

I would like to submit that in this matter the Government should take a serious view and see to it that some deterrent punishment is given, something that will make an impression on the people of this country that we mean to be very firm and concerned against such criminals against society. That is why I support Shri Banerjee's submission under Rule 377 and I expect the Minister to come out with a statement assuring a very firm and expeditious action, not merely saying that they will look into it and make an inquiry and meanwhile years will pass by but assuring that they will take expeditious action which will create an impression in the country that we mean business against such criminals against society who indulge in such social crimes. This is all I want to submit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the Deputy Minister for Health who is here anything to say?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING (SHRI A. K. KISKU): I appreciate the feelings of the House. I can only say that the Government is very much exercised over this whole thing. It was discussed recently in the Central Council of Health meeting also this particular matter raised by Mr. Banerjee the Minister is making an inquiry and he will make a statement in the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, there is another very important matter—four Iranian students have been given deportation order....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This House is not for Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu alone. There are 528 members.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Four Iranian boys have been served with the deportation order. What is the

crime they have committed? or peacefully demonstrating before the Iranian Embassy. Please show some compassion. The deportation order should be withdrawn.

13 20 hrs.

PONDICHERRY BUDGET, 1974-75  
GENERAL DISCUSSION AND DEMANDS FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT, PONDICHERRY 1974-75

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up the General Discussion and Discussion on the voting of the Demands for Grants for the Union Territory of Pondicherry.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): It is really something illegal This cannot come to this House and I have given notice about it. We shall oppose it at that time. Let me tell you the Government has taken recourse to illegal and improper methods and they have no right in the present circumstances....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. I have called Shri Somnath Chatterjee. If you want to speak in his place, you speak.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is another trick.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When has to deal with a customer like you..!

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am a humble, innocent person....

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): Sir, would you like to fix some time-limit?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: 5 hours .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have not fixed the time.

**SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH:** An hour and a half would do, Sir. interruption. One hour or one-and-a-half-hours....

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I am sorry Members are talking among themselves. Order please. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has just suggested one hour or one-and-a-half hours....

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE** (Gwalior). Make it two.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** All right, then, let us agree . . .

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE.** We want to concentrate our fire on the Appropriation Bill.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Then you want 2 hours for this

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA** (Begusarai) 2 hours for the general discussion and 3 hours for the rest

**SHRI SEZHIYAN** (Kumbakonam) Sir, there are three aspects. First is general discussion on the Budget. Then comes Voting on the Grants. Only after voting on the Grants could we take up Appropriation Bill. Then comes the Appropriation Bill for introduction, for consideration and passing etc For the third stage we require more time. That is why we wanted to make this clear.

**SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH:** What time do you want for all the three stages? What do you suggest then?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA** Only for Appropriation Bill two hours; so many legal and constitutional points are there....

**SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH:** The legal points were discussed the other day. Normally, Appropriation is a formality. We can have 2½ hours.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** So we agree on 2½ hours for all the three stages.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** Not Appropriation Bill....

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Four hours in all Sir..

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Whole of today, Sir. Please see the time. It is already 1-25 . . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** If you want to discuss, you cannot split up the discussion. I heard you saying that you want to concentrate your fire on the Appropriation Bill. It is for you because we cannot discuss one thing and then again discuss it over a second time and so on. So let us have one discussion. And, as you know, Appropriation Bill would be a formal thing to be put So, taking all that into account, let us agree upon some time about that

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE** How can the introduction of Appropriation Bill its consideration and its passing be clubbed together?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Then suggest where we stand

**SHRI SEZHIYAN.** It is only after the grants are given, the Appropriation Bill can be introduced. These cannot be clubbed together Whatever discussion we may have, four hours will be enough for this.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Let us have this clear understanding that although, technically, Appropriation Bill cannot come before the grants are given, we still can agree not to have any further discussion at this stage. But we shall take three hours in all for the whole thing. Let there be no confusion and let us agree on one thing.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** In fact, in these three hours, I may not even get any chance to speak on the Appropriation Bill

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** Passing of Appropriation Bill will be only a technical process. Let us have two hours for general discussion and voting on Demands for Grants on Account and one hour for the Appropriation Bill. There is no discretion in these matters. And I do not want any discretion. Discretion is the best way to run. Let us agree on this.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN** Let us have 1½ hours for Appropriation Bill

**SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH** If they want 1½ hours for Appropriation Bill, let them have it and have another half an hour for Budget. What is there in it? There is nothing in the Budget. Let them finish with half an hour.

**SHRI JOYJIRMOY BOSU** This amount is intimidation.

**SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH** I do not have greater voice than you.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Let us have 1½ hours.

**SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH** Let them have 2½ hours for discussion and finish with that as otherwise all other Demands connected with the Ministries will be held up. Everyday we are losing time.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** Let us have 1½ hours for general discussion and another 1½ hours for the Appropriation Bill. Is that all right?

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS** Oh yes.

**DEMAND No. 1—LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Motion moved.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 179,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Legislative Assembly'."

**DEMAND No. 2—ADMINISTRATOR**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Motion moved.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,000 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 1974 in respect of Administrator."

**DEMAND No. 3—COUNCIL OF MINISTERS**

**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 1974 in respect of Council of Ministers."

**DEMAND No. 4—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Motion moved.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 3,83,000 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 1974 in respect of Administration of Justice."

**DEMAND No. 5—ELECTIONS**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** Motion moved.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 55,000 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, 1974 in respect of Elections."

**DEMAND No. 6—REVENUE**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,44,000 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 1974 in respect of 'Revenue'."

**DEMAND No. 7—SALES TAX**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,38,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Sales Tax'."

**DEMAND No. 8—TAXES ON VEHICLE**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 47,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Taxes on Vehicles'."

**DEMAND No. 9—SECRETARIAT**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,55,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Secretariat'."

**DEMAND No. 10—DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,97,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 2,30,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'District Administration'."

**DEMAND No 11—TREASURY AND ACCOUNTS ADMINISTRATION**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,23,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Treasury and Accounts Administration'."

**DEMAND No 12—POLICE**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 23,55,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Police'."

**DEMAND No. 13—JAILS**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,14,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Jails'."

**DEMAND No. 14—STATIONERY AND  
PRINTING**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,63,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

**DEMAND NO. 15—MISCELLANEOUS  
ADMINISTRATIVE GENERAL SERVICES**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,97,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Miscellaneous Administrative General Services'."

**DEMAND NO. 16—RETIREMENT  
BENEFITS**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,07,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Retirement Benefits'."

**DEMAND NO. 17—PUBLIC WORKS**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 69,18,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 47,30,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Public Works'."

**DEMAND NO. 18—EDUCATION**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,19,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 14,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Education'."

**DEMAND NO. 19—MEDICAL**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 56,28,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Medical'."

**DEMAND NO. 20—INFORMATION AND  
PUBLICITY**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,75,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Information'."

**DEMAND NO. 21—LABOUR AND  
EMPLOYMENT**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,80,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Labour and Employment'."

**DEMAND NO. 22—SOCIAL WELFARE**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,50,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Social Welfare'."

**DEMAND NO. 23—CO-OPERATION**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,90,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 4,45,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Co-operation'."

**DEMAND NO. 24—MISCELLANEOUS GENERAL ECONOMIC SERVICES**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,40,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Miscellaneous General Economic Services'."

**DEMAND NO. 25—AGRICULTURE**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 23,42,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 2,71,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Agriculture'."

**DEMAND NO. 26—ANIMAL HUSBANDRY**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Motion  
moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,38,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 67,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Animal Husbandry'."

DEMAND No. 27—FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,90,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1974 in respect of Fisheries Department."

DEMAND No. 28—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,60,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Community Development'."

DEMAND No. 29—INDUSTRIES

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,46,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 7,50,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Industries.'"

DEMAND No. 30—FOOD AND NUTRITION

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,03,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Food and Nutrition.'"

DEMAND No. 28—COMMUNITY

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 64,09,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 24,08,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Electricity'."

DEMAND No. 32—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,37,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 1,66,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage.'"

DEMAND NO. 34—LOANS TO GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,49,000 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, 1974 in respect of 'Loans to Government servants'."

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is significant that this House is now discussing the budget for the Union Territory of Pondicherry. This is the result of the toppling game that has been indulged in by the ruling party and the time of this House is taken when the Legislature of the Pondicherry—the Union Territory—should have gone into the matter.

13-28 hrs.

[SHRI VASANT SATHE in the Chair].

It is very important note that when the ministry was allowed to be installed in Pondicherry, obviously, there was some impression given by the Centre that this ministry would be allowed to continue.

But, when the budget was brought and the Vote on Account was brought, significantly, after the election to the Rajya Sabha was over, that consideration was no longer relevant and the toppling game was resorted to which ultimately led the Ministry to resign and the Assembly had to be dissolved. Therefore, the ruling party had the objective of getting assistance from certain political parties for the election of its nominee to the Rajya Sabha. And then, after having achieved that object, it was free to get rid of the

Government. Obviously it was known, in view of the composition of the Pondicherry Assembly that no party had got a clear majority and when a Member of the ADMK had become the Speaker of the Assembly, obviously, the ruling party at that time was in a minority in Pondicherry.

So far as one aspect is concerned, the budget estimates and the Vote on Account were not brought before this House after the dissolution of the Pondicherry Assembly for the simple reason that this Government of the Congress Party would have then to give their support in favour of the Vote on Account which they had voted against in the Pondicherry Assembly. That was why in order to avoid that anomaly, they took recourse to an illegal, unconstitutional and undemocratic method of issuing a Presidential Order about which we had discussed earlier on the floor of this House. The Congress Party, in Pondicherry, had voted against the Vote on Account in the Pondicherry Assembly. At that time the Ministry fell. And obviously, they could not come before Parliament with the same proposal and voters in favour of that in Parliament which they had voted against in Pondicherry. Therefore, this subterfuge was adopted. The validity and the constitutionality of this Presidential Order is now the subject matter of a writ petition in the Madras High Court. You all know this is now a subject-matter of writ petition in the Madras High Court. Now an attempt is being made to obtain the approval of this Parliament to a certain illegal presidential order to which we shall come later to a certain illegal presidential order. So far as these Budget Estimates are concerned we find that certain expenses have been mentioned for part of the year but we do not find any proposal as to how and in what manner the economic condition of this Union territory of Pondicherry is going to be benefited by the nature of expenses. We do not find any proposal as to how the unemployment question is to be



tackled. We do not find any proposal as to how the question of steep rise in prices of all essential commodities is to be dealt with. Nothing has been said. Therefore, the real remedy at the moment should be instead of coming before the Parliament with these piece-meal vote, on accounts without having an idea as to how the administration of this Union territory should be conducted there should be an immediate decision taken to hold the elections in Pondicherry. There is no reason why an election cannot be held in Pondicherry immediately.

Now, that the Assembly had been dissolved we demand the Government should take forthwith a decision to hold the elections in Pondicherry and to stop the Central rule. So far as the other aspects of the Pondicherry administration are concerned, we have seen that there have been serious complaints about the method in which the administration has been carried out. We would like to know what are the proposals before the Central Government while the Presidential rule is in force to bring about necessary agricultural and land reforms and necessary steps for improving educational standards. Nothing has been said and we call upon the Government to tell us through this House and to the people of Pondicherry as to how the things are to be remedied.

There are also serious problems of power crisis and we ought to be told as to how that problem is going to be solved. Therefore, we say the time of the House is being taken because of the attitude of the ruling party to arrogate to itself more and more powers even by taking recourse to various methods of subterfuge to topple governments which have been elected. Therefore, we want that immediately necessary direction be issued for holding elections.

Sir, before these budget estimates were presented this Presidential Order was issued. We would like to know why the budget estimates were not

brought before the House and why the Presidential Order was promulgated on 29th March? What was the difficulty in preparing this vote on account or coming before the House on 28th or 29th March and the House could have sat on 30th March to go into the question? Why is there an attempt to side-track the Parliament and to bring in the name of exercise of incidental and consequential powers a Presidential order whose constitutionality is open to grave doubt? I find from the debates that the Law Minister has been pleased to say more than once that Government would be in a position to support the supposed validity or constitutionality of the Presidential order. Although that is supposed to be the stand of the Government, curiously enough, a back-door method has been adopted by the introduction of a deeming provision in the Appropriation Bill, which we shall consider more fully later, to give the approval of this Parliament to an illegal order. If they think that the Presidential order is legal, then they do not require this deeming provision to obtain the approval of Parliament. Realising that it is not a legal order which has been issued in abuse of the President's powers under wrong advice given by the Law Ministry, it is now sought to be legalised in this manner.

Therefore, we are opposing these Demands, and we say that Government should here and now declare a firm date for holding elections and should take immediate steps to hold fresh elections in Pondicherry.

**SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM** (Tiruchirapalli): I do not know which hon. Minister is going to reply to the debate. Of course, the Finance Minister may reply so far as the budget side of it is concerned. But I do not know which Minister is going to reply regarding the political and legal sides of the question.

From 1st April, the Lt. Governor or the Pondicherry Administration has been incurring expenditure without

[Shri M. Kalyanasundaram]

any appropriate sanction from an appropriate legislature. The President or the Government here tried to set that irregularity aright by means of a Presidential Order which is under question now. The Opposition parties in this House have taken a very serious view of it and they have opposed it, and subsequently that order has also been placed on the Table of the House. Now, the matter is before a court, and I do not know what the court is going to decide about it. I shall leave it at that.

But my point is that there was no need for Pondicherry to come under President's rule so soon after the elections. My charge against the ruling party here is that they are responsible for this awkward situation in which the State Administration is placed. To cover that awkward situation, they have committed another awkward mistake, namely the Presidential Order. That is my charge against the ruling party.

As you are all aware, it was a stalemate after the elections. No party was able to get an absolute majority in Pondicherry. The ADMK had 12 members and they had the support of the Communist Party of India which had 2, and later the Communist Party (Marxist) which had one also gave them support. So, assured of the support of 15 members in a House of 30, the ADMK came forward to form the Ministry to break the political stalemate. When the elections were over and no party had an absolute majority, in order that the President's rule may not continue even after the elections, the ADMK came forward boldly relying on the assurances given by the ruling party from Delhi which had made also a public declaration that they would function as a responsible and constructive Opposition in Pondicherry. Privately also, the president of the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee informed the leaders of the ADMK that they had no objection to the ADMK forming the Government

and they would not create any trouble. So, fortified with such assurances, the ADMK-CPI alliance formed the government.

The Assembly was summoned for the first time on 26th March. On the 27th proposals were made for a vote on account for the first five months only. I think more or less the same proposals are here, a vote on account for the first five months. Would the heavens have fallen if the two Congress Parties had not pressed for a division on that vote on account motion. Here in this House they say that the Appropriation Bill for a vote on account is a formal affair. True. We concentrate only on the main budget demands and cut motions. Divisions are sought only on cut motions. The convention is that on an appropriation Bill for a vote on account division is never demanded. But here is an irresponsible opposition which demands division on this vote on account motion for the first five months. They combined together and defeated that motion when there were only three days to go for the financial year to end. Did the ruling party here give proper instructions to their unit there? If only they had approved this vote on account motion and allowed it to be passed, the next day they could have brought in a no confidence motion and removed the Ministry, if they so wanted. But they could not wait.

I am only trying to show how irresponsible and obstructionist the ruling party and the Congress (O) behaved there. Here was a chance for the ruling party to behave as a proper opposition party, a responsible and constructive Opposition. But this was how they behaved and that is why Government here is facing this awkward situation.

The Anna-DMK and CPI alliance has not lost anything. It is the ruling party and the Congress (O) which have lost their prestige, whatever they had of it, by this tripping.

After the election, the Anna-DMK and CPI publicly stated that there should be no horse-trading. The party which had the largest number should be invited to form the Government. So when the Anna-DMK-CPI alliance did whatever was possible even under those circumstances to preserve the democratic process there, the ruling party never had a responsibility to come to the help of the Government there; instead they joined hands with the Congress(O). If I call the Congress(O) by anything, their members here may take objection; after what they have decided, it is the Congress of Kamraj....

SHRI C. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Common Congress.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Kamraj Congress and the ruling Congress supported by our friends, the DMK. The DMK would go to the end of the earth to spite the Anna-DMK and CPI. I can understand their anger. But why should the Congress join with the DMK and Congress(O) to topple a Government consisting of the Anna-DMK and CPI? The matter is not so simple. The forces which are behind these two Congresses have to be exposed. The two old Ministers are the biggest landlords in that territory, Shri Venkatasubbiah Reddiar and Shri Purushottam Reddiar. They are a clique. They have got a major portion of the cultivable lands in the territory. Secondly, who are behind the Kamraj Congress? The biggest toddy shop contractors are behind the Kamraj Congress. Out of the five MLAs there, three are today shop contractors. Shri Kamraj led a campaign for imposing prohibition in the whole Tamil Nadu and had 15,000 volunteers sent to jail. But there his candidate set up for assembly election are the biggest toddy shop contractors.

Again, coming to the former DMK Chief Minister, he was the Chief Minister when the Congress was

there. He became the Chief Minister when the DMK got a majority. What a wonderful man! He knows how to become Chief Minister. This time, if the Anna-DMK had promised Chief Ministership to him, he would have jumped immediately after victory, but the Anna-DMK refused to have anything to do with him. That is the type of person who is there. There are allegations against him, against the way in which he has been handling the Government-owned distilleries and also how he has been recovering the revenue from the toddy shop leases. The main revenue in Pondicherry—50 per cent of it—is from toddy shop leases. So, he is in difficulty. He was particularly anxious that the Government should be toppled. If that Government stabilises, he was apprehending that charges of corruption and favouritism would be levelled against him. By utilising his position as Chief Minister, he was able to get some contracts, some agencies for the members of his family. There are charges against him. The Anna-DMK and CPI publicly announced that charges would be framed against him. So, all these three forces have combined together to topple the Ministry. Each had its own fears.

The previous Speaker from the Communist Party (Marxist) said that land reforms must be implemented. They need not implement them. Already, when the Communist Party was there in the Ministry one year ago, there was a ceiling Act passed. Rules have not been framed. There is an Act passed for the assignment of house-sites. Rules have not been framed. These two Acts have been kept in cold storage without being implemented for over a year. It is more than a year since these Acts were passed. Rules have not been framed. These landlords, especially the landlords who are dominating the Congress, were afraid that they would be personally losing the house-sites, because many of the agricultural labourers are occupying lands which are in their possession. They were

[Shri M. Kalyanasundaram]

afraid that if these Acts were implemented, they would be losing the house-sites.

You will find in the budget that the provision for this or the allotment for this has been increased for this year. I think the figures are more or less the same as adopted in the Ministry's proposals. It is three times that of last year for housing. Their programme was to construct 10,000 houses for the landless poor, the agricultural labour, in the rural areas. These landlords were very anxious to finish this Government before it does anything like that. That is the reason behind this toppling.

It is a serious matter. The ruling Congress or the Congress(O) cannot come to the people justifying their action either there or here. I am wondering whether they will be in a position to hold the elections. The elections should not be delayed. I warn them now. Even before the vote on account expires, that is, before the period expires in August, the elections must be completed and a new, popular Ministry must be installed. So, the election programme should be such as to enable a popular Ministry to come to power before the expiry of this vote on account.

Sir, why Pondicherry has assumed so much importance is because it is the first general election in a small territory after these two Congresses came together. Now, it is for the people to see in which direction these two Congresses want to take the country. This is confined to Pondicherry and Tamil Nadu, and it is for the people to decide as they like. I am only trying to point out in which direction politics is to be drawn by these two Congresses coming together. Which are the forces behind these two Congresses? Who are the forces which are wanting the unity of these two Congresses and for what purpose? The biggest landlords, the monopoly houses in Tamil Nadu, were anxious to bring

these two Congresses together. It was not the wish of the dying man, T. T. Krishnamachari, which is responsible for this. Those forces had persuaded T. T. K. to bring Kamaraj and Indira Gandhi together for the limited understanding in Tamilnadu and Pondicherry not to fight against the DMK or its policies but project the alliance of the two congresses as an alternative to the Anna-DMK and CPI alliance. In that game they miserably failed as they were bound to fail. In Coimbatore we were able to defeat them inspite of their alliance. Their tactics will not succeed. The people of Tamilnadu have sympathy for the Anna DMK-CPI alliance. Their anger is against the two Congresses. In spite of all this bungling they have done a wise thing in dissolving the Assembly to the disappointment of the local MLAs. They expected that the Assembly would be kept under suspension and they could indulge in some horse-trading. I should however add that elections must be held as early as possible.

Coming to the budget proposals, the working of the State breweries must be examined properly. The revenue is going down. How much does it produce and how is it distributed? All these matters will have to be examined. My information is that a large quantity of alcohol produced in the Government-owned brewery is sold through Shaw Wallace and Company and it is not available for the local traders of local manufacturers. Why should Shaw Wallace be favoured like this? This happened during the regime of Mr. Faruk Maralcair. It will have to be examined.

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** It was the DMK-CPI coalition.

**SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:** Not the CPI; it happened after the CPI had left... (Interruptions). At least let them disown him now after knowing all these things. Why were the toddy shop contractors anxious to topple the Ministry? Huge sums of

lease amounts are in arrears and Mr. Faruq was showing them indulgence. It was when he was in charge of that portfolio that such indulgence was shown. Moneys were not recovered properly. Huge arrears were still pending. It will be in lakhs, about Rs. 30 lakhs or so.

**SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Salem):** It is not correct.

**SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:** If you tell me the correct figure, I shall accept it. Is it 25 lakhs? Mr. Faruq has been showing favours without distinctions of caste, creed or community or political party. If any Member of this House had witnessed the proceedings on that day, they would have seen how he was leading the whole team and they would have felt ashamed. That is how the two Congresses are going to take the country to the lap of hoarders, black marketeers and smugglers. My point is, it is a surplus area so far as food-grains are concerned Karaikal is a delta area and they produce rice in surplus. The rice from Karaikal and Pondicherry is smuggled to Kerala for black-marketing. The black-marketing in Kerala is operated from Tamil Nadu with the benevolence, connivance and cooperation of the Tamil Nadu Government.

**SHRI G VISWANATHAN:** Sir, on a point of order.

**MR CHAIRMAN:** What is your point of order?

**SHRI G VISWANATHAN:** Mr. Kalyanasundaram, the Deputy Leader of the Community Party of India is making a baseless allegation and I request you that this should be removed from the records unless he proves his charge here. He says that the Tamil Nadu Government is conniving with the black-marketeers.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore):** He is making an allegation which can be refuted by them.

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** May I make a submission. Rice is smuggled to Kerala which is ruled by the CPI. Then, may I say that the black-marketeters are encouraged by Mr. Achuta Menon?

**Mr. CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order.

**SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:** My point is, the Tamil Nadu Government and the Pondicherry Government should sell their surplus rice to the Government of Kerala and not to the black-marketeters. Sir, these matters must be examined carefully and the amount that is provided in the Budget, should be spent properly during the coming four or five months when Pondicherry is under President's Rule. Steps should also be taken for holding elections before July. This is my submission.

श्री जनप्राबराव बीरः (साजपुर) :  
महापति महोदय, मैं पुदुचेरी विनियोग (निष्पानुदान) विधेयक का विरोध करता हूँ। इन का एक कारण तो यह है कि जहाँ तक इस की वैधता का सवाल है, इसी सदन के एक माननीय ने न्यायालय में उस को चुनौती दी है और इन लिए जब तक न्यायालय में इस बारे में निर्णय नहीं होता है तब तक इस सदन में इस विधेयक पर विचार करना ठीक नहीं होगा क्योंकि जो कुछ श्री जलदवाजी ने किया गया है, उस को इस विधेयक के द्वारा नियमित किया जा रहा है।

14 hrs.

यह स्थिति इस लिए पैदा हुई है कि सत्तारूढ़ दल खुद शासन कैसे चलाता है, यह तो सर्व-विदित है, किन्तु वह श्रीरो को शासन नहीं चलाने देता है। हाल ही में पुदुचेरी में झन्डा डी० एम० को और सी० पी० आई० दोनों ने मिल कर जो भी सरकार बनाई थी, उसे तो उस में अस्थिरता शुरू से ही थी, किन्तु यदि उस को कुछ समय के लिए काम करने का मौका मिल जाय, तो कल्पना है कि उनसे

[श्री जगन्नाथ राय घोषी]

स्थिरता या शांति? ऐसा नहीं है कि इस देश में ऐसे उदाहरण नहीं हैं। सब से पहले केरल राज्य में पी० एम० पी० ने बहुत ही महानारिटी होते हुए भी सरकार बनाई और वह सरकार कुछ दिन चली। ऐसा नहीं है कि वह प्रयोग इस देश में नहीं हुआ है। 30 सदस्यों में से 14 का सरकार बनाना और उस को चलाना कोई कठिन बात नहीं थी, किन्तु सत्तासूक्त दल को यह लक्ष्य है कि यदि वह खुद राज्य न करे तो वह किसी और को भी नहीं करने देगा। इस लिए जैसे ही उन्होंने देखा कि वह सत्तासूक्त दल-भगना डी० एम० के० और सी० पी० आई० ने तो राज चला नहीं सके तो औरों को मौका देने की बात भी न करते हुए उन्होंने वहाँ की विधान सभा को एकदम बंद कर दिया। अब हमारे मित्रों ने कहा कि भ्रष्टा किया। हम भी कहते हैं कि भ्रष्टा किया क्यों कि आखिर यही खेल चलता रहता तो डिफेन्सन होतारहता। इस देश में ऐसा खेल चल यह तो हम ज्यादा भ्रष्टा नहीं समझते। किन्तु जैसे हमेशा यह कहा जाता है कि बुढ़िया भर गई इस का दुख नहीं है, दुख तो इस बात का है कि मृत्यु ने दरवाजा देख लिया। इट विक्कण्ट एबंदरी बंड मिनीस्ट्रेंट।

अब सब से पहले मुझे इस विषय में यह कहना है कि ये छोटे छोटे राज्य हम ने क्यों बना रख है? जिस वक्त यहाँ फ्रांसीसी थे तो उन्होंने कही मात्र में अपना छोटा सा राज्य रखा, कही यनाम में आन्ध्र के अन्दर रखा और पुदुचेरी में तमिलनाडु के अन्दर रखा आज भी वहाँ की छोटी सी विधान सभा देखने लायक है। उस में यनाम में भी आते है, भाही से भी आते हैं जो दो हजार का गांव है, केरल के अन्दर है और पश्चिम तट पर है जब कि पुदुचेरी पूर्वोत्तर पर है। तो यह सब मिला जुला कर क्यों रखा यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता केवल एक फौरन रूप जो फ्रांसिसियों का था वह उस पर का आधार था। लेकिन वह आधार अब क्या क्या तो अलग-अलग कोई भाही, कोई

बनाम कोई पुदुचेरी यह सब मिलाकर क्यों रखे वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। इन में कोई संकल्पि का भी तबाल नहीं है, कुछ भी नहीं है। वास्तव में इस को तमिलनाडु में जोड़ देते, भाही को केरल में जोड़ देते और यनाम को आन्ध्र में मिला देते तो छोटे छोटे राज्यों के अन्दर राष्ट्रसद्देशिक को बजह से जो संकट पैदा हो जाती हैं वह न पैदा होतीं। लेकिन इस समय यदि यह विषय सामने आया है तो इस बात पर भी हम जरा फिर से विचार करें कि छोटे-छोटे राज्य जैसे गोवा को अलग रखा है, जब वहाँ की जनता कहती है कि महाराष्ट्र के साथ हम को मिला दिया जाय, वहाँ पर चुनाव भी हो गया और भारी बहुमत में महाराष्ट्रवादी गोकान्तक दल जीत कर आया, उस के बाद भी उस को अलग रखने का क्या औचित्य है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। वैसे तो कोई यह कह सकता है कि महाराष्ट्र और मैसूर के बीच में गोवा को ले कर झगडा था लेकिन पुदुचेरी के संबंध में तो ऐसा कोई झगडा था नहीं। जहाँ तक तबाल है पिछले टाइम का तो वह तो डी० एम० के० का ही राज्य वहाँ था तमिलनाडु के गोदर भी डी० एम० के० का ही राज्य था। ऐसे छोटे-छोटे राज्यों को चलाने के बजाय उन को बड़े राज्यों के अन्तर्गत मिलाना, यही तो 1956 के बाद हम लोगों ने किया था। हमारी कर्नाटक स्टेट में भी एक छोटी सी पिछड़ी स्टेट थी कुर्ग, वह तीन माडे तीन लाख की स्टेट थी किन्तु उस को मिला दिया। जब उस को मिला कर एन थट कर्नाटक किया तो ये छोटे-छोटे राज्य क्यों चल रहे हैं कुछ समझ में नहीं आती। यानी इस में कोई रेशनेल ही नहीं है।

आज यह भी खान खड़ी हो गई है वह इस लिए खड़ी हो गई कि ऐसे ऐन मौके पर सरकार को गिराया गया, कि वोट भ्रान एकाउंट न वहाँ पास हो पाया न यहाँ। लोक सभा में भी उस को पास करने के लिए समय नहीं था। ऐसे समय में जो आपत्ति खड़ी हो गई उस में

रेडिओकिटब एक्ट से यह सारा कुछ करना यह कहां तक पैत्र है, मुझे इस में खुद शंका है और जब इस बारे में न्यायालय में चुनौती दी है तो उस का जब तक निर्णय नहीं आता तब तक हम लोक सभा के अन्दर कुछ इस का फंसला करें यह तो मैं अच्छा नहीं समझता। पुदुचेरी जो कुछ हुआ उस को ध्यान में रख कर यदि मताब्द बल यही सीख ले कि श्रीों को भी राज चलाने का मौका दे देना चाहिए न कि ऐसे ही टापरिंग का गेम बह करते रहे और देश के अन्दर, अस्थिरता का वातावरण पैदा करते रहे यह अच्छा नहीं है, अगर इतना भी ये सीख लेते तो अच्छा था। इस लिए बैधता को चुनौती जो मिली है उस का निर्णय जब तक न मिले तब तक मैं तर्ही समझता कि हम को इसे पास करना चाहिए। इस लिए मैं इस का विरोध करता हू।

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN** (Wandiwash): Sir, it is really unfortunate that the budget of Pondicherry is being discussed, in this House instead of in the Pondicherry Assembly, is you know, before the election, the ministry which was functioning there was the coalition of DMK and CPI. The ministry of Shri Farooq Maricar was functioning smoothly, but the CPI cannot tolerate anything that flourishes in this country and they were responsible for pulling down that ministry. The CPI of Pondicherry was against their withdrawal from the ministry, but the Tamil Nadu unit of the CPI was against the Farooq Ministry. I do not know whether Mr. Farooq did not favour them. So, they wanted Mr. Subbaiah, the CPI representative in the ministry, to withdraw from the coalition. There was pressure and ultimately Mr. Subbaiah withdrew from the ministry. Even after the resignation of the two ministers from the DMK, the Farooq ministry could have continued as there was no necessity for the Assembly to meet. In spite of it, to uphold the democratic values, the Farooq Ministry resigned and there were general elections. In the

general elections no party secured a majority, as all of us know, and the ADMK-CPI coalition was brought in to play.

The CPI is a very intelligent party. They are waiting for some party which will form a Ministry in any State. They will immediately jump into the bandwagon. They are doing it in Delhi. They wanted to do it in Pondicherry. They are doing it in Kerala. Whichever party forms Ministry in any State, they will join the Ministry, whether invited or not.

In the elections to the Pondicherry Assembly the ADMK got 12 seats. With the coalition they could get only 14, which is not a majority in a House of 30. On the 4th March, Shri Ramaswami, the leader of the ADMK, met the Lt. Governor. When he came out of the Government House, the newsmen asked him on what basis he is going to form the Ministry. He simply stated that the Lt. Governor is satisfied; he declined to give the details. On the 5th March Shri Ramaswami was said to have submitted a list of 16 members whereas his party had only 14 seats even after the coalition. When pressmen asked him to divulge the names of the two new members, he refused to do so. Everything happened behind the iron curtain. Perhaps Shri Kalyanasundaram knew what was happening behind the iron curtain. On the 6th March the Ministry was formed. I want to ask the Government, because they are the masters sitting in Delhi upon the Lt. Governor, why this untenable government, doomed to infant mortality, was allowed to be formed, knowing fully well that in a House of 30, they are only 14 and, therefore, they are in a minority. Even taking for granted that the CPM will support them, the number would have come up to only 15. Thus the Government was formed.

Now Shri Kalyanasundaram says that they formed the Government on the assurance of somebody. Who gave that assurance? What was the basis

[Shri G. Viswanathan]

of that assurance? Did the Prime Minister give them any assurance? Shri Ganesh or Shri Gokhale may be able to throw some light on that aspect. They say that somebody assured them "you go and form the Ministry, we will back you". Now they complain that they were let down and they are complaining against practically every party. They fell because of their own weakness or their weight and they are complaining, like the lame man who falls on the road blames all the pedestrians. The Ministry has gone, and I am glad that the Assembly has been dissolved. Otherwise, a lot of horse trading would have gone on.

The people of Pondicherry want their separate identity to be maintained. Otherwise, it would have been merged into Tamil Nadu long ago. As Shri Joshi pointed out just now, the people of Pondicherry are not for the merger. They want their separate identity to be maintained. Not only that, they have been demanding for Statehood for a long time. Practically all the political parties, particularly the DMK, has been promising them statehood. Even the Congress is a party to this demand, so far as statehood for Pondicherry is concerned.

Pondicherry has been neglected for a long time. Even though it is a Union Territory, it has not been looked after very well by the Union Government. It is full of slums. I wish some of the Ministers who visit the State of Pondicherry during the elections, and sometimes even otherwise to visit the Ashram, go round and somehow the slumps come up every day. The Ministry must make a beginning in the matter of housing. They must allot some land to the Housing Board and houses should be constructed by the Housing Board because the poor people cannot afford to build houses.

There is no power generation in Pondicherry and it has to depend on Tamil Nadu and Kerala for its power supply. It does not generate any hydro-

electric power. The Government should build immediately a thermal power house to meet the power requirements of Pondicherry.

There is no important industry in Pondicherry. When the various Central Ministries are establishing projects all over India not even a single Central project is established in Pondicherry. I would request the Central Government to see that at least some of the projects are established in Pondicherry.

Though the people of Pondicherry have been promised a Central University, it has been hanging fire for a long time. Now the Government must come to a definite conclusion about giving a Central University to Pondicherry.

Pondicherry is a place of international importance. Tourists from all over the world visit the Ashram and other places in Pondicherry. In spite of this, the tourism Ministry have not established even a single project in Pondicherry for the last so many years. On the contrary, they have cut down even the very meagre amount that has been allotted. The original allotment for 1973-74 was Rs. 6,44,000 which finally came down to Rs. 4,87,000. What do we find in the budget for 1974-75? We find that the budget estimate has been cut down to Rs. 2,87,000, as a measure of economy they say. But why is this economy confined only to Pondicherry and not to any other State? I would request the Minister of Tourism to take up some projects in Pondicherry, because thousands of tourists from all over the world visit Pondicherry.

I would conclude by saying that at least one important industry should be located in Pondicherry so that more and more educated people of that area will get employment.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH)** Although there was a demand for 2-1/2 to 3 hours for this discussion, it has been very brief. Only three points were touch-



ed during the course of the discussion. One is the constitutional and legal aspect. I think the House has extensively discussed this and the Law Minister has answered every point. On the question whether the Presidential Order was constitutional and valid I can only quote from what the Law Minister has said. That I do not want to do and take the time of the House. This question was discussed earlier and also at the time of placing the Order on the Table.

The other point raised was about the political question of the constitution and fall of the Ministry, the House is aware of the circumstances in which the Ministry was formed and also the circumstances in which it fell. I would not like to go into this matter.

Some specific points were raised by Shri Viswanathan. It would not be correct to say that Pondicherry has been neglected. There has been definite progress. As can be seen from the budget estimates for the last six years. In 1969-70 the budget estimates were of the order of Rs. 863 lakhs. By 1973-74 it went up to Rs. 1,501.44 lakhs. As far as the Plan is concerned, Rs. 400 lakhs have been provided for 1974-75 for the State Plan schemes, which is a high target, as far as Pondicherry is concerned. The Planning Commission has approved an outlay of Rs. 5.25 crores, comprising Rs. 4 crores as Central assistance and Rs. 1.25 crores as State resources. The Plan Outlay is: Agriculture—Rs. 131 lakhs; Irrigation and Power—Rs. 37.73 lakhs; Industry and mining—Rs. 29.17 lakhs; transport and Communications—Rs. 34.98 lakhs; Social Services—Rs. 191.47 lakhs. As regards Education, out of the Budget estimate of Rs. 15,014.4 crores, Education gets an outlay of Rs. 262.78 lakhs.

It is also known that the percentage of literacy in the Union Territory of Pondicherry is 46 per cent as against the national average of 29.34 per cent.

He referred to a Central University to be set up in Pondicherry. There is a proposal to set up a Central University during the Fifth Plan. Necessary land will be made available by the State Government and proposal has also been initiated for making education free up to the degree level.

A proposal to set up a thermal plant has been accepted in principle by the Planning Commission.

About housing to which a reference was made, it is given in the Explanatory Memorandum that there is an increase in the Budget estimates for housing. This is intended to cover land acquisition and allied schemes, including free distribution of house sites to landless workers under the Minimum Needs Programme.

With these words, I commend the Budget proposals for the acceptance of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 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, 1974, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof—

Demands Nos. 1 to 32 and 34."

*The motion was adopted.*

14.18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

PONDICHERRY APPROPRIATION  
(VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL\* 1974

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R.  
GANESH): I beg to move for leave