative General Services'."

## Demand No. 16

## RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,24,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Retirement Benefits'."

## Demand No. 17

## PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 87,69,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 56,88,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Public Works'."

## Demand No. 18

## EDUCATION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,38,22,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 13,000 on Capital Account be granted

to the President on account, out of the Consolidated fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year, commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Education'."

## Demand No 19

## MEDICAL

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,14,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Medical'."

## Demand No. 20

## INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,59,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Information and Publicity'."

## Demand No. 21

## LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,22,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year

commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Labour and Employment'."

## Demand No. 22

## SOCIAL WELFARE

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,76,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 13,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Social Welfare'."

## Demand No 23

## COOPERATION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,50,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 5,32,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Co-operation'."

## Demand No. 24

## MISCELLANEOUS GENERAL ECONOMIC SERVICES

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,33,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April,

1975 in respect of 'Miscellaneous General Economic Services'."

**Demand No. 25**

**AGRICULTURE**

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER . Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 37,00,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 2,44,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Agriculture'."

**Demand No. 26**

**ANIMAL HUSBANDRY**

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,19,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 83,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Animal Husbandry'."

**Demand No. 27**

**FISHERIES**

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER . Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,75,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 21,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Fisheries'."

**Demand No. 28**

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,22,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 35,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Community Development'."

**Demand No. 29**

**INDUSTRIES**

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER . Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,78,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 5,22,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Industries'."

**Demand No. 30**

**FOOD AND NUTRITION**

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER . Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,23,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Food and Nutrition'."

**Demand No. 31**

**ELECTRICITY**

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :



"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 84,83,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 38,16,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Electricity'."

## Demand No. 32

## PORTS AND PILOTAGE

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,89,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 1,22,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account, out of the Consolidated fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

## Demand No. 34

## LOANS TO GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,94,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President on account out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975 in respect of 'Loans to Government Servants'."

## Demand No. 4

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 64,000 on Revenue Account be

granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

## Demand No. 5

## ELECTIONS

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Elections'."

## Demand No. 6

## REVENUE

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER Motion moved

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 24,78,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Revenue'."

## Demand No. 7

## SALES TAX

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 30,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Sales Tax'."

## Demand No. 8

## TAXES ON VEHICLES

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 7,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Taxes on Vehicles'."

## Demand No. 9

## SECRETARIAT

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 76,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Secretariat'."

## Demand No. 10

## DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 39,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'District Administration'."

## Demand No. 11

## TREASURY AND ACCOUNTS: ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 58,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day

of March, 1975 in respect of 'Treasury and Accounts Administration'."

## Demand No. 12

## POLICE

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,89,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Police'."

## Demand No. 13

## JAILS

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 13,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Jails'."

## Demand No. 14

## STATIONERY AND PRINTING

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 22,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

## Demand No. 15

## MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,000 on Revenue Account be

granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Miscellaneous Administrative General Services'."

## Demand No. 17

## PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 7,73,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 1,63,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Public Works'."

## Demand No. 18

## EDUCATION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 13,27,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Education'."

## Demand No. 19

## MEDICAL

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,32,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Medical' "

## Demand No. 20

## INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 17,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Information and Publicity'."

## Demand No. 21

## LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 34,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Labour and Employment'."

## Demand No. 30

## FOOD AND NUTRITION

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 13,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Food and Nutrition'."

## Demand No. 32

## SPORTS AND PILOTAGE

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 13,000 on Revenue Account be granted

to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of Payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975 in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

**SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR** (Pondicherry) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Administration of Justice' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to have a High Court (Judicial Commission) at Pondicherry (1)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Elections' be reduced to Re. 1'.

[Postponement of elections without any reason whatsoever (2)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Elections' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need for holding elections immediately (3)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Revenue' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Collection of tax machinery and their failure to uphold the human consideration in view of drought conditions in Pondicherry (4)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Taxes on Vehicles' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[New taxes on vehicles and their burden on common men (5)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Secretariat' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need to remove anomalies arising out of Third Pay Commission Report (6)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head Treasury and Accounts Administration be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Administration's failure in proper management of accounts (7)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Police' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Reorganisation of the Police Force in the Union territory of Pondicherry (8)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Public Works' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Bad conditions of roads in the Union territory of Pondicherry (9)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Education' be reduced to Re. 1

[Failure to announce Third Pay Commissions scales for the Education Department (10)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Education' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Pay anomalies and the poor condition of the teachers and the college professors (11)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Medical' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Need for opening of new health centres in every village (12)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Labour and Employment' be reduced to Re. 1"

[Failure to check problem of unemployment (13)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Labour and Employment' be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Magnitude of unemployment (14)]

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Ports and Pilotage' be reduced by Ra. 100"

[Need for a port at Karakal (15)]

Mr. DUPT-SPEAKER : The cut motions also are before the House.

\*SHRI JAGDISH BHATTACHARYYA (Ghatal) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on the Supplementary Demands for Grants on Pondicherry. Sir, it is an irony that the budget has been presented to this House for obtaining the approval of this House when it should have been legitimately proper that the budget should have been passed by the Pondicherry Assembly and by the elected representatives of the people. We have seen, Sir, that during the last two sessions two to three such budgets for other States were also got passed by this House. After the last elections, a representative Government was formed in Pondicherry but this did not last long. But thereafter no elections were held there and no representative Government was allowed to be formed. Why should it be so? After all Pondicherry is a small place and has a population of 4,71,707. In my opinion it should not take more than 5/6 days preparation to hold general elections there but still elections are not being held there. Sir, we would have discussed the Gujarat Budget a little earlier but for the fact that the discussions has been postponed till tomorrow on some constitutional consideration. In Gujarat also, as in Pondicherry, elections are not being held. However, in regard to Gujarat the Government have taken the position that due to some agitation a political instability prevails there and in addition natural calamities like famine and drought have also been the contributing factors for the postponement of election there. But I ask the Government, what factors, political or natural calamities—are standing in the way of the Government to postpone elections in Pondicherry. The truth of the matter is that the

\*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

ruling party does not feel that the present situation in Pondicherry is favourable for them and they will not go in for elections there unless the situation turns favourable.

Sir, the present budget has been prepared by the bureaucrats who are presently running the Pondicherry administration and in presenting this budget to this House the hon. Minister has done nothing more than serving a cooked dish. But can one deny that budget do not, in any way, represent the wishes of the people and their representatives, at no stage, of the formulation of the budget demands had any say. In regard to other States whose budgets were passed by this House in the recent past there are many MPs represented in this House and through their participation in the discussion they represent the cross section of the people of the State but in the case of Pondicherry we have only one member in this House and judged from this angle the people's wishes cannot be fully represented here. Therefore, I must say without any hesitation that the present budget does not reflect the hopes, aspirations and the wishes of the people for whom money is being sanctioned.

Sir, you are well aware of the functioning of the Aurobindo Ashram in Pondicherry. I have nothing to do with their religious activities but I can say from my personal experience I have visited Pondicherry,—that they are doing very good work in the sphere of education. They have drawn up a plan for the rehabilitation of people and are also trying their best to develop cottage industries there. I feel, Sir, that a good work done by an organisation should not only be commended but the State Government should come forward to give some financial assistance to that organisation. I do not know whether any provision has been made in this budget for financial assistance for the activities sponsored by the Ashram but I would suggest that adequate assistance be given to them.

Sir, Pondicherry has a small port. The sea is calm. During my visit to Pondicherry I had found that many wine shops have spurious and foreign liquor is very much in use. Where from does this foreign liquor come? Surely they are being smuggled into Pondicherry and this has to be stopped. I must also say that indiscriminate issue of licences for setting up wine shops has also to be looked into. With the increase in the number of licenced shops the chances of growth of unauthorised shops for spurious wine also increase. Therefore, it is my submission that the number of such shops should be reduced.

I do not want to discuss in detail the different demand contained in the budget because there is nothing new in it. We have seen the Central budget as also the budgets of different States. If the people think that these budgets will do them good then the Pondicherry budget will do good to the people of Pondicherry also but I can say with certainty that during all these years of their power, this Govt. have done nothing which has contributed to the prosperity of the people and the present Pondicherry budget will also go the same way. Through their actions, they have pushed the country towards disaster and nothing better can be expected of them.

श्री कल्लक्कड बर्मा (उज्जैन) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय पाण्डिचेरी में चौथी बार राष्ट्रपति मानन की घोषणा बहाई गई है और उसके परिणामस्वरूप बर्मा का बचट हम मदद के मामले रखा गया है। इससे पता चलता है कि हम सरकार की मनोवृत्ति क्या है। ऐसा लगता है कि जिस प्रदेश में सत्ताकण्ड चल के अनुकूल परिस्थिति होगी है, वहाँ सरकार चुनाव कराने में एक मिनट की भी देरी नहीं करती है।

मैं आपकी वाद विमाना चाहता हूँ कि जब 1971 में पाकिस्तान ने हमारा युद्ध चल रहा था, तो बंगला देश ने डाका पर जिस दिन हमारा अधिकार हुआ, उससे केवल एक दिन पहले सरकार की ओर से यह प्रस्ताव आया था कि विमान-समाप्तों के चुनाव एक साल के

लिए टाल दिया जाये। लेकिन जब 3 बजे डाका पतल का समाचार मिला तो प्रधान मंत्री ने दूसरे दिन घोषणा कर दी कि पूरे देश में विमान-समाप्तों के चुनाव होंगे, जब उनको माल पर के लिए टाला नहीं जायगा। यह सरकार की दूषित मनोवृत्ति का द्योतक है।

पाण्डिचेरी में भी यही स्थिति है। वहाँ पर सत्ताकण्ड चल की स्थिति बड़ी नाजुक और नर्म है। उसको धकेल कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। वह चाहे किसी भी प्रकार के गन्दे हूचकड़े धपता, वह वहाँ पर किसी भी कीमत पर बहमन में नहीं धा सकता है। इसीलिए बड़ा राष्ट्रपति मानन की घोषणा 6 महीने के लिए बहा दी गई है।

गुजरात के बारे में अभी मेरे एक पूर्व-बन्दा ने कहा कि बहा धपान गया मुझे की बात कहकर चुनाव टाले जा रहे हैं। लेकिन वास्तविकता इससे भिन्न है। गुजरात के नागरिकों को उनके अधिकारों में बचिन रखा जा रहा है। जो कार्य पाण्डिचेरी और गुजरात के विधायकों को करना चाहिए था, वह काम हम समय में बैठकर हमको करना पड़ रहा है। यह बड़े दुःख की बात है कि जन-प्रतिनिधियों को उनके अधिकारों में बचिन रखा जा रहा है। सरकार बार-बार पाण्डिचेरी में राष्ट्रपति मानन की घोषणा 6 6 महीने के लिए बहाने के बारे में प्रस्ताव लाती है यह लोकतन्त्र के लिए कोई अच्छी परिपाटी नहीं है। यह तो लोकतन्त्र की जड़ों को खोखना करने वाली परिपाटी है।

जहां सत्ताकण्ड चल की लगना है कि वह चल-बहल करारक और दूसरे तरीके धपनाकर सत्ता पर टिका रह सकता है, वहाँ सरकार तुरन्त चुनाव कराने की है। अभी नागा रैज में यही बात बोललाई गई है। इसी प्रकार को बटारा कई बार और प्रदेशों जैसे बिहार, में भी हुई हैं। लेकिन सरकार को इन बारे में कोई फिक नहीं है।

पाण्डिचेरी एक बहुत छोटा-सा राज्य है। लेकिन उसके विकास का सवाल बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। वहाँ पर मैटिकल फीमिलिटीय और दूसरी

सुविचारण वर्षाय नहीं है। वहाँ के नागरिकों को उनके अधिकारों से वंचित रखा जा रहा है। धनर बड़ा विद्यालय-नया कार्य करती होती तो वहाँ के नागरिकों को इन सुविधाओं से किसी भी क्रम पर वंचित नहीं किया जा सकता था। लेकिन पाण्डिचेरी के नागरिकों का यह दुर्भाग्य है कि वहाँ बीबी डार राष्ट्रपति शासन की प्रवृत्ति को बढ़ावा जा रहा है। गुजरात में भी यही हो रहा है। मैं इसका मजबूत विरोध करना हूँ। सरकार को इस प्रकार राष्ट्रपति शासन की प्रवृत्ति बार-बार नहीं बढ़ानी चाहिए। धनर ऐसा करना जरूरी हो तो उसको एक बार बढ़ावा जा सकता है। लेकिन धनर उसको फिर बढ़ाना हो तो वहाँ जनमत-संग्रह कराकर लोगों की भावनाओं का ज्ञानना चाहिए और उसके आधार पर कोई निर्णय करना चाहिए।

धनर पाण्डिचेरी में विद्यालय-नया कार्य करती होती, तो जो बजट वहाँ पर रखा गया है, वह विद्यालयों के मामले में, उस पर विश्वास होता है और उसकी श्रद्धापूर्वक बुराईया मानने वाली। उनमें पाण्डिचेरी के विद्यालय और निर्माण की गति को बढ़ावा मिलना। देश के अन्य प्रांतों के साथ-साथ पाण्डिचेरी के विकास की गति भी बढ़ती। लेकिन इस प्रकार उनका विकास और निर्माण की गति का अक्षय्य किया जा रहा है।

मेरा निवेदन है कि पाण्डिचेरी एक तटवर्ती प्रदेश है, इसलिए उसके बारे में सरकार को शीघ्रतापूर्वक विचार करना चाहिए। सरकार का इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि इस प्रकार की स्थिति की पुनरावृत्ति किसी अन्य प्रदेश में न हो। धनर उसमें थोड़ा भी अन्याय, नैतिकता और जनता का मुकाबला करने का माहुर है तो उसको हार और जीत की चिन्ता न करने हुए, मैदान में खाना चाहिए और प्रजासत्ताक तरीके से वहाँ चुनाव कराकर जनता के निर्णय को स्वीकार करना चाहिए।

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN  
(Coimbatore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,  
we are now discussing again the Budget for

the Union Territory of Pondicherry. It is only in the last Session we have had discussion here on the Supplementary Demands.

Now, it is one year since the Operation Topple was carried out in Pondicherry and the democratic Government was sent out by the ruling party here in alliance with others. We have been demanding that election should be held in Pondicherry and the democratic Government should come into being there so that all the problems in that area could be solved, because it is only such a democratic Government that can solve the problems there. Sitting here miles away from Pondicherry, the Government and the Ministry is totally unaware of what is happening there and how things are being mis-managed and the people are being harassed and are being more and more exploited. That is the reason why this demand is being reiterated and it has the support of all the sections of the public in Pondicherry. Since 1947 people in this country have been having parliamentary and democratic institutions. When you talk here of those who are being led by Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan and the attack on these very institutions, then why is it that you deny to the people of Pondicherry, who are demanding precisely a democratically elected Government through which they would be able to solve their own problems? For one do believe that we should defend these institutions and see that they are properly utilised and not misused nor dismissed away whenever the ruling party or the Government may like. This demand is a demand of the democratic movement of all democratic sections without exception, in this area which is far away in the South and is neighbouring to the State to which I come from.

There are various problems there which have been pestring the people for a very long time the bureaucratic attitude of the Government and the administration in Pondicherry to-day, making it impossible for the people there to get the problems solved for instance an anomaly that existed in the implementation of Central Pay Scales for the Government employees in Pondicherry.

The Government notified in March 1970 that the Central pay scales would apply to the Government servants in Pondicherry. This was made applicable to all the sections. But still there were some who were left out, for instance the employees of the Government Press in Pondicherry. Repeatedly, one memorandum after another was sent by them and finally it is as late as November, 1974 that a communication was sent by the Ministry of Home Affairs here to the Finance Department in Pondicherry that the Central scales would also apply to the employees of the Central Government Press. It is very strange that it took 4½ years for the Government to remove this anomaly and that too after repeated representations. Then why is it that they cannot give effect to this with retrospective effect? Why should these employees be penalised and not have the benefit of the pay scales from the date the other Government employees in Pondicherry received them? This is a question that the Minister has got to look into and see that this injustice is overcome because these employees have been suffering all these years on account of discrimination.

In the Education Department teachers are not getting the benefit of the Pay Commission's recommendations. Here is another case of discrimination. Here again the bureaucratic administration without any democratic content is running the Union Territory and the people have been left to the mercy of the bureaucratic administration.

Unless and until the Central Government which to-day is responsible for the conduct of administration and the affairs of Pondicherry takes up these issues and they give immediate effect to them, this discontent will continue and you should not be surprised if disturbances follow out of this discontent.

Similarly, you know, Sir, that throughout the South, we are to-day having very severe drought conditions and side by side with the drought conditions, we are also facing famine conditions. In this State, the provision of drinking water facilities and the need to give drought relief to the people

there as well as drought advances and relief to the employees of the Government has become a matter of very prime importance and I hope that the Minister will see to it that these issues are taken up immediately and they become part and parcel of the budget that he is putting before us.

Sir, in conclusion, I would once again appeal that the elections in Pondicherry should no longer be delayed because unless and until those elections take place and people are given an opportunity to choose the government of their liking, I am afraid that things will go from bad to worse and this area is going to be neglected. As I have already seen in my State, Tamil Nadu, various forces are making their voices heard and they are trying to create divisions thereby violating the provisions of the Constitution and such a contagion might also be reflected in Pondicherry. The people of Pondicherry have, to their credit, a very valiant struggle that they fought in liberating this territory. These people who are loyal to the traditions of our country should join the mainstream of our country and they should not continue to have the Presidential Rule and extension of this Rule there. This only means violating the fundamental rights that are enshrined in our Constitution.

I would once again appeal that the people of Pondicherry may be given the opportunity to choose a popular Government of their liking.

**SHRI ARVINDA BALA PAJANOR** (Pondicherry): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I feel so much pleased that so many Members have taken so much interest in Pondicherry. The Members from the Communist Party (Marxist) also expressed their sentiments for the people of Pondicherry. Sir, I am the lone Member of Pondicherry but I am very much amused that during the last session, practically, for so many days, they were mentioning about Pondicherry. But, when it comes to question of the people's wish, I hardly find even those Members who raised some technical points are present. I do not know whether the ruling party



members are going to support. I am second to none in asking for the elections there. But, so far as democracy is concerned, I am forced to believe that we are abusing the spirit and are only trying to keep the form. I can very well tell my friends who are speaking from this side that simply asking for the election. Everyday we are asking for the same and we have submitted memorandum after memorandum. We are speaking very high about the people's rights, fundamental rights to have their popular Government and all that. But, finally, if they do not decide and if they do not make up their minds to have elections, I do not think that there will be elections to uphold the true democracy in this part of the country. Pondicherry may be a small territory. I am not in agreement with Mr. Sezhiyan's arguments regarding the constitutional issues that he raised. It is governed directly by the Government of India now. During the last two occasions, we have been pressing that Pondicherry must be treated as a State. Every time we will speak about unity of the country but fail to see Pondicherry has a peculiar character unity in itself. People speaking different languages from Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Tamil Nadu are here and, practically, the entire South is represented in Pondicherry territory.

I think somebody from that side at least should get up and say that they are all for the election and Vote for my cut motions. In to-day's papers I saw that some very responsible Member from Pondicherry belonging to the ruling party said that their image has now gone up there. In the recent elections they were able to capture a majority of the seats in the Municipality. But, Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of this august House that the elections to the Municipality took place some time in the year 1968.

When they dissolved this Assembly last year even prior to that they suspended the Municipal Chairman and kept the elections in abeyance for one year. Now, those who were elected as Municipal Councillors in 1968 have conducted the Municipal Chair-

man elections and thereby have captured the power in majority of municipalities and Commune Panchayats. It virtually amounts to going back to 1968. I think the same principle may be adopted here and they may extend the Parliament by five years and postpone the elections of Parliament also for five years and say popular democracy is well kept in our country.

Sir, so far as Pondicherry is concerned it seems Members are interested only in certain terminology or scandal but not in the welfare or sufferings of the people. I am thankful to Mrs. Pavathi Krishnan for highlighting certain real problems of my State.

Sir, I do not blame the administration there. Some people say that it is because of bureaucratic Government over there that our problems have been neglected. I am of the view the young officers or the administrators over there are forced to do certain duties. If they do not do their duties they will be sent off. I will hold the Central Government responsible for it and will not blame the bureaucracy alone. As far as they are concerned they are putting in their best. Naturally, they cannot represent the viewpoint of a particular place as a Member can do in the legislative Assembly. So, we cannot criticise the authority over there leaving the Central Government free from this anomaly.

Sir, I am of the view that Pondicherry should be recognised as a State. The Government of India have been giving certain reasons to oppose this demand. When we met the Home Minister he told us about the financial viability and when we met the Finance Minister he was giving us a different answer.

Sir, we have to go to the Home Minister as far as our personal problems are concerned but they are not given due consideration. The matters which were sent to the Central Government long back are still pending. Sir, I will try to show how negligent this Government has been towards Pondicherry. Sir, this year is known as

International Women's year. The *de jure* transfer took place in 1962 the Indian Succession Act has not been extended to Pondicherry so far. In Pondicherry there are certain people who have renounced their civil status and they are governed by code civil and for their women their rights are governed there. For people who are directly governed by code civil there is no problem but people who are Christians and not renounced and not governed by code civil the Hindu Succession Act is not applicable. Also the Hindu Marriage Act is not applicable. So, you must realise the Christian women who have not renounced their civil status are not having right in their property and this is a very primitive position. Sir, even this simple point we have been urging over a number of years and the Central Government is not considering the same.

Sir, Mrs. Parvathi Krishnan mentioned about the pay anomalies. While speaking on last year's budget I suggested appointment of a Commission to rectify these anomalies. The entire Education Department, Press and some other departments have been left out and even where pay scales have been announced there are very many anomalies. So, they can send a Commission and rectify this anomaly. Unless this is done in an urgent manner the consequences will be unpleasant.

Sir, then I talk of the Government servants, I must think of the ex-French staff also Sir, in the year 1954, they never contemplated as to what their future will be? So, they simply opted for the French pay scales and some of them opted for the Madras pay scales. Subsequently, Sir when the Central scheme was introduced, it was beneficial to them. So once again, an option was given to them and many of them opted for the Indian pay scales. Now, Sir, in the year 1968 or 1969, when it was reopened before the 1970 Commission, to Goa, they gave one other option to opt for Indian pay scales. Now I would plead with this Government that they should give one more option to the ex-French staff of Pondicherry, Karaikkal, Mahe and Yanam to opt

for the Indian pay scales so that you can have a better administration and they will also be satisfied. Since these people are in a minority, they cannot press for their democratic rights. Even if they are right, it is thrown into the dust bin. As a Member of Parliament, I can press for their rights only here and the Government of India would do the needful to these innocent and poor people.

When the Railway Minister was speaking on the other day, he was speaking about the extension of rail services and other things. But Sir, for one full year, to my State, not a single train was run. When I represented, they never cared for it. Pondicherry is the Headquarters of my Union Territory; Karaikkal is another territory; Mahe is another portion and Yanam is another portion. No train was run to these places. Now, they speak about the reasonableness of extending the train services to these places. What is the time involved? We have to go by train from Madras to Pondicherry. Some Member was speaking about this and he said that we can go by train from Madras to Pondicherry. We cannot go by a through train. One has to get down at Villipuram, wait for eight hours, get another train and that will take another eight hours to cover a distance of about 25 miles. This is the way the trains are being run. Now, to Karaikkal, a train starts at about 9.45 AM at Mayman and that reaches at 12.15 PM and the distance covered is only about 20 miles. When we represented this matter, they explained away that it is not economical for us to run trains to these small towns. If the train services are untimely, how can they be economical? The train services suit neither the students nor the officers nor the businessmen. The train services suit them. It is alright for them to come before the House with the statistics that out of the 1500 trains which were cancelled, about 1300 trains have been restored and only about 200 remain cancelled. My complaint is that, so far as Pondicherry is concerned, they are not paying any attention considering the welfare of the people. That is the reason why they are not even thinking of conducting elections.

Now, I come to my next point regarding you that Member who is involved in the power position. In regard to power, we are mainly dependent upon Tamil Nadu. We have to go with a begging bowl to Tamil Nadu to get power. In regard to power that is coming from Kerala via Tamil Nadu, we have to first beg Tamil Nadu and then send our begging bowl through Tamil Nadu to Kerala. Sir, four years back, as a matter of policy, they proposed that we should have a thermal plant. When this was proposed and when the report was sent as early as 1973, no reply came from the Central Government. Today, from the Budget papers, I find that they are not contemplating the setting up of this thermal plant under the Plan. The unfortunate thing is, they cannot take up new schemes on their own. Sir, I will not take your time unnecessarily. Practically, 75 per cent of the amount is spent on overheads. They just provide for a certain amount of administration and for certain staff. There are no plans and there are no progressive ideas. I do not even consider this as a Budget. There is no point in discussing about the constitutional niceties for a long time forgetting about the people and their interests.

Then, Sir, Ariyanguppam river is another project. Some Members spoke about the port facilities at Pondicherry. When it is a question of port facilities, instead of unloading the fertiliser at Madras and Cuddalore, it is better and economically viable for them to pass on a certain quantity to Pondicherry also. Sir, if the Ariyanguppam river is fully utilised we can have berths and so on and they can unload it. But, we do not even find this scheme in the Plan. They have provided only Rs. 4 lakhs or Rs. 5 lakhs for the port facilities. These are only eyewash programmes. When I go back to my constituency, I am not able to say anything to my people. They ask, 'what have you achieved?' I can only say that I had been to Delhi and I saw the big *tamasha* there, that they spoke for so many days about our State but there has been no benefit. Some of them are so ignorant that they ask 'Are

you that Member who is involved in the licence scandal?' That is how they ask. I feel very much annoyed when they ask like this.

If this is the way we are going to function, how can we go ahead? We are getting stuck up in technicalities. As an advocate I have been bored for 15 years whenever there is a hair-splitting argument going on about whether it should be *melvaram* or whether it should be *kudivaram*. Now even in Parliament that disease has crept in. This is the kind of thing that has been the real block for our progress. Those days are over. We must go to the spirit of the thing. What for have we been sent here? Last time, when I faced election, Shrimati Indira Gandhi along with Shri Kamraj who is not here, but who is always available in the Central Hall, along with other people contested against us and got defeated. Then people thought that at least they would take it in the proper spirit and serve them. But they joined together in an unbody manner and threw us out of power. Now the people are saying, 'Let progressive-minded people get together and come to us. We will once again elect you. We will see to it'. But I do not know what is in their mind and why they are postponing elections, thus denying the people their right by this kind of undemocratic methods.

When I speak about this, I do so without any political motivation. I say this because if we are sincerely interested in the people, we must go back to them with a clean conscience and a clean slate. I am very proud that you, Sir, expressed in favour of our rights, members' rights, Parliament's rights as the supreme authority and all that. But if you see the condition in our territory, what is the position? If we take one after another of the items in the budget, I find hardly a single item of interest to me. That is why I am sorry to say this that I do not know whether we are being misled. A sum of Rs. 23 lakhs is mentioned in connection with drought relief. I do not know from where it has come. I am not interested in argument

because that is not the main idea. There was drought and people were suffering. The Government came forward with a begging bowl to the Central Government. The Central Government said they would give Rs. 38 lakhs. Subsequently it was reduced to Rs. 23.55 lakhs.

When it is a question of spending, they say 'It is a matter of policy. We will not give you. You must adjust within the plan itself'. Because of that, our Government was forced to adjust this drought relief fund within the plan. Where from they have taken this amount, I am not competent to say. They spent it and it is for a good cause and the people are happy about it. But at the same time, this is a Union Territory. You are directly governing it. Therefore, when you speak about policy matters, you have to take it in your own sphere as part of your own territory. It is a backward territory. You must give the amount from your pocket, either from the consolidated Fund of India or from some other source and not ask to adjust it within our own funds. If you are going to ask us to adjust within our plan, then we will ask for Statehood. We are not like Shri Karunanidhi, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, who is asking for autonomy. We are asking for our own administration, a better administration which will manage in a better way. If you are not going to do it, I am afraid you will be encouraging separatist tendencies. Already the separatist idea is gaining ground which is opposed to the unity idea which alone can promote the welfare of the people on the whole.

Once again I appeal to the Prime Minister who, I think, will be listening from somewhere and to the other Ministers. It is unfortunate that I see here only the Minister of State for Finance. This is a subject in which every one of you should be interested. This is the Territory that has given the unifying colour for the State. You speak very highly of it. But all the time, you are only interested in the Ashram. You forget that there are many other places than the Ashram. I am also interested

in the Ashram. My name is Aravinda Bala Pajanor. My father was a devotee of the Ashram. But this matter will not end there. We must take a composite view of it. You must take full interest for the entire territory. If you do that for Pondicherry, I am sure you will do it for other States also. This can be a model for you.

Last time also we had asked for a High Court. When you have a Judicial Commissioner's court for Goa and other places, you are denying this to us, I do not know for what reason. You have double standards.

Then I request you to send a Commission to our Territory because it is a backward Territory industrially. In the Plan, I see you are having an Industrial Development Corporation. But the amount you are allotting is more like the time allotted to my party in this House. I am very grateful to the Deputy-Speaker that he has given me quite a long time. But if I have to speak on the Railway Budget, I am given only 3 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a special case because you come from that area. You are the lone representative of the area.

SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR: I am very grateful to you for giving me more time. I can only mention this now. The Business Advisory Committee should see to it that a minimum of 5 minutes is allowed to a party. I am allowed only 2 minutes on Steel and Mines and 3 minutes on Shipping and Transport. Within this time, what can I express? That is why I say we are only adhering to the form of democracy, not the spirit of it.

I have a number of other matters to speak about. So far as the Pondicherry public servants are concerned, the Health Minister said this morning that they are trying to unify the pay scales. I am happy about it. Even seven months ago, we sent a representation to the Health Minister

stating the anomalies. A technician in the Willingdon Hospital is paid two times the emoluments of his counterpart in JIPMAR hospital. An assistant is paid not even three-fourth of his counterpart in Lady Hardings Hospital. Within the same country, you are having this kind of discrimination. If you are not going to solve this problem for which we sent a petition, do you expect us only to speak in this Parliament which will be just playing to the gallery?

That will not serve any purpose.

Once again I appeal to you: please send us a Commission so that it can go into the anomalies and rectify them and also look into other matters which need looking into and do the needful so that we can have a better administration there with good and conferred government staff so serve the people as is expected in a democracy.

ड० संसात (अर्थात् इन्जिन): उपाध्यक्ष जी, पांडिचेरी के बजट पर कुछ बोलने की मेरी इच्छा इस कारण से हुई कि मुझे यह भीषण प्राप्त हुआ था कि मैं पांडिचेरी तीन बार जा चुका हूँ और वहाँ के निवासियों की अपनी शिकायतों से दुर्गन्धा देख सका हूँ। जिन बेहरे को मैंने देखा मैंने यह पाया कि उसे शायद पूरा भोजन नहीं मिलता उसके पास यह साधन नहीं है जिन से वह अपने परिवार को पाल सके। श्री एस०एल० सीनम जब वहाँ के सैप्टीमेंट गवर्नर थे तो मुझे चार, पाच दिन बहल रहने का मौका मिला था। श्री सरविन्द घोष, जो भारतीय स्वतंत्रता के इतिहास के एक चपलगातो मितारे हैं। उनके प्रति भी मेरी श्रद्धा है और उन्होंने जिन प्रकार वहाँ पर साध्य बनना है, उनमें किस प्रकार के कार्य चल रहे हैं, वह देश के विकास का साधक एक उदाहरण हो सकता है तो मुझे वहाँ जाने की कई बार इच्छा होती रही। जिन प्रकार वहाँ पर शिक्षा का मन्त्रालय एक सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्रीय स्तर से किया जा रहा है, जिस प्रकार वहाँ पर कुटीय उद्योग या छोटे उद्योग काम में लगे जा रहे हैं, व्यक्तियों को उनमें लगाया जा रहा है,

तो मुझे भी याना भी कि वहाँ पर ऐसी सरकार, जो लोगों की सरकार हो, तो वह शायद उन लोगों के कुछ बर्द को दूर कर सकेगी, जो कि प्रसीडेंट इन में नहीं किया जा सकता है।

जब वहाँ पर श्री बी०बी० जती साहब लेफ्टीनेट गवर्नर थे मैं पाच छ दिन के लिए रहा गया था और जो मैंने 8 बर्द पूर्व लोगों के बहरे पर एक बरीबी की तन्वीर और चित्र देखा था ठीक वही माननीय जती साहब के जमाने में देखकर धाया था। तो मैं विल मजी जी ने जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कारण है कि हम अभी भी वहाँ पर राष्ट्रपति का शासन रखने जा रहे हैं? क्या वहाँ पर डीमिजिटेशन रही हो पाया है? अगर डीमिजिटेशन की जो पत्रिया पूरी करनी चाहिए, वह अगर इम्प्लान करमिन ने पूरी नहीं की है तो उसे शक्य पूर. किया जाना चाहिए,

15.47 hrs. [Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami in the chair]

जब मैं वहाँ पर गट पर गया तो मैंने देखा कि नेज बनने वाली इन प्रकार की वहाँ नावें आ रही थी और वहाँ में माल उतारा जा रहा था तथा सामान धारण से उधर उधर भेजा भी जा रहा था जिन से ऐसा भ्राम्य होला था कि कोई पुछने वाला नहीं है कि या यह सामान कहाँ में धाया और किस प्रकार धाया। स्मरणिय का मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ वह एक छोटा झट्टा भी रहा, और जब सारे देश में हमने स्मयसर्त को दकड़ा तो पांडिचेरी का भी एक झट्टा कयाक धाया है। वहाँ पर भी हमने कुछ व्यक्तियों को जो स्मरणिय करते थे पकड़ा है। ऐसी जगह पर हम वहाँ के लोगों की दुर्गन्धा को बदलने के लिए एक झट्टा पोर्ट बना सके जिसे हम पाइनर पोर्ट कह सकें तो झट्टा रहेगा। या अगर सीडियम पोर्ट वहाँ पर बन जाए— मैं जानना हूँ कि यह तो टेक्निकल एडवाइज पर निर्भर करेगा— तो मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि पांडिचेरी का डेवल्पमेंट हुत पनि के हो जाएगा।

इन्डस्ट्रियल डेवल्पमेंट कारपोरेशन के बन्दर में भी मुझे जाने का मौका मिला था।

यद्यपि मैं ऐसे वक्त वहाँ पर गया था जबकि मैं पार्लियामेंट का सदस्य नहीं था। मैं एक कार्यकर्ता के रूप में वहाँ पर गया था और इस नामे वहाँ गया था कि व्यक्तिव श्रावण में क्या कार्य चल रहा है उस को देखने के लिये गया था ताकि उस का देखकर श्रावण में बम्बई नगरी में कुछ काम कर सकूँ। मैंने वहाँ पर देखा कि इन्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट कार्पोरेशन के लिये वहाँ पर जो चुनी हुई सरकार थी, जो कुछ भी वह रपया मागती थी, वह उस को पूर्ण तरह से नहीं मिलता था। जो उस समय वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री थे, उन से मैं मिला और उन मुख्य मंत्री ने मुझ से कहा कि मुख्य मंत्री होते हुए भी मुझे दिल्ली बड़ी-बड़ी जाना पड़ना है और होम मिनिस्टर के प्राय-पीछे घूमना पड़ना है और धन्य-धन्य मन्त्रियों के प्राथना करने पड़ती है लेकिन जा हम मांगते हैं, उस की पूर्ति नहीं हो पानी। तो इन्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट कार्पोरेशन का खर्चा हम क्यों कर रहे हैं। इनका ज्यादा खर्चा कर क धरम हम व्यक्तियों को वहाँ पर उद्योग में नहीं लगा पाते हैं, तो उन सम्था को मिटा देना चाहिये और उन का हटा देना चाहिए। यहाँ जा मे इन प्रकार काम रहा है वह कुछ के कारण बाल रहा है। मैं कभी नहीं चाहूँगा कि इन्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट कार्पोरेशन का वहाँ से हटाया जाय लेकिन जब वहाँ बार्ड काम नहीं रहा और वह वहाँ पर रहे, ता मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूँगा कि इन्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट कार्पोरेशन ने वहाँ पर क्या काम किया है, उन को किनना रपया प्राप्त ने भेजा है, कितना रपया वहाँ पर ग्रान्ट के रूप में दिया गया और कितना बीन के रूप में दिया और कितनी वहाँ पर व्यक्तियों की क्षत्रिया आई और इस प्रकार कितन लोगों की प्राप्त ने क्षत्रिया प्राप्त की यह सूचना बिना मंत्री देने की कृपा करे।

मैंने वहाँ की शिक्षण सम्थाओं को भी देखने का प्रयत्न किया और मुझे बड़ा कुछ हुआ, वहाँ के अध्यापकों की दुर्बला को देखकर, वहाँ के विद्यार्थियों के रहन-सहन को और उन के कपड़ों को देखकर। यह साफ़ दीखता था कि वे किस परिवार से आते हैं या तो उन परिवार की आमदनी

बहुत कम है और वा वहाँ की सरकार के बात बँस रही है। केन्द्र ने उसे जो स्टिपेंड दे रखा है जो हमारे कानून में है, इन्स्टीट्यूशन में जो उस का बर्ना है, उसे तो हम खर्च नहीं सकते, तो मैं यही चाहता हूँ कि जब हम देश को एकता के सूत्र में बाँधना चाहते हैं और केन्द्र की वहाँ पर कुछ भी करण रही है। अगर हम पाठशालों की जो कुछ भी करण रखें, उन को अगर हम सेफ रखना चाहते हैं, उन को हम बिपन्नता नहीं चाहते हैं, ता उनमें स्टेट का दर्जा दिया जाना चाहिए। यह एक छोटी सी बात जा मे कह रहा हूँ, ऐसा नगना है कि बिना साधन मममें मैं बोल रहा हूँ। स्टेट बनान के लिये उसकी कितनी आमदनी है कितनी आमदनी वह कर सकेगा यह एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को वायवबिल सुनिश्चित बन सकना या नहीं बन सकेगा यह सब बातें ता धरम हैं लेकिन राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण से हमारे नैतिक दृष्टिकोण से और बलवान दृष्टिकोण से हम एकपरीमेत को धरम हमन वहाँ पर भ्रम किया उनमें स्टेटहूड दे कर, तो वहाँ के चाँफ मिनिस्टर का वहाँ पर दौर कर धरम बन्द का प्रयास नहीं करना पड़ेगा और उसे जो दखल प्रदाय यह धरम करना पड़ना है, वह ज़ायद बन्द है जागगा और वहाँ के लोगों की जा हुरदा 27 वर्षों की आजादी के बाद भी चल रही है, वह कुछ हद तक दूर है जागगी। तो मे समझता हूँ कि उनमें स्टेटहूड देने के लिए धरम नहीं ता बन निर्णय लेना चाहिए। यह छोटा ना प्रश्न नहीं है। इस पर निर्णय लेने के लिये काफी समय चाहिए, लेकिन मे मंत्री जी ने प्राथना ककना कि वे कृपा करके इस पर विचार करने के लिये मुहम्ममम जी मे कहें कि कॅबिनेट में इस की खर्चा हो। हम हर मूरत में इस को स्टेटहूड देने में तो हम मे हमारी जीत रहने वाली है, हमारी क्षत्रिया पाठीं कांसेस के राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण से यह बहुत ऊँची चीज होने वाली है। इस में कोई शक नहीं है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर जो बीजे पीवा होती है, उन बीजे का एम-

पोर्ट की काफी शक्ति प्राप्त हो किना जा सकता है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमारे सली जी ने इस पर कभी ध्यान दिया है कि वहाँ पर एक्सपोर्ट की क्या परिस्थिति है। वहाँ पर तारिखल पैदा होना है और काफी की पैदा होती है। मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि इस के लिये भी उन को तैयारी करनी चाहिए।

श्री ज्योदा न कहने हुए मे यही प्रार्थना करता कि आप ने आ बजट पेश किया है, भगवान न करे कि प्रेसीडेंट बल को और धागे बहा पर बढ़ना पड़े, उन का जब मैं ने अध्ययन किया, तो मैंने पाया कि आप ने बजट का 70 परसेंट खर्चा तो है, वह नान-भान ने लोगो की सम्बन्धों के देने में ही क्या जाना है और 30 परसेंट जो बचता है वह कन्टीन्जेंट प्लान पर आप का खर्च करना पटना है। इस तरह स आप कोई नई स्कीम नहीं लने है और वह इसलिये नहीं रख पाते क्या कि बहा पर प्रेसिडेंट बल सारी पावर व्योराजमी को हाथ में है जिन को टैबिल पर बैठ कर काम करना मे मान्य प्राप्ता है। जनता मे आकर उनके विचारों का जान कर नई कल्पना सामन रखना उन को प्राप्त नहीं है। इसलिये जल्द से जल्द बहा पर चुनाव लिये जान चाहिये और स्टेटहुड उमे मित्रता चाहिए उन के बारे मे सच विचार कर के उन्हें देने का प्रयत्न करेंगे, मेरी मैं प्रार्थना करना हूँ। इस के प्रस्ताव ज्योदा से ज्योदा उन का मान्य इस कार्यकाल मे है वर यह बतान का प्रयत्न करने कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने गम्भीर मान्य के विनो मे इनका प्रस्ताव काम किया है और केन्द्र से इस प्रकार पैसा देने मे लामो का प्रस्ताव हुआ है।

आप ने मुझे कुछ ज्यादा समय दिया है, इस के लिए मे आपकी धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

**SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR** (Ahmedabad) Although the discussion on the Budget Demands for my own State of Gujarat has been postponed yet another time, and I hope it will now be held tomorrow, I am glad that the Deputy-Speaker who was then presiding took the correct constitutional view in the larger

interests of the rights of Parliament over the executive and ruled that although the Demands for Gujarat were important, the overall importance of constitutional propriety had to prevail. I am also sure that my friend Shri Sezhiyan and many others on this side who interjected in the various points of order and debates on that important constitutional issue never meant to stall anything. Anyway, I am glad that the Deputy-Speaker took a lenient view when the Pondicherry Budget came, and, therefore, we are proceeding with this discussion.

It was very heartening to hear my good friend, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan—I do not see her just now in the House—tell us in so many words that the election in Pondicherry must be held as early as possible. In fact, she said it should be done immediately. Equally encouraging were the observations of my esteemed elder and friend, Dr. Kailas, who said that Pondicherry must have new elections immediately. Then I wonder why my friends from both the CPI and the ruling Congress say that no elections should be held when it comes to the question of Gujarat. The CPI had voted against my amendment on the President's Address in which I asked for early elections in Gujarat. But, Sir, I am glad that over such a short period of time, just after some days, wisdom has dawned upon our friends both in the CPI and also in the Ruling Congress in regard to the election in Pondicherry, and I hope they will now apply the same yard-stick tomorrow when they come to the question of elections in Gujarat.

16 hrs.

**DR. KAILAS :** Why not?

**SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR :** My friend, Shri Aravinda Bala Pajantor, has made a very moving speech. He comes from Pondicherry and naturally he felt more agitated and disturbed on a number of points. I need not repeat these points nor have I the direct knowledge in terms of speaking on those points. But like Dr. Kailas, I also had the good fortune

of visiting Pondicherry mainly for the purpose of visiting the great Aurobindo Ashram. Sir, I remember vividly the extreme poverty in the eyes of the ordinary people, commoners, children, people living in huts, small cottages and I must say that I felt extremely distressed, because I could not really relish, much less could I even tolerate, the glaring contrast that prevailed there. On the one hand, in the Ashram, we had all the facilities and comforts and also a kind of spiritual atmosphere. But outside, almost at the close doors of the Ashram, I saw such a glaring contrast and Shri Arvind Bala Pajananor as also Dr. Kailas are right when they say that Pondicherry is continuously neglected. Sir, I would have liked many hon. Member belonging to various regions of our great country to come forward and participate in this discussion. It is not only the responsibility of the hon. Member from Pondicherry to talk in terms of the difficulties and problems of his State, but it is the concern of all the people of the country, and of the whole people of the sub-continent.

Now, if elections are not held, what is the reason? Are the electoral rolls not completed? I am told they are completed. Is the Election Commission not ready? I am told the Election Commission is ready. The people are wanting elections. My friends from the South tell us that the elections are very much wanted by the people. Then what is the obstacle? Then what is the hinderance? Sir, the tragedy of the situation is, not only in Pondicherry but in many other parts of this country, that quite often, what I may call, vicious politicking dominates and problems of peoples welfare are put into secondary considerations, in third and fourth categories. Sir, democracy means people's welfare. Are we interested in putting this person or that person, this party or that party in power? Are we only interested in depriving this group or that group of power? Or, are we interested in making continued efforts aimed at the increased welfare of the people? It is possible that

in trying to increase the people's welfare one party may be in power today, but that same party may be in Opposition tomorrow. How does it matter? What matters is whether people's welfare is promoted. If people's welfare is promoted and for that 'A' or 'B' party is to go out, well that party will have to go out. People's welfare cannot remain at standstill.

Therefore, I feel that Pondicherry must have elections very soon. Secondly, I would like to make a mention about the drought. It is very serious. In Pondicherry, the conditions of drought are very disastrous. So also in Tamil Nadu and in other parts of South India. Last month I was in Madras, and got the people's views, and I also saw for myself the conditions there. I was told that Madras had been facing an acute problem in regard to drinking water.

Fortunately, rains have come and there is some relief in other parts of Tamil Nadu except Madras City. If the people of Pondicherry or Gujarat are distressed by drought, should the argument be that because there is drought, therefore you will not have a popular Government? Rather the argument should be that because there is a problem of such gigantic dimensions, only the elected representatives of the people will be able to deliver the goods. I have nothing against the officers. If they are competent and experienced in the job, it is all the better for the administration. But by the very nature of things, no bureaucracy can function with any kind of direct contact with the people. So, I cannot accept this argument that elections should be postponed because of the drought, and that normal healthy democratic processes should be kept in abeyance.

As in Gujarat, teachers' conditions are miserable and college professors are not getting adequate pay in Pondicherry. If there is a popular Government, the people can make representations far more effectively than they can do with the bureaucratic machinery. I understand, the Central



Government has already sanctioned a central university in Pondicherry. I want to know what steps have been taken to see that this is expedited. It is no use giving an assurance and sleeping over it.

The conditions of the roads are extremely poor and inadequate in Pondicherry. The number of health centres is less than what is required, especially in the rural areas. The minister should give more attention to having good roads and more health centres. I will not talk about unemployment, because that is nothing peculiar to Pondicherry alone but is common to the whole country. If that is a consolation to my young friend, I can offer him that.

I should like the Government of India to spend a little more time, money and attention on the development of Karaikal, which can be developed into a good, useful port to serve Pondicherry and South India

As I said, we want to give an impression that all the Members of Parliament are interested in the proper development of all the areas of the country. Pondicherry has had the privilege of having the Aurobindo Ashram. It has also the privilege of having one of the world's very interesting experiments—a new kind of institution called "Auroville." Funds for this are pouring in from UNESCO and many international and private agencies all over the world. We want it to develop, but should we allow this glaring contrast—Aurobindo Ashram and Auroville, which are receiving the attention of the peoples and the Government of India and the peoples and the Governments of the world on the one side, and the lack of care and attention for the common people of Pondicherry on the other? This is my appeal, and I hope that the Government of India will see to it that Pondicherry becomes famous, not only through these two big institutions, welcome as they are important as they are, but by steady and sustained and, I will even say, speedy development and progress of the vast members of poor people who reside in Pondicherry.

SHRI SEZHIAN : Mr. Chairman, I agree with the other hon. Members who preceded me in saying that there should be immediate elections in Pondicherry and representative government should be allowed to function there. Whatever might have been the reason in March 1973...

SHRI M RAM GOPALA REDDY (Nizamabad) : You are the reason.

SHRI SEZHIAN : If Shri Reddy wants to enter into a dialogue, I am prepared for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You please ignore him.

SHRI SEZHIAN . If an hon. Member of this House, an elderly gentleman, says something, I will not ignore that. He said that I am responsible for it. I accept it. Because, on the 27th March 1974, at the first meeting of the Assembly, a no-confidence motion was adopted, the Ministry was unseated and President's Rule came. But I must say that the Congress Party to which Shri Reddy belongs, joined with us in supporting that no-confidence motion. In fact, he is more responsible because his party had a greater strength than my party.

I am not here to suggest that merely because we participated in the no confidence motion, we do not want the elections to take place afterwards. Farlier, we were the ruling party. Then in the elections we got defeated. The party which came to power was defeated by a no-confidence motion. But that is no excuse for postponing the elections and, consequently, the functioning of the democratic government there. When the elections are held, my party may or may not come to power. That is not the consideration. Personal or party gain should not be the consideration; we should follow the democratic norms and procedures. Otherwise, we will have autocracy in place of democracy, always being ruled by the Centre. If the Centre feel that representative government is not suitable for Pondicherry for some time to come, the

same argument can be applied to all the States and all of them can be brought under President's Rule, and every day Shri Mukherjee will have the honour of coming before the House with supplementary demands or excess demands.

**SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE :** And being stalled by you.

**SHRI SEZHIAN :** My first plea is that the elections should be held at the earliest possible moment and every party should be given the opportunity to go to the people of Pondicherry, because the people have the constitutional and fundamental right to have administration by their duly elected representatives.

In this context, we have three Presidential Orders, issued on the 27th March 1974, 26th September 1974 (after the expiry of six months) and the third on the 7th March 1975. What do they say in these Presidential Orders? When the first order came, we approved it immediately. The Order of the 7th March is a replica of the Order of 26th September 1974. It says:

"Whereas I have received a report from the Administrator of the Union Territory of Pondicherry and after considering the report and other information received by me, I am satisfied that the situation in the Union Territory continues to be such that the administration of the Territory cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and for further administration of the Union Territory it is necessary that the operation of the provisions should be continued "

He says the same thing in respect of the report for 1973-75 also. There also he says:

"Whereas I have received a report from the Administrator of the Union Territory of Pondicherry and after considering the report and other information received by me, I am satisfied . . . etc."

Now he has referred to two documents received from the Administrator of Pondicherry and, based on the reports, he has taken the decision. Whenever a Presidential Order is imposed on the States, invariably, the report of the Government is placed on the Table of the House along with the Order. In these circumstances, when two reports have been received in which he requested the President to continue the President's Rule—once in September and again in March—in all fairness to the House, we should have the reports from the Administrator addressed to the President—that means, addressed to the Executive here—so as to know what were the grounds put forth by the Administrator, and what was the speciality that was there which made the Union Government and the President to take a decision that President's Rule should continue as recommended by the Administrator.

On the 14th March I wrote a letter to the Speaker about these things and asked that the two statements sent by the Administrator should be made available to the House so that the House would be in a better position to appreciate why the Presidential Order is being continued for the third time. Whenever a State is brought under aegis of the President's Rule, this House ought to function as the Assembly of the particular State; so we should know why we are doing the job which is meant to be done by the another Assembly. It comes to this, that not only are you usurping the powers of the House, but the House is made to usurp the powers of some other Assembly. This is not a democratic procedure.

Coming to rules, you may say that nowhere in the Union Territories Act is it said that the Administrator's Report should be laid on the Table of the House. That would probably be technical but not democratic.

Two more things, and I will be done. Regarding Plan allocations, Pondicherry has been given a very raw deal; it has

not been given its due share. In the Fifth Five Year Plan it was originally Rs. 32 crores and then, due to the increase in the Third Pay Commission's scales etc. it was expected to go to Rs. 40 crores. This was the agreement between the Union Territory of Pondicherry and the Planning Commission and this was agreed to by the Centre. So, on the basis of 40 crores for the Fifth Five Year Plan for the years 1975-79, on an average Rs. 8 crores should be allotted for each year. But I find that for the year 1974-75 they have allotted only Rs. 5.29 crores and for the year 1975-76 only Rs. 5.11 crores have been allotted—amounting to Rs. 10.40 crores on the whole. So, out of the allocation of 40 crores, for the first two years they have allotted only Rs. 10.4 crores which means that the balance of Rs. 30 crores is to be spent in the next three years which I very much doubt. For the first two years you have given only 25 per cent instead of 40 per cent. Therefore I would appeal that this Plan allocation should be raised.

Secondly, I want to make a general observation—without going into details Pondicherry, somehow or other, is used by the Administrator and the officials here as a spring board for promotions. Supposing an Under Secretary wants a promotion, he is immediately shunted to Pondicherry. He does not have any involvement there. He goes there on promotion as Deputy Secretary and he comes back here confirmed in that post. He does not have any involvement with the problems of the State. I am not against integration. I do not say that the Pondicherry administration should be manned only by persons of Pondicherry. Why not have some cadre which has got some involvement in that State? After all, the bureaucracy is there to serve the people. It is not the people who are to serve the bureaucracy by giving them the posts that they want.

You take any institution there, whether it is the secretariat or JIPMER or any

other institution. Those who want to get a promotion go there for a period of six months and, once the promotion is confirmed, they want to revert back to Delhi and manipulate from here. This idea of using Pondicherry as a spring-board or a play-ground for training the persons without benefiting the particular State is not conducive to the interest of the State. Otherwise, in course of time, they may insist on a separate cadre for Pondicherry itself. If these things are done, the persons who want promotion are sent there for a short period and brought back here on the same posts, this is neither good for the administration nor for the people of the State.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members for making their observations on the Budget and the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Pondicherry.

I agree with the hon. Members that it would have been more appropriate if the problems of the people of Pondicherry could have been discussed and sorted out on the floor of the Union Territory Legislative Assembly. But it is known to you, Sir and the hon. Members, the circumstances under which the elected Government of the Union Territory could not function. It is no use trying to find out the location of responsibility for the failure of constitutional machinery which hardly could exist after the elections of 1974.

Regarding early elections, the issue has been raised not only on the floor of this House but on other occasions also and the position of the Government has been made quite clear. We are not opposed to hold elections early. But at the same time the very basic problems of the Union Territory should be looked into. The unprecedented drought which is prevailing there and the various relief measures which have been undertaken are to get through and, at the same time certain

normalcy should be brought back in the consideration of the Union Ministry which the elections could be held.

I would not like to make any observations which may appear to be extraneous. In this country, we find that two types of demands are raised. On the one hand, a demand is raised for the dissolution of the elected Assembly and, after that, on the other hand, immediately they raise a demand for having a fresh elected Assembly. This is their concept of democracy, that is, an elected Assembly should be dissolved before its stipulated period and, after that, immediately there is a demand that there should be a fresh elected Assembly. That is a political angularity of the hon. Members of the Opposition. But I can assure the House, as it has been pointed out by my colleague in the Home Ministry, that the elections will take place as soon as the situation is normal there.

The hon. Member from Pondicherry has made a very forceful speech and has highlighted particularly the problems of the people there. I agree with him that the problems of the people of Pondicherry should be looked into in its proper perspective and that Pondicherry should not be known as merely the location of the Ashram there. The Ashram plays an important role not only in the life of Pondicherry but also in the life of the entire India. Apart from that, the people of Pondicherry have also their own problems and those problems should not be over-shadowed by the Ashram or the problems related there.

Shri Mavalankar has raised a question regarding the Central University. Already a proposal is there. But it has to be kept in mind that if the Central University is established by the Education Ministry, the entire expenditure is to be borne by the Education Ministry; Pondicherry Administration or the Union Territory has nothing to do with it. It has not yet been finalised. That is why, it has not been possible for me to say at this stage, when it will be finalised, but it is under

AN HON. MEMBER : It has been sanctioned.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : There is a gap between the sanction and implementation. Money has to be allocated; other things are also there.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR : Sir, kindly ask the Minister to request his colleague in the Education Ministry to expedite this.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : I will pass on your suggestion to my colleague.

Regarding deficit of the Union Territory, it is known to the hon. Members that unlike the States, the entire deficit of the Union Territory is being met by the Central Government. So far as the revenue deficit is concerned, it is met straightway by assistance; so far as the capital deficit is concerned, it will be met by loans. Even for the present Plan allocation, I appreciate that the size of the Plan has not been up to the expectations of the people of Pondicherry, but in the limited situation of so many constraints in our economic life, it has been possible for us to increase the Plan outlay of the current year by a few lakhs from the last year. Last year it was of the order of 4.45 crores; this year, it has been 5.14 crores. It is coming either as the grant-in-aid or as loan assistance.

Two or three projects have been mentioned particularly by some hon. Members. In regard to the Thermal Power Project, we expect that the detailed project reports will be ready by the end of this month. After that the Government will be in a position to take a decision. Preliminary studies in regard to the composite project of Ariankuppam Port Project are also under completion and as soon as the whole thing is finalised, Government will arrive at a decision.

If these two Central sector projects where investment is much more are taken in hand, undoubtedly, the entire assistance will have to come from the Central Government. It will not be possible for the Union Territory Administration to bear any part of the expenditure.

Regarding other measures of development and other things, certain points have been raised regarding the conditions of the roads, drought relief etc. I hope, the Union Territory administration will take care of these and certain allocations have been made in the State Annual Plan. But the basic question remains. If we cannot augment the Plan allocation, we cannot take care of all the areas which deserve our attention.

Before I conclude, I would like to highlight one more point which has been raised by Shri Sezhiyan about the laying of notification and the report received from the Union Territory Administrator to the Home Ministry on the floor of the House. On an earlier occasion, I explained the legal position about it on the floor of the House. When a State is under President's rule under Art. 356 of the Constitution, notification and the Governor's advice to the President are laid on the Table of the House, but if it is being done under Sec. 51 of the Union Territories Act, that legal requirement is not necessary. And in this connection, the position has been explained in details in a letter that has been sent to Shri Sezhiyan under Home Ministry's Memo dated 18th March, 1975. If he has not received it by this time, he may get it. It is in connection with his letter to the Home Ministry that the position has been explained in detail.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** We will have a separate discussion after we have received that letter.

**SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE:** No, no. Which you wrote to the Home Ministry? I am not concerned with that.

With these words, Sir, I again thank the hon. Members who have taken part in this discussion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr Pajanor, you want your cut motions to be put to vote?

**SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR:** I am particular about cut motion No. 2 which may be put to vote.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right. I will put cut motion No. 2 of Shri Aravinda Bala Pajanor to the vote of the House.

Now, the question is:

"That the Demand for Grant on Account under the head 'Elections' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Postponement of elections without any reason whatsoever(2).]

**THE LOK SABHA DIVIDED:**

Division No. 8

16.39 hrs.

**AYES**

Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagdish  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.  
 Chavda, Shri K. S.  
 Deo, Shri P. K.  
 Horo, Shri N. E.  
 Joarder, Shri Dinesh  
 Mayathevar, Shri K.  
 Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Roy, Dr. Saradish  
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar  
 Sezhiyan, Shri  
 Shakya, Shri Maha Deepak Singh  
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar  
 \*Shastri, Shri Sheopujan  
 Singh, Shri D. N.  
 Verma, Shri Phool Chand

\*Wrongly voted for AYES.

## NOES

Ambesh, Shri  
 Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman  
 Arvind Netam, Shri  
 Balakrishniah, Shri T.  
 Banerjee, Shrimati Mukul  
 Barupal, Shri Panna Lal  
 Basumatari, Shri D.  
 Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal  
 Bist, Shri Narendra Singh  
 Daga, Shri M. C.  
 Deo, Shri S. N. Singh  
 Dhamankar, Shri  
 Dharia, Shri Mohan  
 Doda, Shri Hiralal  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
 Gavit, Shri T. H.  
 Gopal, Shri K.  
 Hari Singh, Shri  
 Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.  
 Kailas, Dr  
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A. S.  
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila  
 Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.  
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.  
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram  
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.  
 Majhi, Shri Kumar  
 Mallanna, Shri K.  
 Mallikarjun, Shri  
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mohan Swarup, Shri  
 Murthy, Shri B. S.  
 Naik, Shri B. V.  
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh

Oraon, Shri Tuna  
 Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand  
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra  
 Pandey, Shri R. S.  
 Pandit, Shri S. T.  
 Paokai Haokip, Shri  
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand  
 Peje, Shri S. L.  
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.  
 Raj Bahadur, Shri  
 Ram Dhan, Shri  
 Ram Singh Bhai, Shri  
 Ramji Ram, Shri  
 Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan  
 Rao, Shri P. Ankinedu Prasada  
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar  
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal  
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga  
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das  
 Roy, Shri Biswanath  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar  
 Sathe, Shri Vasant  
 Sethi, Shri Arjun  
 Shambhu Nath, Shri  
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri  
 Shankaranand, Shri B.  
 Sharma, Shri A. P.  
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram  
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal  
 Shivnath Singh, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri B. R.  
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Stephen, Shri C. M.  
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.  
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad

Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra  
Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
Yadav, Shri Chandrajit

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result\* of the division is :

Ayes: 18; Noes: 83.

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am putting the rest of the Cut Motions together.

Cut Motions Nos. 1 and 3 to 15 were put and negatived.

Now I am putting the Demands for Grants. 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, on Account, out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year commencing from 1st April, 1975, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof—Demands Nos. 1 to 32 and 34."

*The motion was adopted.*

Now I am putting the Supplementary Demand for Grants. The question is :

"That the respective Supplementary sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Accounts and Capital Account shown in the third column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to defray the charges which will come

\*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Sarvashri Ram Deo Singh, P. O. Mavalankar and Madhuryya Hal-dar.

NOES: Sarvashri Sidram Reddy, Narsingh Narain Pandey, K. Ramkrishna Reddy and Sheopujan Sbastri.

in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1975, in respect of the following demands entered in the second column thereof—

Demands Nos. 4 to 15, 17 to 21, 30 and 32."

*The motion was adopted.*

16.32 hrs.

PONDICHERRY APPROPRIATION  
(VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL 1975\*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE): 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 the Union Territory of Pondicherry for the services of a part of the financial year 1975-76.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is.

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry for the services of a part of the financial year 1975-76."

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: I introduce† the bill.

SHRI ARAVINDA BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): I could not send the slip to you earlier.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: I beg to move† that "the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry for the services of a part of the financial year 1975-76, be taken into consideration."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, section 2, dated 20-3-1975.

†Introduced/Moved with the recommendation of the President.