

least, on the last day, let us determine to behave well. (*Interruptions*) Let us start with a clean slate.

Now, we take up Bills for introduction.

THE SREE CHITRA TIRUNAL INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY, TRIVANDRUM BILL, 1979

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (PROF. SHER SINGH): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to declare the Sree Chitra Tirunal Medical Centre Society for Advanced Studies in Specialities, Trivandrum, in the State of Kerala, to be an institution of national importance and to provide for its incorporation and matters connected therewith.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

PROF. SHER SINGH: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE RAMPUR RAZA LIBRARY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1979

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Rampur Raza Library Act, 1975.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER): Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE KHUDA BAKHSH ORIENTAL PUBLIC LIBRARY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1979

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library Act, 1969.

The question was proposed.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : श्रीमान्, खुदा बख्श लाइब्रेरी एक नेशनल लाइब्रेरी होते हुए भी उसका मैनेजमेंट दिन ब दिन खराब होता जा रहा है। . . . (*Interruptions*) सभापति जी, सुनिये। इसीलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मन्त्री महोदय इसकी जांच करावें।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can speak later on. It is only introduction now. (*Interruptions*) I was also in the Assembly for so many years. At the time of introduction, even if it is a Private Member's Bill, nobody objects. It is not the occasion now to speak. Why are you unnecessarily taking the time of the House?

The question is:

"That the leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library Act, 1969."

The motion was adopted.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: Sir, I introduced the Bill.

I. THE BUDGET (PONDICHERY) —General Discussion 1979-80—

II. THE PONDICHERY APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1979

III. THE PONDICHERY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1979

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next item Shri Satish Agarwal.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATISH AGARWAL): Sir, 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 1979-80, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

Sir, I also move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry for the services of the financial year 1978-79, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA (Gujarat): Sir, I am on a point of order. What about Special Mentions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already announced about it. You did not hear. We will take it up after the regular business is over I have given permission to a large number of Members.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: That means, it can never be taken up. Sir, I do not know why we are deviating from the procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already announced. We are prepared to sit for any length of time.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, it is an established practice in this House that always Special Mention is taken up first and then the Bills and the Government business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have said earlier also that in order to give better opportunities to a large number of Members, I thought that it would be better to take it up after the regular business is over. There are about 13 or 14 Members who have been allowed. Otherwise, we cannot finish the work.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, I would like to make a submission. So far as the Pondicherry Appropriation Bills are concerned, these Bills have to be passed and today we are sitting for the last day of the current session. So, if you kindly permit, let this financial business be over. The other Bills are not financial Bills. So, after the financial business is over, after

the Pondicherry thing is over, you can allow Special Mentions. There is no urgency that the other Bill has to be passed immediately, today. We can sit till late in the night and finish the business.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA): Sir, this Industries (Development and Regulation) Amendment Bill is brought after an Ordinance was issued, and it should be passed today itself.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We will pass it today. We will sit till late in the night. We are not saying that it will not be passed.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, I have one submission to make. Sir, no Minister remains in the House and as soon as the Government business is over, all the Ministers will go away. Even the Parliamentary Affairs' Minister will not sit. We never find Mr. Advani in the House. In the absence of any Minister, any representative of the Government, there will be no desire on our part to make our points. Why can't they remain?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will make a special request through our hon. Minister here that some Ministers must be present today. Today, the Members are particular and Mr. Minister, you try to keep here as many Ministers as it is humanly possible for you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, my submission to you is that it is right that after the financial business we take up the special mentions. Otherwise, Sir, what will happen is, that if there is some disturbance in the House, it will be said, we adjourn the House and go, we do not want it. Therefore, let us keep at least one item of the Government business behind so that they do not go away.

Secondly, Sir, he has moved the Bill. The first item, you will see in

the Pondicherry Budget, General Discussion. Sir, there should be some procedure. The Appropriation Bill does not come before the General Discussion of the Budget. That should be followed. How do you do it in the Lok Sabha? Budget, General Discussion, is first taken up and then the Appropriation Bill is moved. Will you allow it?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: In the Lok Sabha they do not discuss the Appropriation Bill. They discuss grants. Here, we do not discuss grants. Here we discuss the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the general discussion on the Budget comes first and then only the consequential things come, the Finance Bill, the Appropriation Bill and all those things. Here, Sir, you can say that the general discussion on the Budget should start and then you can say that the other things will be here. You cut short the discussion on the Appropriation Bill and have the general discussion on the Pondicherry Budget but do not keep the Budget General Discussion after the Appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is before.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He should first move the general discussion on the Budget.

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA: Sir, both the items are to be taken up simultaneously.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, in the Revised List of Business, General Discussion on the Budget (Pondicherry) 1979-80 is mentioned on the top and thereafter at item (4) and (5) there is the Pondicherry Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1979 and the Pondicherry Appropriation Bill, 1979. The Vote on Account is for Rs. 18.34 crores and the Supplementary Grants are for Rs. 3.6 crores. All these three items can be discussed together. No problem. I have not been formally moved. It is already there.

Where is the question for me to move it? (Interruptions)

The questions were proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, shall I proceed? (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): We are discussing the Soviet visit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thank you, very much. Sir, Mr. Piloo Mody takes objection when he is abused. I do not like his being abused, I tell you very frankly. When I got up, he said, I come from the Soviet Union.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I said, we are discussing the Soviet visit?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have come from the Ferozeshah Road.

श्री रामानन्द यादव (बिहार) : श्रीमान्, अभी अभी आपने हम लोगों से यह कहा कि हम सदन में एक नया चैंडर शुरू करें और दूसरों के प्रति ऐसी कोई बात न कहें जिससे आपस में कोई इल-फीलिंग पैदा हो। लेकिन मुझे दुःख है कि श्री पीलू मोदी अपनी आदत के अनुसार फिर उसी तरह की बातें कहने लगे हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में आपके द्वारा लेक्चर देने के बाद भी वे भूपेश दादा पर इस तरह के लांछन लगा रहे हैं और उनसे कह रहे हैं कि वे सोवियत रशिया के हिमायती हैं और सोवियत रशिया से आए हैं, इसलिए सोवियत रुम का पक्ष लेंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इनको ऐसी बात न कहने के लिए मना करें ताकि ये इस तरह की बातें सदन में न करें। आखिरकार, हम लोग भी आदमी हैं, इस तरह की बातों से प्रोवोक हो जाता है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, he follows Hindi very well.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, I want to make a clarification. I do not mind their objecting to what I say. They

[Shri Piloo Mody]

have a right to object to what I say, just as I have a right to say. But, let them, at least, hear correctly what I say. I said, we are going to discuss the Soviet visit to India. I did not say that he had come from the Soviet Union.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, undoubtedly we need sometimes clownish utterances, because otherwise the Rajya Sabha will be very dull. We must have a comic figure and sometimes the character of a circus. Therefore, how can it be complete without any clown? Therefore, I welcome Mr. Piloo Mody's interruptions in this matter. It fulfils a very important entertaining role and I hope he will continue to do so.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, does he give me a license?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, with regard to the Pondicherry Budget we are taking up all the three things together. I would like to say in this connection that on January 18, Mr. Morarji Desai made a statement at Madras saying that Pondicherry would be merged with the neighbouring State. That statement was most unfortunate, ill-advised and provocative and that statement was made by the Prime Minister of the country in disregard of such commitments of the Government in legal and Constitutional position. Sir, my objection to it apart from the merit of the statement is also on the ground that the Prime Minister of the country should not behave in this manner. Sir, first of all Pondicherry has a special status in our Constitution and that status was determined by a number of covenants. There is the Treaty of Secession which was signed between the President of India and the President of French Republic. In that Treaty, under Article 2, it is stated:

"The establishment will keep benefit of special administrative

status which was in force prior to 1st November, 1954. Any Constitutional change in the status which may be made subsequently, shall be made after ascertaining the wishes of the people."

This is the commitment between the President of India and the President of French Republic. Now, Sir, this commitment was included in a series of other important documents, including the changes in the Constitution. Sir, just I point out to you because sometime the Government has to be corrected. Sir, the Constitution was amended in this very House and in the other House to give effect to this particular clause in the Treaty and here, Sir, presently I will show you that certain changes that were necessary were included and then the Schedule was changed in order to provide for the special status of Pondicherry. All these things were done, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also made a number of statements and said things that are well-known in this House and the other House accepting that Pondicherry would have the status and a special position in our Constitution.

Now, Mr. Morarji Desai suddenly went to Madras and Pondicherry and then he made a statement. First of all, Sir, was there any Cabinet decision that he should make such a statement or give an opinion in this manner? To our knowledge, there was no such Cabinet decision. Did he ask anybody there? No, he did not. He made it absolutely on his own. If the Prime Minister of the country goes on expressing his views in his individual manner, as he did in the case of Sikkim and he did it in another case also, this is not good for the country. If you think that status of Pondicherry has to be changed, first of all there should be a discussion in the Cabinet; secondly, Parliament should be told, and thirdly, only then can the Government proceed. But here nothing was done. We all read in the newspapers, not only the people of Pondicherry but all of us, that something is going into the mind of

the Prime Minister. Here, Sir, I have read out the Article to you. What happened after that? In the wake of this Treaty, consequential provisions were made in the Constitution through the Fourteenth amendment incorporating the Union Territory of Pondicherry in the First Schedule, besides inserting Article 239A enabling Parliament by law to create, *inter alia*, for Pondicherry a local Legislature or council of Ministers. Both have been created. Parliament in pursuance of Article 239A have done all that. All these things have taken place. It is not just sudden. Since I mentioned Jawaharlal Nehru I would recall what he said at that time. I quote. In March, 1949, he said:

"I hope the learning of French will continue in Pondicherry and make Pondicherry a centre of India, of the French language and the window of French culture which is the great culture of the Western world."

This was the statement. We have been following this. Now, the Prime Minister made a statement. That is why I say it was most unfortunate, improper and wrong, for the Prime Minister to have made a statement in this manner that led to the agitation. Now, I am coming to that.

First of all, I congratulate the people of Pondicherry for their agitation and the anti-merger agitation has been a democratic reaction to a very wrong approach and arbitrary way of talking on the subject by the Prime Minister. Sir, this agitation led to many things. Repression took place; firing took place and also, on the side of the people, legitimately, they carried out certain mass actions. On the 26th or 27th of January, police firing took place, as a result of which some people died. Some say five; some say more. I am not going into that. Who is responsible for this? I think, the Prime Minister must own the moral responsibility for the death of these people and the police firing that took place which resulted in these deaths. I say he should own

up the responsibility for this. He is playing with fire. It was not necessary at all. He knows it very well. Pondicherry's status cannot be changed just by a decree. A law has to be passed and he knows very well that a constitutional amendment will have to be made. He also knows very well that in this present situation, a constitutional amendment, a law, cannot be made, without the approval of the Rajya Sabha. He also knows very well that despite the majority in the Lok Sabha, it would not be possible for him to get this thing passed. When he knows all these things, why should he say so? This is an affront to Parliament. With the full knowledge that he would not be in a position to implement his arbitrary decision, he said this in public in Madras with a view to provoking the people of Pondicherry. This resulted in all kinds of things which had happened and, ultimately, in the death, as a result of police firing, of some people of Pondicherry. What else could be a more scandalous thing than this? I would ask hon. Members. So, Sir, that part is there. I need not dilate upon it. To cut short the discussion, I would only say this. My friends from AIADMK who are here...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Nobody is there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does appear....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Munusamy is there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, he is here. My AIADMK friends should not misunderstand me. It does appear that he has the backing of the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Definitely.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I take it when you say 'definitely'. Our information is also the same. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu is interested in this merger business. At one time, they were fighting. What has happened to Mr. MGR? I would like to know. Everything is not the same as the production of a film. He should not take it like that. He seems to have come

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

to an understanding with Mr. Morarji Desai in this matter. The people in Pondicherry suspect it. That is why when Mr. Bala Pazhanoor, the leader of the AIADMK in the Lok Sabha, was sent there by Mr. MGR, he was not even allowed to enter. He would have been mobbed but for the fact the anti-merger leaders saved the situation by their very sober intervention.

Therefore, I say the position should be clarified. There should be a forthright declaration. I am not asking the Prime Minister to apologise and all that kind of thing. One apology is good enough in his 83 years of his life. I am not asking him to do that. But he should say that he has committed a mistake. We should be given an assurance that there shall not be any merger business without ascertaining the wishes of the people. Sir, that is the position and that position should remain. That assurance should be there. Not only this, the Pondicherry people had demanded a full statehood. In fact, we have an obligation. When we have granted full statehood, very rightly, to others, we should give like Tripura and Manipur, Pondicherry also full statehood. They do not have it. They are still an union territory and they are entitled to have full statehood. This should be granted to them.

Personally, I should ask the question to consider that the Lt. Governor, Mr. Kulkarni, is an utter misfit. I had criticised him in the past. He is an utter misfit. He must be replaced. As you know, in the days of emergency he was one of the champions of Shriman Sanjay Gandhi. Mr. Kulkarni now is the champion, I do not know, whether of Mr. Kanti Desai or somebody else. He must be championing the cause of somebody because this Lt. Governor has been the champion of the children of the high bosses here. This Lt. Governor is absolutely a bureaucrat. All kinds of things are happening under the President's rule. We had criticised him in the past and I criticise him now. I demand his removal and his replacement by another Lt. Gover-

nor. You can send ex-Maharani of Patiala as Lt. Governor, I do not mind.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR
(Himachal Pradesh): I won't go.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She won't go, she says. All right, send someone else, but Mr. Kulkarni should be replaced. There should be a judicial inquiry into the police firing. That is a very important demand.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Kulkarni must be replaced by a CPI man.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why should there not be a judicial inquiry when the police firing have taken place? I should like to know this and Mr. Kulkarni is denying a judicial inquiry. Then, Sir, there is another demand. The cases arising out of the agitation should all be withdrawn. Why should they not be withdrawn? If anybody has to be put up for trial for what happened in Pondicherry, it should be Mr. Morarji Desai himself. Why should these people be tried? You created such a situation unnecessarily that led to the shooting and firing and you have put the arrested people for trial. Sir, you have a long experience of being in the Assembly. You have also the experience of being a Governor and you know how a Governor should function. Mr. Kulkarni is not functioning like you. He is functioning like somebody else. When Mr. Sanjay Gandhi was coming on the television or otherwise in the public life, Mr. Kulkarni became great champion and builder of the national leader. Today, he knows how the bread is buttered and now he is serving the present Government as loyally as he served Mr. Sanjay Gandhi. And now he is behaving in an atrocious and outrageous manner disliked by the people of Pondicherry. So, why impose a Governor or Lt. Governor like Mr. Kulkarni on the people of Pondicherry? Have another Lt. Governor if you must have this office still functioning there. So, withdrawal of the cases is very essential.

Those who have been killed, their families should be given higher compensation. Increase the compensation that you have given them.

But the most important thing is that the elections should be held. The Assembly was dissolved in November last year. Uptill now we do not know what is the schedule for elections. Why are the elections being delayed? The Government should come forward and a categorical statement should be made in this House that the elections would be held not later than August or so. They should make this statement. We would like to have elections to be held much earlier. Well, certain formalities have to be gone through but there is enough time for elections to be held much earlier. When Mr. Charan Singh or the Janata Party needed, in a matter of 40 days or two months elections were held in nine States by a stroke of pen. The Assemblies were dissolved in 9 States in the country. And today we find that in November the Pondicherry Assembly went out of existence and upto now there is no announcement even by the Election Commission as to when the elections are being held. Why this playing with the people of Pondicherry? Are they not entitled to have a Government of their own even under the existing arrangement of a Union Territory?

Sir, I demand that the date be announced here, the electoral schedule and programme be announced as far as Pondicherry is concerned. You must know that there even the Municipal Council and Panchayats have been dissolved. There is no democratic institution functioning in Pondicherry. Only we have the Lt. Governor, Mr. Kulkarni, functioning in his own way.

Sir, then there is another point. There is the decision about prohibition. Sir, Mr. Piloo Mody is not for prohibition. Prohibition has become a fad with Mr. Morarji Desai. I never smoke in my life. I do not drink. I do not treat prohibition in that way in my personal life. I am not one of those who preach prohibition and drink like

fish. I am not one of those. Well, Mr. Morarji Desai is preaching prohibition to the nation. It will cost a lot of money to the public exchequer at the cost of developmental and other expenses. And he has said: "Among my Cabinet Ministers, nobody drinks". Sir, I am surprised. It seems truth is prohibited in the Cabinet. If anything has been prohibited in the Cabinet, it is the truth; otherwise Mr. Morarji Desai would not have said: "My Cabinet Ministers do not drink". Sir, shall I have an examiner? If you like, I can get an examiner, as the drivers, when they drive, are tested whether they are drunk or not. It will be found out. I can produce an examiner and you will find how many Ministers drink. I am not making a false statement. If they drink, they should not drink too much. That is all I say. It would be better if they do not drink. But why does he say this kind of a thing? His Cabinet does not believe in prohibition in personal life. Mr. Morarji Desai certainly does not drink. He does believe in prohibition. But many of his Cabinet Ministers don't. And they tell the nation: "Go dry".

Prohibition costs Rs. 600 crores or so. Let not the States' finances be ruined and the Central exchequer's money be spent and bootlegging, corruption and nepotism grow, as we have seen what happened in the case of Bombay prohibition when he was the Chief Minister of that State. It was a total failure. Corruption, inefficiency, bootlegging and all the best of it went on and it did not succeed. Now we find that this is being pressed. Sir, I should like in this connection to ask the Government not to go ahead with the business of prohibition, at least till a popular Government comes into existence. That is what I shall ask of this Government.

These are some of the demands I wish to make in connection with this Budget. There are many other aspects into which one can go. Industry has been neglected to some extent. Development of Pondicherry has also been retarded in some way. These should get special attention from the Government. These are matters which, however, should be left to the popular Govern-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

ment. I have stood here today to protest strongly against Mr. Morarji Desai's behaviour and I want a categorical assurance. It is not enough for Mr. Patel to say that the matter is under consideration. What is under consideration? Anyway, he has softened. He wanted to take away a little heat from Mr. Morarji Desai's statement and create a little normal situation. In so far as this is concerned, what Mr. Patel says is not bad. But we want a categorical assurance from the Home Minister on this. So far as other things are concerned, it should be made absolutely clear. This proposal of merger should be clarified and there should not be any such thing as they have said. Sir, in this connection curfew was proclaimed and for three days section 144 was there. Five people were killed and, according to us, 13 rounds of police firing took place. Was it necessary? Mr. Morarji Desai came back and made a sudden statement of that kind. Is it the way that the Prime Minister should speak and then say that it is his personal view? I cannot understand. I should not say very much.

The only thing I should like to say about our friend, Mr. M.G.R. is this. I do not go to cinema. I do not know what kind of actor he is. But I understand that he is a very good actor, film-star and so on. I am very sorry to hear that the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu is involved in this thing. May I, Sir, through you urge upon the Chief Minister also to make a declaration there in the Tamil Nadu Assembly whether he is involved or not in regard to this matter. He should own it up or disown it. Whether he should disagree or supports Mr. Morarji Desai's position he should have the courage to declare it on the floor of the House. If he did not do so, that also he should state on the floor of the House and publicly so that the people of Pondicherry should know. I do not like bad blood being created between Tamil Nadu and the Union Territory of Pondicherry and between the peoples of these two places. Therefore, I would

like him to clarify the position. And this would be good for him, his State and certainly for the neighbourhood there.

This is all that I have to say and I hope the Government will give its answer. I do not wish to say very much. I have said this on the basis of information. Meanwhile during the last few days the Pondicherry anti-merger leaders had come here. They have given some facts and these have been submitted to the Government and they should take the necessary steps.

Finally, before I sit down, Sir, the present Finance Minister should have been here. Why? Because we are sanctioning money for Pondicherry. Pondicherry is under the Union Government. After all that I have heard and the way he treats the financial matters I wonder whether we should sanction the money so easily without him here. The episodes of his son-in-law, Solanki, in Uttar Pradesh, and the nephew Gurudutt cannot be disposed of so easily. Sir, it has been brought to the notice of the House through the Members, otherwise also Mr. Kalp Nath Rai and others have brought it to the notice of the House, that the Finance Minister's son-in-law Solanki was appointed Chairman of the Housing Board. Then he went to buy some land in Kashipur for farm or a warehouse. The land was bought for Rs. 8,70,000 or so which should not be costing more than Rs. 40,000.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): I wonder how this is connected with the Pondichery Appropriation Bill?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the Finance Minister is connected. Therefore, I say the Appropriation Bill is connected. Suddenly it was said that a warehousing body should be set up in Kashipur. Then, Sir, it was said that Mr. Gurudutt was given the task, and the land of Mr. Gurudutt was bought. This is a very serious thing. Three acres of land, hardly worth Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 20,000 was bought for Rs. 8,70,328.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: On a point of order. Sir, we are discussing now the Pondicherry Budget. Can the Uttar Pradesh budget also be brought in here? I cannot understand Sir. There must be some relevance. Should the House be treated in this manner?

12 Noon

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not brought in the Uttar Pradesh Budget. I have brought in Mr. Charan Singh, the Finance Minister of the country, and when I sanction the money which will be spent by this Finance Minister, what is the guarantee that another nephew, another son-in-law would not appear in Pondicherry to have this kind of a deal? This is what I am afraid of.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR (Maharashtra): Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is referring to the budget as if it is Mr. Charan Singh's own personal budget. How can a senior Member like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta describe the budget as Mr. Charan Singh's budget? It is not his personal budget. By your own logic, the best thing for you would be to defeat the Government on the budget itself. What we are discussing is the budget presented by the Cabinet as whole. Mr. Charan Singh might be one thing for you and quite another thing for another person. But how is it relevant? The strange argument of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is as if it is the personal budget or personal account of Mr. Charan Singh. It is not so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The question is valid. I must say that you have intelligently put the question and you will get an intelligent answer also. Sir, I am not at all concerned with Uttar Pradesh. We are not discussing Uttar Pradesh. Let Uttar Pradesh go to heaven or hell I am not concerned with it

(Interruptions)

I am not concerned with this State. All that we want is a Finance Minister of integrity and public probity. Mr. Charan Singh says in a Press statement, "They are not my family members; they are only relations." Yes, they are your relations: one is son-in-law and another is nephew. Son-in-law becomes Chairman of the Warehousing Board and then he makes such an arrangement that the nephew's land was taken for Rs. 8,70,000 when it should not cost even Rs. 45,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now come to the budget proper.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And Mr. Charan Singh did not deny this charge. Please understand, the Finance Minister is not an ordinary person. Charges were made here. He should have come and made the statement here. He makes a public statement through the Press; he has spoken through the Press. Mr. Charan Singh said that "Mr. Govind Singh and Mr. Guru Dutt are not members of my family."

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA: From U.P. kindly come to Pondicherry.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Significantly enough, Sir,...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have taken half an hour. There are others also to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Significantly enough, Sir, the sale deed was registered on the 23rd of January when Mr. Charan Singh took his oath. The date is significant. The moment Mr. Charan Singh becomes the Deputy Prime Minister and comes to the Cabinet, there in Uttar Pradesh—What is the connection? Will you tell us?—the sale deed was registered. Now you may ask: Are we discussing the Registration Office here? No, we are not

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

discussing the Registration Office. We are discussing the sale deed being formalized and put through on the day on which the uncle and father-in-law become the Deputy Prime Minister of the country. Was there any hot line between the Deputy Prime Minister's Office and the Registration Office? The presumption is that pressure and influence had been brought to bear completely on the transaction and the deal was struck when it became known that the man under whose favour it was got was back as the Deputy Prime Minister of the country. It is scandalous. Ask Mr. Charan Singh to come and explain it before he asks for money for appropriation under the Appropriation Bill for Pondicherry. We should like to know the position. Let him deny it. The Deputy Prime Minister himself said that when he came to know of the deal, he had expressed his disgust. Well, he expressed his disgust. Where is the disgusted gentleman? Should he not be here to express his disgust? It seems the Minister is disgusted when the son-in-law gets away with money, the nephew makes money when land is sold.

If he had not been disgusted about it, the amount perhaps would have been well over Rs. 80 lakhs. You can understand the value of disgust of Mr. Charan Singh. Or, was Mr. Charan Singh disgusted because it was Rs 8 lakhs? Did he expect more? Is he disgusted because his nephew did not make more money than Rs. 8 lakhs? Or, is he disgusted because his position had been utilised by his son-in-law and his nephew, Mr. Guru Dutt and Mr. Govind Singh to collect money from the public exchequer? Sir, how can I entrust the public exchequer in the hands of the Finance Minister of the country who is not even repentant, who has not given an explanation to Parliament as to how things had been done? Sir, I am told Mr. Kalp Nath Rai had gone

to the Prime Minister and brought it to his notice. He has given to me a copy of his letter to the Prime Minister and a photostat copy of the sale deed. They said: "You go to the Chief Justice." Why should we go to the Chief Justice? Are we not the judges on such matters? If not, then dissolve Parliament, go with the Supreme Court, sit in the lobby and ask the Chief Justice to decide as to what is right, what is wrong, what is good, what is bad, what is corruption and what is not. This matter should be discussed. I demand a thorough inquiry into it. It is not an ordinary matter. It is a matter which involves the finances of the Union Government.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra): I want to ask them one point. Is the Chief Justice always required to go into a thing when we the Members of Parliament, can take decisions? Why not appoint an Advocate-General in the Rajya Sabha so that we can have his advice? As Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has rightly said, it is not for the Chief Justice or anybody else to decide, it is for us to decide when we are politically elected here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, today they say "you go to the Chief Justice"; tomorrow somebody else will send us to Sai Baba. It is not a question of Sai Baba or a temple priest or the Chief Justice deciding it. It is a question of our deciding in Parliament as to how the Ministers should function, how the Finance Minister should function. We should go into the question of probity, morality and complete integrity especially in financial matters. Sir, this is the position.

Sir, you have a son-in-law. Everybody knows that the son-in-law is not a family member, but everybody knows how sons-in-law are favoured. I know the Chief Ministers and Governors who die for their sons-in-law. They think that the son-in-law is more

important than the son. Where is the question of saying: "Oh, not my family members; my relations." Sir, the son-in-law may not be technically a family member, but the daughter is under the law. Therefore, the daughter has material interests and hence the father-in-law and the son-in-law are bound by golden ties and material interests.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You finish now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Charan Singh is looking after the material interests of his son-in-law and nephews very well. I wish I had a father-in-law like that and an uncle like that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: There is a rich man in the country who pays the highest income-tax. He has an eligible daughter. Would you marry her?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That daughter, I leave for my friend here; if he has got any son, he can try. But I am saying that it is just not a question of what one likes or not. Jokes apart, it is a serious matter. You tell us, my friend here, when people read it in the newspapers, what they will think about it.

When charges were brought by me against Mr. Solanki here and when I moved my resolution for sending those things to a committee, requesting you to appoint a committee, I mentioned about corruption on his part. You were good enough not to form a committee. Today you see the case, a fool-proof case with documented proof. Mr. Kalp Nath Rai has brought this thing. Well, some people may or may not like him, Mr. Kalp Nath Rai, because he is a bit of, what others call him, a bully. He is not a bully. But people call him bully. But I do not call him so. But what he has brought cannot be disputed by anybody. He has proved his charge with documentary proof, with exact

figures, and Mr. Charan Singh does not have the courage to repudiate him. The only defence of Mr. Charan Singh is this. He says, "Yes, it is so. I am disgusted. But they are not my family members." The guilt has been proved. And I say, Mr. Agarwal, you ask your Finance Minister to come today and explain it. I wish he comes and explains it.

Before I sit down, I come to the Government of Uttar Pradesh. Mr. Banarasi Das has come in power. All right. Well. He should also hold an enquiry. I put it before Mr. Banarsi Das—he was in this House, sitting here—that it would be the test of his honour and his integrity. If he has taken courage to keep some people, the RSS people, out of the Government, a good thing he has done. I appreciate his courage. Will he show the same courage now of reopening the case of Solanki and Guru Dutt and go into this thing? In any case, because the Finance Minister of the country wanted a thorough enquiry by an appropriate agency of the Central Government and by us, I hope the matter will be taken up seriously by all the Members.

Mr. Charan Singh is under clouds today. Mr. Charan Singh's integrity is under question. Mr. Charan Singh is suspected of allowing his name to be used for money making by his son-in-law and his nephew in collusion at the cost of the exchequer of the Uttar Pradesh Government and hence of the Uttar Pradesh public.

श्री श्याम लाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
सभापति महोदय, जो पांडिचेरी बजट और उसका एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल आया है इस के सम्बन्ध में बहुत संक्षेप में दो-तीन बातें कहना मैं चाहता हूँ। पहली बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पांडिचेरी हमारे देश का एक महत्वपूर्ण स्थान रहा है और पांडिचेरी का जब दिलय भारत में हुआ तो फ्रेंच सेटलमेंट हुआ था

[श्री श्याम लाल यादव]

वहाँ पर एक विशेष संस्कृति पनपी थी और एक प्रकार की व्यवस्था थी। उसका जब विलय हुआ तो उसका श्रेय उस समय के प्रधान मन्त्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने उठाया और उन्होंने शान्तिपूर्वक पांडिचेरी का विलय करवाया। उस विलय के समय जो आश्वासन दिया गया, मैं समझता हूँ कि उस आश्वासन को बदलने की कोई सूरत आज तक पैदा नहीं हुई है। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अपने बयान में भारत सरकार की तरफ से साफ तौर पर यह कहा था—मैं उस पोरशन को यहाँ पर बढ़ देना चाहता हूँ।

At this juncture, it will be pertinent to recall the noble sentiments expressed about Pondicherry by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

"An open window on France in respect of its particularism..."

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has been already stated.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV:

"... and tradition of its own, in respect of the culture with which they have been imbued and also in respect of the language which allowed this culture to be assimilated, and nothing will be imposed on the people of Pondicherry and the changes, if any, will be brought in after consultation with the people of Pondicherry."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's assurance was reinforced by a similar statement made on behalf of the Government of India in the process-verbal signed by the Government of India and France on 16th March, 1963, that is, seven months after the *de jure* transfer of the establishment to the Indian Union. The process-verbal in part reads as follows:

"The Union delegates stated that the Government of India did not contemplate any sudden reform of judicial organisation in Pondicherry. Changes which would be necessary to bring the system in Pondicherry in harmony with that prevailing in the rest of India will be introduced gradually allowing a reasonable period of time."

मान्यवर, ये आश्वासन उस समय दिये गए। मैं समझता हूँ कि कांग्रेस सरकार इन आश्वासनों पर सदैव दृढ़ रही। आज भी हमारी कांग्रेस पार्टी ने यह प्रस्ताव स्वीकार किया है कि हम उसी भावना का आदर करते हैं। लेकिन उस समय कई दलों ने, मैं उनका विस्तार से नाम नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ, पांडिचेरी के अलग अस्तित्व का विरोध किया था। मैं सदन को इस बात की भी याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने सन् 1962 के अपने एक प्रस्ताव में, डी० एम० के० पार्टी ने भी अपने एक प्रस्ताव में और कई अन्य पार्टियों ने भी यह बात कही थी कि पांडिचेरी का अलग अस्तित्व नहीं रहना चाहिए। आज मुझे खुशी है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अपने विचारों को बदला है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह अच्छी बात है।

इस संबंध में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पांडिचेरी के सिलसिले में जो बयान दिया और जो बात कही वह अत्यन्त दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण है। उस बयान का जो प्रभाव हुआ और जो प्रतिक्रिया हुई वह सब को विदित है, सारा देश उसको जानता है। सर्व प्रथम जनता सरकार की यह गलती थी कि जब पिछली बार उसने वहाँ पर चुनाव करवाये तो उसके बाद इस प्रकार से एक अल्प मत की सरकार को नहीं बनने देना चाहिए था। अल्प मत की सरकार बना कर जनता सरकार ने वहाँ पर एक विवाद की स्थिति को बनाए रखा। आप जानते हैं कि अल्प मत की सरकार ज्यादा दिन नहीं चल सकती थी। सन् 1978 के नवम्बर महीने में विधान सभा को भंग कर दिया गया, लेकिन अभी तक वहाँ पर चुनाव नहीं कराये गये हैं। मैं विचार

मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने नौ विधान सभाओं को भंग करवाया और वहाँ पर चुनाव करवाये, लेकिन क्या कारण है कि नवम्बर, 1978 में पाण्डिचेरी की विधान सभा भंग करने के बाद भी आज तक वहाँ पर चुनाव नहीं करवाये गये हैं ? जब उन्होंने नौ राज्यों की विधान सभाएं भंग करवाई तो उसके लिए कोई कारण नहीं दिया। आज पाण्डिचेरी के इस बजट में, एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल के संबंध में जो बयान दिया है उसमें भी कहीं भी इस बात का संकेत नहीं मिलता है कि निकट भविष्य में शीघ्र ही पाण्डिचेरी में चुनाव करवाये जाएंगे।

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

मैं यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस जनता सरकार की करनी और कथनी में बहुत बड़ा अन्तर है। पाण्डिचेरी में इन्होंने विधान सभा को न भंग कर दिया, लेकिन अभी तक वहाँ पर चुनाव नहीं करवाये हैं? (Interruptions) शाही जी, आप लोग बार-बार इस तरह की बातें कहते हैं, इसी लिए मैं आपकी करनी और कथनी की बात कह रहा हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने मद्रास में यह बयान दे दिया कि पाण्डिचेरी के माही, कारेकल और यानाम आदि हिस्सों को भिन्न-भिन्न राज्यों में मिला दिया जाएगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि जनता सरकार का यह एक षडयन्त्र है और इसी लिए इस तरह का बयान दे दिया गया। मैं समझता हूँ कि उनको इस तरह की बात कहने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। यह कहा जाता है कि यह प्रधान मंत्री की व्यक्तिगत राय है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हर मामले में व्यक्तिगत राय कैसे हो जाती है। जो भी बात प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं वह वे प्रधान मंत्री के रूप में कहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जनता सरकार ने पाण्डिचेरी के टुकड़े-टुकड़े करके उसको अनेक राज्यों में मिलाने की जो साजिश र रखी है, उसी साजिश को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए जनता सरकार प्रयास कर रही है। पदों के पछे कोई कार्य कर रही है और इस कारण आज तक इन्होंने चुनाव के सम्बन्ध में कोई भी निर्णय नहीं लिया।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज वित्त राज्य मंत्री ज इसका उत्तर दें तो वे कृपा करके यह बतलायें कि चुनाव के बारे में उनकी क्या कल्पना है, क्या व्यवस्था है और वे क्या आश्वासन पाण्डिचेरी के निवासियों और सदन को देना चाहते हैं। वे पाण्डिचेरी में चुनाव करवायेंगे या नहीं करवायेंगे? मान्यवर, पाण्डिचेरी के विकास के लिये तो सप्लीमेन्टरी ग्रांट में कोई व्यवस्था है और न जो बजट है उसमें कोई नई व्यवस्था की गई है। वहाँ जो कुछ चल रहा है उसी को चलाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि जब वहाँ कोई भी निर्वाचित सरकार नह है, कोई भी स्थानीय निकाय निर्वाचित नहीं हो तो सारा प्रशासनिक कार्य नौकरशाही के जरिये कराया जा रहा है जिससे कि उस प्रदेश का विकास नहीं हो पा रहा है, पाण्डिचेरी में जहाँ तक शिक्षा का संबंध है वहाँ पर अच्छी शिक्षा की व्यवस्था फेंच जमाने से रही है। वहाँ पर साम्प्रदायिक सौहार्द बराबर बना रहा है। लेकिन वहाँ के लिए सिंचाई की कोई नई व्यवस्था नहीं है, कोई नया प्राधान नहीं दिखाई देता। जो एक वहाँ नहर बनी हुई थी जिससे थोड़ी बहुत बिजली बनती थी, वही व्यवस्था वहाँ पर चल रही है। वहाँ जो नगर बसा हुआ है पाण्डिचेरी वह पुरानी वास्तुकला का एक सुन्दर उदाहरण है। जिस तरह से वह शहर बसाया गया था, उस शहर को बसाने में मैं समझता हूँ वहाँ की संस्कृति, फेंच संस्कृति का प्रभाव है। लेकिन मान्यवर, जो वहाँ पर उपद्रव होते हैं और जिसके कारण से लोगों को हिंसा पर उतरना पड़ा है उसके सिलसिले में मैं कहूँगा कि 26-27 जनवरी को जिस प्रकार से वहाँ सेन्ट्रल रिजर्व पुलिस ने दुर्व्यहार किया लोगों के साथ और जिस प्रकार से गली बरसाई यह वहाँ के इतिहास में एक अद्भुत घटना है और सरकार को इस बात पर पश्चात्ताप नहीं है। जो लोग मरे हैं उनको मुआवजा नहीं दिया गया। जो घायल हुए उनके लिये कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग मरे हैं उनको पूरा मुआवजा दिया जाए।

[श्री प्रमल यादव]

को लोग घायल हुए हैं उनकी दवा-दारू में उन्हें जो खर्च उठाना पड़ा है और जो नुकसान हुआ है उसका मुआवजा दिया जाय । जिनकी सम्पत्ति का नुकसान हुआ है सरकार उनको मुआवजा दे और अगर सरकार यह नहीं करती तो मैं समझता हूँ कि तानाशही तरीके से यह सरकार केवल अभी तक जो वहाँ का प्रशासनिक ढाँचा रहा है उसको चलाना चाहती है । वहाँ के लोग नहीं चाहते कि उनका विलय किसी प्रदेश में हो । जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में ही कहा कि जो अल्प मत की सरकार को बनाने का मौका वहाँ पर जनता पार्टी ने दिया उसका यह असम्भावी परिणाम है जो इस तरह की परिस्थितियाँ वहाँ पर पैदा हुई हैं । इसकी जिम्मेदारी इस सरकार पर है । इसलिए मान्यवर, हम यह समझते हैं कि तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने वहाँ के नागरिकों को जो आश्वासन दिया था उस आश्वासन से हटने का कोई कारण, उसका कोई विवेकपूर्ण और तर्कपूर्ण आधार सरकार के सामने नहीं है । वहाँ के सभी नागरिक और पार्टियाँ जो पहले नहीं चाहते थे कि पांडिचेरी का अलग अस्तित्व हो अब इस बात के लिये सहमत हैं और कह रहे हैं कि पांडिचेरी का अलग अस्तित्व रहना चाहिए । वहाँ की जो स्थानीय जनता पार्टी है उसमें इस बात का प्रबल विवाद उत्पन्न हो गया है, झगड़ा हो गया है, दफ्तर को लेकर कौन पार्टी उसमें काबिज रहेंगी, कौन नहीं रहेगा । लेकिन देखने से लगता है कि उसका बहुमत इस बात के लिये प्रयत्नशील है कि पांडिचेरी का अलग अस्तित्व हो । इतने दिनों से पांडिचेरी का अस्तित्व पृथक् रूप से बराबर चलता रहा और आर्थिक दृष्टि से भी उसका काम चलता रहा । कोई अव्यवस्था उत्पन्न नहीं हुई । इसलिए मैं नहीं समझता कि इस पर प्रधानमंत्री को कोई जिद करनी चाहिए । और अगर व्यवस्था में कोई परिवर्तन करना है तो जो शुरू से कल्पना की गई है, जो आश्वासन दिये गये हैं उस के अनुसार उस प्रक्रिया का अनुमोदन होना

चाहिए, उस प्रक्रिया का सरकार पालन करे और वहाँ के लोगों की इसमें राय लेनी चाहिए, इसके बारे में राय होनी चाहिए कि वे शुमार क्या चाहते हैं । केवल लोक सभा में बहुमत के आधार पर वहाँ के लोगों की भावनाओं को ठेस नहीं लगानी चाहिए । मेरा निवेदन है कि उन लोगों के ऊपर इस तरह से बुल-डोजर नहीं चलाना चाहिए । मुझे शंका है कि वहाँ का असेम्बली की चुनाव ही नहीं कराना चाहते हैं । ट्रीटी आफ दि सेशन आफ दि फ्रेंच इस्टेब्लिश-मेंट आफ पांडिचेरी करैलकल यनम माहे के आर्टिकल 2 में साफतौर से लिखा हुआ है उसका उदाहरण देकर मैं सरकार को स्मरण करना चाहता हूँ कि :

“...Establishment which keep the benefit of the special administrative status which as in force prior to the 1st November 1931 any constitutional changes in its status which might be made subsequently shall be made after ascertaining the wishes of the people.”

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार उस संवैधानिक अनुच्छेद 2 का उल्लंघन करने को तैयार है और उस आश्वासन को तोड़ना चाहती है ? क्या वहाँ की जन भावनाओं का निरादर करते हुए वह इस तरह की कार्यवाही करना चाहती है ? इसलिए मैं इतना जरूर निवेदन करूँगा कि अगर सरकार ने इस प्रकार का अनुचित और अन्यायपूर्ण प्रयास किया तो वहाँ की जनता विद्रोह कर उठेगी और उसका समर्थन तमाम जनतंत्र प्रेमी लोग करेंगे और साथ देंगे ।

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: Sir, while supporting the Appropriation Bill, I would like to say that in the Pondicherry Budget, they have not made enough allocations for industry, for fishery and for agriculture. This is a Centrally administered area and, in the eastern States,

wherever the Central Government is administering, they have allotted more funds and there is development also. But, in Pondicherry, there is no development. After taking over Pondicherry from the French Government, we have said that whenever there is any change in the Constitution or whenever they want to merge Pondicherry with the neighbouring States, the French Government would be consulted. Now, Sir, without consulting the French Government, our Prime Minister has said that they are thinking of merging Pondicherry with the neighbouring State. Again, Sir, our Prime Minister has said that it is his private opinion. Sir, our Prime Ministers private opinion creates a lot of trouble now and then. In the Sikkim affair, he said that it was his private opinion. Again, in respect of Pondicherry, he has said that it is his private opinion. It is creating a lot of trouble and so many people have died due to his private opinion. So, Sir, I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister that, as long as he holds that position in the country, he should not have any private opinion and I think that would be better. Now, Sir, why has the Prime Minister given that statement? He has given that statement in Madras, not in New Delhi. After meeting the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister, he has given this statement. Now, it is clear that the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister has requested him saying that to have a stable Government in Pondicherry is impossible and so he wanted the territory to be merged with Tamil Nadu. This is not a fair thing. It is because some political party is not able to get a majority there and is not able to rule Pondicherry and because of that he has recommended, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has recommended, that it should be merged with the neighbouring States. This is not fair. Sir, we know that the AIADMK was in a minority in Pondicherry. But our Government had allowed them to form the Government there because it was the largest single party then. It is not correct. When they are the largest single party,

they cannot rule the territory and, so, unless they have a majority there, there is no use. Now, Sir, it has been proved that without a majority they were unable to run the Government there. Sir, in Pondicherry, the French ruled there for several years and there is the French culture and the people know only French . . .

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir I want only one clarification. India is not bound to consult the French Government on Pondicherry. We are an independent country, we are an independent nation, and we have to decide our fate and our affairs independently without consulting any other country.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV : It is not correct, Sir. We are bound to do so because it is an obligation.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : We have given an undertaking to the French Government that we would consult them.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY : We are a free country, we are an independent country, and there is no question of consulting any other Government.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : When Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was there, he gave that undertaking.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY : Sir, we are an independent country and we need not consult any other country.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV : Sir, he is unnecessarily creating a controversy. This is a commitment of the Government of India.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY : We need not consult any other country.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : I am telling you what has actually happened and this is an undertaking given by the Government.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Kerala) : Mr. Reddy, you speak when you get your chance. Why are you unnecessarily speaking now?

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY : We are an independent nation and we are capable of deciding our Affairs.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : Sir, they have French culture. The old people know only French language. Now, the younger generation is learning English and Hindi. The people who are in politics are only older people. They do not know these things. Therefore, it is better that you continue Pondicherry as a separate State for some time till the younger generation comes up. If you want to merge it immediately, there will be a lot of trouble and agitation. How many people have died because of just one statement of the Prime Minister? The entire Pondicherry State has rebelled. They have demonstrated that they do not want to merge. What happened in Goa is different. Some people wanted merger with the neighbouring States of Maharashtra and Karnataka. Some people did not want merger. There was an election on this issue. We have asked for their opinion. Here also, instead of giving a statement, the Prime Minister could have asked for their opinion and conducted elections. If they are not willing to merge with others, then why are you forcing them? The entire trouble has been created by Mr. M. G. Ramachandran, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. He is not able to get a majority there. But he wants to rule that State. When he cannot rule that State, he has created this trouble.

Sir, then I come to prohibition. But the main income of Pondicherry is from liquor. If you introduce prohibition immediately, the entire economy will be upset. I am for prohibition. I want people not to drink. But you cannot do it immediately.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI (Bihar) : Repeat what you want. What do you want about drinking?

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : I am for prohibition. I am a teetotaler. I do not drink. (Interruptions) Why do you worry? Before we introduce prohibition, the economy of the State must be improved. You start more industries there. Let there be development of fisheries in that area. Then the people should have more income from agriculture. If you introduce prohibition after these improvements, then there is no objection if you introduce prohibition. If you introduce prohibition immediately, the economy of the State will be ruined. That is why I am appealing to the Government not to introduce prohibition in Pondicherry till the economy of the State is improved. In the mean time, the Government can ask some committees to advise people not to drink. The people have to be educated about the evils of drinking liquor and how they suffer because of it. They must be educated before prohibition is introduced.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : The Pondicherry people are not suffering.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : The Central Government is giving more grants to the Eastern States. More industries are started and so much money is spent in the Eastern States. I have no objection. But I want the Central Government to give more funds to industries and to start some industries in Pondicherry. They should ask the private sector also to start more industries even by giving them some tax relief in order to improve the economy of the State. Sir, there is one small place called Yenam

on the border of Andhra. It belongs to Pondicherry. Sir, their culture is separate, their education is separate, and their living style is separate. So, Sir, when the culture is separate, you cannot force them to merge with Andhra. I am not for Yenam to merge with Andhra. They are having a separate culture. French style is there. French culture is there. Why should you finish that French culture? Let us have that French culture also in our country. So, Sir, I earnestly appeal to the Prime Minister not to heed to the advice of Tamil Nadu Chief Minister who is interested in his party coming to power in Pondicherry, who is interested to have Pondicherry merge with Tamil Nadu so that he can rule Pondicherry also. That is his ambition. So, I appeal to the Prime Minister that if at all they want to take any decision about Pondicherry, the people's opinion must be taken by holding an election there whether they want to merge or not. Unless you take their opinion, you cannot force them to merge with the neighbouring States.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while supporting the Budget and the Appropriation Bills, I have to make certain observations with regard to Pondicherry.

Sir, Pondicherry has a unique culture which is a mixture of French, English, Tamil and partly Bengali also, and the people live there in complete harmony. It is a unique culture that we witness not only now but from the old days. Recently the communal harmony has been a little affected. Perhaps, you know, Sir, that some hooligans raided the Aurobindo Ashram there, looted the property and demolished many valuable machines, and the whole institution suffered a great loss. Sir, the plan was hatched and executed in a very scientific manner. I have not seen till today either the Government of India or the State Government there trying to institute an

enquiry or appoint any inquiry commission to go through this destruction, a destruction of not an individual property but the property of the people, the property of the public. It is an institution which has grown with the support and co-operation of people from all over the country and also outside. It is a disgrace for any State, and because it is a Union Territory, for the Government of India to keep quiet. I would like to urge upon the Government of India to immediately make an exhaustive enquiry and compensate for the loss, and give a guarantee that such drastic things will never happen in future.

Sir, there is a Governor there. Of course, he is very much there but, it seems that he never takes any interest in such matters. Now, for a Union Territory without any Assembly at the moment, it entails upon the Governor there to run the administration. He showed utter callousness in this matter.

Sir, I would also like to point out about the utterances of the Prime Minister with regard to Pondicherry. Did he verify the wishes of the people? Nobody can super-impose any decision from above, may be, he is the Prime Minister, may be, he is anybody. But the right of choosing the best course lies with the people of Pondicherry and not with the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has a habit of telling things, and after realising the mistake, he always says that it is his private opinion. Can a person holding a high position, a high place in public life and also in the administration as the head of the Government, a country's Prime Ministership, air his private views? It is a very sinister approach to things. It is creating a lot of misunderstanding all over the country and it is a very bad reflection.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of having an understanding and a discussion with the French Government. Somebody said, it is sacrosanct, it is a solemn promise given by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and it is incorporated in the Constitution of India. Sir, when

[Shrimati Purabi Mukkopadyay]

this country was divided, when this country was liberated, there were solemn promises given to refugees. Have those promises been honoured? No. Is the Government of India prepared to honour its commitments? No. There have been solemn promises given to the princely order. We have superseded that. We have changed our Constitution and taken away those liberties and privileges. Can not the Constitution be changed to give full freedom to the people of Pondicherry? Why should the French Government come into the picture in this 20th century? May be, at that time it was necessary. Have we honoured all our commitments? Cannot the Constitution be amended to suit the conditions at the present time? Are the people of Pondicherry children that they cannot take their own decisions? And, have they to be treated like this by every Government? Look at the *per capita* expenditure incurred by the Government of India on Pondicherry. What do we find? It is a very sorry state of affairs. Somebody said that the Eastern region Union territories get more. Yes, all the Union territories have their own problems. The poverty of the population or the smallness of the population cannot be the base for awarding financial assistance because each Finance Commission has laid down some categories of problems, like the problems of economic backwardness for this purpose. The complexities of the problems will entail more expenditure on the people. And the Government of Pondicherry cannot have that burden of expenses if the Government of India does not come forward as in other Union territories.

Sir, I am one of those who have toured all the Union territories of this country extensively and I have seen what abject poverty they are going through. So, Sir, the quantum of financial assistance given to Pondicherry should be more. Then, Sir, why should Pondicherry always remain a Union territory? Why cannot it have the full status of a State? I demand full

statehood for the people of Pondicherry. And, whatever decision has to be taken, let the people of Pondicherry decide. If they want to merge, it is the people of Pondicherry who will decide that and they will decide whether they will merge with any State or not. Pondicherry has a unique place and position. It is bordered by three States. Do you mean to say that Pondicherry will be cut into three or four slices and given on a silver platter to other States?

Then, Sir, why should the Prime Minister be guided by the Chief Minister of another State to decide the issue of a different State. Let the Cabinet decide what they want to do about Pondicherry. Let there be a formulation of the policy of the Government and the Prime Minister should have some respect for the people of that region before he decides their destiny or expresses an intention of deciding the destiny of these people.

Sir, I demand a full-fledged inquiry into this Ashram affair. Let a Parliamentary Committee go there, a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament. It is not a question of religion or anything of that sort. It is a question of survival of the culture, social reforms and educational reforms of Pondicherry. Shri Aurobindo Ashram has done a lot of good work not only for Pondicherry but also for the rest of the country and we cannot ignore them like this when there is looting and arson. The rest of the country cannot remain mum whosoever may be responsible for it or whichever party may be behind it. Whatever administrative lapses are there, let there be a thorough probe and let us decide the issue on the spot. Thank you.

SHRI V. P. MUNUSAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome the Pondicherry Budget in general. At the same time, on behalf of my Party, I would like to express certain views on this occasion. I am sure, Sir, that the Janata Government

is aware of the prevailing tensions in the minds of the people of Pondicherry over their future.

When the people are agitated as to when elections will take place and when a democratic Government will be restored, I would like to question the need for presenting a Budget for the full year. Is it not a fact that the President's Rule was imposed in November 1978 only for a period of six months? Consequently, the Centre should have been concerned with the Budget only upto April 1979, the date of expiry of the President's Rule. If the President's rule is to operate only for six months, is it not necessary that the Budget also should be synchronised with that period?

Sir, I would like to say a few words about political developments in Pondicherry following the press statement made by the Prime Minister Morarji Desai at Madras on 18th January, 1979, declaring the proposal of merger of the Union Territory of Pondicherry with the adjoining States. Our Prime Minister, during his visit to Madras, has expressed some view or the other which has hurt deeply the feelings of Tamil-speaking people. For example, I can quote here that he has categorised those who do not like to study Hindi as unpatriotic. This is a peculiar phenomenon of our Prime Minister.

Sir, coming to the statement of our Prime Minister on the merger, I would like to draw the attention of the House to Article 2 of the Treaty of our Government with the French Government. The Article reads:

"Those establishments, that is, the Union Territory of Pondicherry, will keep the benefit of the special administrative status which was in force prior to 1st November, 1954. Any Constitutional changes in the status which may be made subsequently, should be made after ascertaining the wishes of the people by means of a referendum."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has given a solemn assurance to the people of

Pondicherry that the former French possession in India will not be merged with the neighbouring States without the consent of the people. The Janata Government seems to be keen on not only reversing everyone of the policies of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru but also in breaking everyone of the assurances given by him to the people of India. Even after deeply perusing the Explanatory Memorandum of the Budget we are unable to comprehend the policy of the Janata Government. Our President has said that he is not aware of any move for the merger of Pondicherry. On the other hand, our Prime Minister says that there is nothing wrong in having a merger. The Finance Minister has presented a Budget covering the whole year. I, therefore, demand a categorical clarification from the Finance Minister as to what is the policy of the Janata Government about the future of Pondicherry and as to when elections are proposed to be held in that State.

Sir, in that context I would like to refer to the fasting undertaken on 15th March, 1979 by a freedom fighter with all his family members for grant of pension. Sir, there are two categories of pensions: one is the Central pension and the other is the State pension. As far as Pondicherry State is concerned, only 20 or 25 people were getting Central pension and after a year or so, the pensions were stopped for want of documentary evidence. In Pondicherry, at the time of transfer, the French Government destroyed the entire documents and official records. Therefore, the freedom fighters are not able to produce any documentary evidence to enable them to get the pensionary benefits. Fortunately, the Home Ministry has issued directions that they can produce documentary evidence or proof from the MPs or MLAs or from ex-MPs or ex-MLAs to say that they are genuine freedom fighters. They are submitting documentary evidence and fresh applications. But the process in the Home Ministry is very slow. Out of 20 or 25 applications, only in regard to 7

[Shri V. P. Munusamy]

or 8, action has been taken and the rest have not yet been processed. I hope the Home Ministry will take expeditious action to give pensions for the freedom fighters.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO (Orissa): Sir, even in Orissa, in the case of the INA pensioners, out of 500, only 200 have been granted pensions and remaining 300 persons have not been granted pensions. This is the state of affairs in regard to the political pensioners. There should be a categorical statement made by the Home Minister. Why should they treat the political pensioners like this?

SHRI V. P. MUNUSAMY: The second category is the State pensions, which is only Rs. 75. There are about 200 freedom fighters in Pondicherry and there is a lacuna in the pension rule. There is a word 'exile', whereas, in Pondicherry, the freedom fighters went on self exile. Therefore, unless the rule is amended as 'self exile', nobody will be entitled to this pension. I would appeal to the Janata Government to amend the rule as 'self exile' and view sympathetically and compassionately the pension cases and see that their pensions are granted as early as possible.

Now, let me express my views on the Budget. I am glad it shows a surplus of Rs. one crore and five lakhs as against the colossal deficit in the Central Budget. But I would like to express my concern about the absence of any plans for the industrial development of Pondicherry and also the inadequate amount of Rs. 50 lakhs allotted for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes form about 20 per cent of the population in Pondicherry and it is, therefore, necessary that at least an amount of Rs. 2 crores should have been allotted for their welfare against a total outlay of Rs. 11 crores and 57 lakhs. I

would like to point out emphatically that Rs. 50 lakhs allotted for the weaker sections is quite inadequate and it only serves to show the gap between the professions and the practices of the Janata Government. Similarly, the Central Government has not formulated any plan for the purposeful industrial development of the Union Territory of Pondicherry. It is common knowledge that the French Government had offered to set up, in collaboration with India, watch factories, paper mills and medium industries. But the Government of India did not agree to this. What is disturbing is that the Government is actually actively promoting the development of large and small-scale industries in the North ignoring the South totally. I would like to ask whether my assessment reflects the correct position or not. Sir, the Government must be fully aware of the contribution of Pondicherry to our foreign exchange reserves by about Rs. 7½ crores. If the Government actively promotes setting up of large and small scale industries, it will definitely give more capital for further development. Our territory possesses all the advantages and facilities for rapid industrial development, with a sizeable capital outlay but it is disquieting that only Rs. 47 lakhs have been proposed for the industrial development.

Sir, coming to the merger issue, serious ferment among the people was caused by the unfortunate and provocative utterances of our Prime Minister made apparently without consulting his Cabinet colleagues. The people of the territory rose in revolt against his statement. Curfew was clamped for three days in Pondicherry town and section 144 was promulgated for 11 days throughout Pondicherry and Karaikal. Five people were shot dead and hundreds were seriously injured. As far as our Party is concerned, we are dead against the merger. Unfortunately, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Naidu said that our leader MGR is in favour

of the merger. I totally protest and deny this statement. As a matter of fact, in our conference held at Coimbatore on 24th and 25th we passed a resolution that the sentiments of the people should be taken into consideration, the opinion of the Pondicherry people should be ascertained before any change is made in the status of the Union Territory of Pondicherry.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: That was after the demonstration started.

SHRI V. P. MUNUSAMY: No, no. I totally deny this. Perhaps the interested parties want to make capital out of this merger issue, that is my humble opinion.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: You should have been a little wiser to declare your policy much earlier so that the people would not have taken it like that.

SHRI V. P. MUNUSAMY: Finally, I emphatically demand that an assurance should be given on the floor of the House that the wishes of the people will be ascertained through a referendum before any change in the administrative status is made.

Secondly, the Government should immediately arrange for early elections in Pondicherry and restore people's Government.

Thirdly, a judicial inquiry into the police firing in Pondicherry during the anti-merger agitation in January 1979 should be ordered forthwith.

Fourthly, all the police cases against the leaders and cadres of the movement should be withdrawn immediately.

As I pointed out in my last Budget speech, Pondicherry is completely neglected by the Centre. The fishing harbour, Ariankuppam River Project, and the Central University are yet to be cleared by the Central Government as they are pending with them

for several years. I appeal that the Home Ministry must come forward to clear them as early as possible.

Finally, I appeal to the Government not to further aggravate the tensions in the minds of the brave people of Pondicherry who championed Bharathi, the gifted Tamil Poet of India's freedom.

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है ।

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at four minutes past two of the clock,

Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

RE. SPECIAL MENTIONS—contd.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Sir, would you allow Special Mentions after this Bill is over? It will be unfair and a great injustice to us.

(Interruptions)

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA (Gujarat): It was decided by the Chair that immediately after lunch Special Mentions will be taken up.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): The whole House is unanimous on this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the business. Mr. Menon.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: What is the ruling, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has already given his opinion. I will consult the record and see what the Chairman has said.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, it was declared in the House.