

[Shri K. S. Ramaswamy] they want to. But if there is any disturbance in production at the time of emergency, the Government has to take measures for continuing the production. Government will definitely see to it that it does not interfere with the rights of the workers; I am sure that during the time of emergency the workers are as much loyal as anybody else and stand by the country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE PONDICHERRY (EXTENSION OF LAWS) BILL, 1968

[Seeing that the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla was absent from the seat)]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Who is moving this Bill?

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala): There is nobody to move the Bill, Madam.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY): Madam, on behalf of Shri Shukla, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to extend certain Central Acts to the Union territory of Pondicherry, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Madam, at the time of the merger of Pondicherry with India all the Central laws were not extended to Pondicherry. Only by stages we are extending these laws. The judicial administration in the territories of the Pondicherry administration has been conducted in the French language. It was difficult to switch over the administration to Indian laws. The Government had given an undertaking that the switch-over

would be very smooth and will not affect the various professions, trade and the public. Now after five years we are extending these laws mentioned in the Bill to the Pondicherry Administration.

Madam, there is a great demand in Pondicherry for the extension of these Acts. A Resolution was introduced in the Pondicherry Assembly. Though it was not passed, all the Members there supported it. I hope the Members will welcome the provisions of the Bill.

The question was proposed.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, even at the outset I start by saying that I am supporting the Bill, I want to add certain suggestions only. The Union territory of Pondicherry consists of Pondicherry, Karaikal, Yenam and Mahi. The four administrative units, combined together, are called the Union territory of Pondicherry. I belong to South Arcot in the Madras State which is adjoining Pondicherry. Therefore, I come from the same place where Pondicherry is situated. So I am well aware of the situation of the territory of Pondicherry and also the mind of the people in Pondicherry. There we find a particular village belonging to the Pondicherry territory while the adjacent village will be belonging to Tamilnad, that is, the Madras State. The father may be living in one village while the son may be living in the other one. The father, a Pondicherry man, has to follow the French laws applicable to his village while the laws applicable to the Madras State will be applicable to the son. For example, If the father wants to file a suit for partition, he has to adopt the procedure framed under the French law, but the son wanting partition from the father, has to adopt the procedure of the Madras State. There is a lot of confusion after the *de facto* transfer of Pondicherry to the Union of India.

So far as Pondicherry is concerned, there have been two transfers, one *de jure*, which took place in the year 1962, and the other *de facto* which took place in 1954. From 1954 onwards, the people who were under the French imperialism slowly took to the customary laws of Tamilnad, that is, Madras State, but without any recognition because they had to follow French laws until *De Jure* transfer in 1962. So there is a lot of confusion in the same family because there is distinction between Pondicherry and South Arcot. Of course, there is only an administrative border line. There is no difference between the two territories. In order to avoid confusion there is a popular demand from the people in Pondicherry for extension of all the civil laws to the Union Territory. There is no dispute between the ruling party and the opposition parties over this matter. They both joined together and passed a resolution in the Legislature. Also they passed resolutions in conferences, in public meetings demanding extension of all the civil laws to the Union Territory of Pondicherry. But only the Criminal Procedure Code has been extended. When the transfer of the Territory took place, the Constitution, the basic law, had been extended to that area. When the parent law has been extended there is no necessity of delaying other laws which are only the branches of the Constitutional law. So after extending the Constitutional law, after extending the Criminal Procedure Code, after extending the Indian Penal Code to Pondicherry, there is no point in not extending the other laws to that area.

Madam, the nature of opposition against the extension of these laws is only from a very microscopic minority of certain individuals and vested interests. They include very few lawyers. We can even name them. They want French and not English. There is a treaty called the Treaty of Transition or 'Process Verla', as they call

it in French. In that treaty it has been accepted that the transition would be slow, gradual and spread over a long period. They opposed the extension of the Advocates Act and also went to the High Court.

It is only people with vested interests who oppose this. They say that if the laws are extended, then the lawyers from other places will come to Pondicherry and they will lose their professions and their fees. That is the only opposition. There is no other opposition in Pondicherry.

Now, when the procedural law is extended, there is no meaning in saying that the substantive law should not be extended. The Criminal Procedure Code is procedural law which has been extended. Here 96 Acts have been mentioned, all belonging to the substantive branch of law—Transfer of Property Act, Contract Act, and so on and so forth. So, so far as the extension of the laws is concerned, there is a popular demand for it and at the same time, there is no opposition worth mentioning.

Now, with regard to the question of transition, all the laws which are now to be extended are in English. But in courts and other places in Pondicherry, they are only using French. Now, one of the grounds of opposition is that if these laws are extended, it will be tantamount to thrusting English down the throats of the people there. But my humble submission before this august House is that from 1952 onwards, they are slowly getting acclimatised with the transition. Transition of anything in any country at any time must have bristled with some difficulties. Without any difficulty, transition is not possible. Even in the case of Diu and Daman, Portuguese laws were in vogue in that area and when English laws were extended, they also felt some difficulty. But that has now been overcome. So here also, if laws in English are extended, there would be

[Shri Thillai Villalan]

some difficulty to one section or another. But simply to say that there would be some difficulty and so transition should not be made, is not at all an argument for opposing a Bill.

So far as the application of these laws is concerned, my submission is that any difficulty can be felt only after extending the laws. All the 96 Acts now being extended will not be applied at one¹ time on one individual. It will be applied at various times on various individuals. So, only after extending the laws, difficulties can be felt and then only rectifications can come.

Now, the extension of these laws will also help national integration. We want national integration. We want integration in all walks of life. But to keep Pondicherry aloof and allow it to follow alien laws by not making the Union laws applicable to that territory would not be paving the way for national integration. Uniformity is the first step—main Gate-way—for integration. Uniformity in the application of laws will also pave the way for national integration. On this ground also, the extension of these laws is welcome. Now, so far as transition is concerned, my submission is this. There are nearly 20 lawyers. I know because I am coming from that place. Only 5 lawyers are practising and they, too, are old people. They will one day or other retire and give place to the juniors. I am myself a practising lawyer and I have got briefs in Cuddalore courts also which is 13 miles from Pondicherry. But the transition from French to English can come only after the extension of these laws. Now, some people say that they know only French and Tamil. But this is the case in all States, not only in Pondicherry. Now English is the court language in all the States. When the regional languages take the place of English, this will be possible in

Pondicherry also. So my humble submission is that so far, as the extension is concerned, there is no opposition; in fact, there is a popular demand for it. It is only a long-awaited Bill. The people in Pondicherry are, in fact, accusing the Government for not passing this Bill. So I extend my whole-hearted support to this Bill with one or two suggestions. So far as the territory is concerned, its four different parts are in different States. Pondicherry is near Tamilnad. Another part is near Kerala and yet another part is near Andhra. All the four constitute the Union Territory called Pondicherry. I suggest that one day or the other these parts should be merged with the adjoining States. That is the real solution for all the difficulties which are being faced. The transition should be slow and in a phased way. Then another suggestion of mine is that Tamil should be made the court language as early as possible. With these words, I extend my support to this Bill and I suggest that this Bill should be adopted unanimously.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN:
Madam Deputy Chairman, Part VIII of the Constitution deals with the Union Territories and List II in the First Schedule of the Constitution details the various Union Territories. For one reason or the other, certain territories like Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands and Dadra and Nagar Haveli have been retained as Union Territories. I can understand the various reasons that have necessitated the retention of those territories as territories administered by the Union directly. But the inclusion in that list of Union Territories of Goa, Daman and Diu and then of Pondicherry cannot be supported by any considerations of a basic nature except one historical fact, namely, that Goa, Daman and Diu were a Portuguese possession and Pondicherry was a French possession. It

was probably because of the further fact that at the time these Possessions were freed from the Portuguese and French respectively, years after the British India had attained independence, years after a major portion of the country had been ruled by the Indians themselves, yet the standard of life and economy generally speaking of the citizens at large in these Portuguese and French possessions were much better than the standard of life and economy in the rest of the country as a whole. So, Madam, in spite of the fact that the people of Goa, Daman and Diu and Pondicherry were happy over the fact that Portuguese and French domination had ended, people thought that it was certainly not good for them to merge within the surrounding or the neighbouring States. Pondicherry consists of Karikal, Mahe and Yanam. Pondicherry and Karikal are enclaves in the Madras State. Mahe is a two or three square mile enclave in the Kerala State. It is shameful to remind ourselves of that fact that, in spite of the fact that the surrounding areas had been freed from the British long back and a decade or more of independent administration had been there, life in these enclaves still administered by foreigners was much better than what it was outside in free India. There are, if I may say so, two historical reasons, one of foreign domination and the other of the state of economy, that necessitated probably the inclusion of these areas within the Union Territories and in the First Schedule to the Constitution. I submit that the approach to integration and the answer to disintegration is not by half-hearted legislations of this nature but there should be a bold approach to the entire problem of these two territories. Then not only the Central laws would apply but also the laws within the surrounding States would begin to apply. And it is time that the Central Government looks into this aspect of Goa, Daman and Diu being merged, so far as the demand goes, in the Maharashtra State, Pondicherry

and Karikal being merged in the Madras State and Mahe and Yanam being merged in the Kerala State. It is only by a constitutional amendment of this nature that integration, unity and unified living can be brought about in these territories.

Now, Madam, a very large number of Acts are sought to be extended. As I submitted, the apprehension and fear on the part of the citizens of these areas to come into India and merge in the neighbouring territories and become part of one State or the other of several States in this country was because they felt that their standard of life would be reduced, their economy would be jeopardised and their general state would worsen. I do not know, Madam, how far that apprehension would continue to exist on account of the wholesale extension of all these laws. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons a more vague way of putting things cannot be found. It is stated:

"There is a desire among large sections of the people of the territory that the civil, judiciary and important administrative agencies should be switched over from the French pattern to the Indian pattern and more laws that are in force in the rest of India should also be extended to the said Union territory."

You can say "from the French pattern to the British pattern". Madam. I was somewhat surprised and shocked to hear that a Resolution to this effect was moved in the Pondicherry Assembly but not passed. Yet the hon. Minister states that a large number of members in the Pondicherry Assembly supported it. I do not know of a greater conflict than arising from such a statement. Any way I am aware, so far as this small enclave of Mahe in my State is concerned, of any general or specific demand of the nature incorporate¹ in the provisions of this Bill. On the other hand what I have heard seen in the two or three square mi]-

[Shri K. Chandrasekharap.]

area of Mahe and Yanam in north Malabar in the Kerala State is that more and more State laws or laws of that nature should be made applicable to that area. Madam, legislation is done at Pondicherry, miles away from Mahe and Mahe has got only one or two representatives in the Pondicherry Assembly. The language there is different from the in Mahe; the common link was French but it is no longer there now. Knglish is not developed. The area covered by Tamil is Tamil and by Malayalam is Malayalam. Therefore, the unifying force of language is also lost. The demand in Mahe is that the legislations particularly pertaining to land reform, available in the rest of the Kerala State should be made applicable to Mahe. I submit, Madam, that such a demand is not met by the provisions of this Bill. This Bill seems to take for granted that a mere application of certain Central legislations will serve the purpose. On the other hand, particularly in an enclave like Mahe what is required is more and more of welfare legislations, that are available to the rest of the people of Kerala State, following the same social customs and manners, *the* same standard of living^ being extended to Mahe and this Bill from that point of view is hopelessly inadequate, if I may say so, to fulfil the general desire of the citizens placed as they are in the enclaves like Mahe.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala); When there was struggle in Pondicherry, Mahe or in any of those areas which were foreign settlements, they were anxious that they should be united with their brethren in the neighbouring areas. That was the only thing that moved them. Actually the condition in most of these Settlements were much better. As one who had worked with the people there as a trade unionist, I know that Pondicherry had a higher standard of living and they had also certain welfare measures which were

much better than the welfare measures we have—the social security measures. Their wages were decidedly higher, whether it was the elementary school teacher or the high school teacher and their condition was better. They agreed to go over here only because of the great upsurge that was there at that time. We must remember that even the French _peo-ple had the right to elect their Deputies to France. What the French working classes achieved, all those benefits could come here. The sacrifices they have made by coming over here are great sacrifices and that we must really understand. Of course, these Bills will have to go there but one thing we will have to respect, namely, that in this land of diversity, whatever French culture and literature they have should be there. Le* the court language be Tamil and French as well as English so that those who have had French education, who had been conducting their activities with the help of that language, may very well use that language for some more time—why?—for a very long time because it is very important to have a few French-speaking people also in ou, country. Why not? Where we have so many languages, where we have 50 many cultures, it is very good that the French language also is helped to develop and in Pondicherry while the Tamil language should be the language of the court, the lawyers may be permitted to speak either in English or French. There should be no force on the lawyers to accept English because most of them will find it difficult.

Another attempt will have to be made, namely, we will have to find out what legislations there are really much more progressive than ours and I would like some attempt by us to find out whether some legislations at least which are more advanced should not be brought over here.

This measure I welcome but that study will have to be made and if

it is done, I believe there will be some legislations which are decidedly better than our legislations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I welcome this measure because this is good and the people there are certainly demanding it. In fact, I wrote to Mr. Chavan asking him to expedite the passage of this measure and he wrote back saying that he had requested the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs to allot time for this. So it goes, without saying that I am in support of it but then it remains to be seen how these are going to be used by the local authorities in Pondicherry which now is under the Congress. We have two sets of laws, one the French laws which are there, which can be amended by the local Legislative Assembly and there are also Indian laws which may be extended now to Pondicherry with proper authority from Parliament. I should like to invite the Minister's attention to an important fact and it is this that the Congress regime is trying to have the best of both the worlds. They are trying to utilise the French laws in order to deprive the People's Front and the opposition of their right to run the local bodies and they are utilising those laws to subvert and suppress the elections to local bodies and appoint commissioners under the previous French decrees in their places. The election to sixteen Municipalities in the territories of Pondicherry, Karaikal, Mahe and Yennam were held in September, 1961 according to the French Municipal Decree dated 12th March, 1880 which is still in vogue. The tenure of the Municipality is for 6 years according to the said Decree. Therefore, the fresh election to all the Municipalities obviously should have been held in September, 1967. In the meantime in December, 1965 a Bill laying down the rules for conduct of the Election was passed in the Assembly which received the assent of the President on 31st January, 1966. This is called the Pondicherry Municipal

Councils (Election) Act, 1966. This kind of measure was passed. Then what happened? In the normal course, the preparation for the election should have been undertaken in time to conduct the election before the expiry of the terms of the Council. But, the Congress Party did not wish to face the electorate as it was afraid of its rout in any election at present. So, the Congress Government invoking the articles 13 and 14 of the French Municipal Decree of 1880 as amended in 1938 which provides for nominating a Commission in the place of the elected Municipality under various circumstances among which the expiry of the term of the Council is also one. According to article 14 of the Municipal Decree of 1880, this nominated Commission can function only for 6 months and not beyond that. The election must be held before the expiry of six months under any circumstances. Firstly the former Congress Cabinet of Sri Farooq Maraiyar by an order dated 24-10-1967 dissolved all the Municipalities and nominated in its place all the old elected Municipal Councillors without changing anyone as the members of the new Commissions. This was the technique. Arbitrary power was used to suppress the elected bodies in this manner. According to this order and the article 4 of the Decree of 1880 the election must have been held before 6 months, that is, before 24th March, 1968. But instead of holding the election, the new Congress Cabinet of Venkatasubba Reddiar moved a Bill in the Assembly amending Articles 13 and 14 of the Decree of 1880 in order to authorise the Government to nominate fresh Commissions without holding elections. See how they behave. This is the undemocratic and arbitrary act of the Congress that they acted without the consent of the electors and even took the following steps to get statutory-power. Now they came again. The decree was used and when the Decree is not good enough, they are coming to seek statutory power.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

A Bill entitled "The Municipal Decree (Amendment) Bill of 1968, was introduced by the Chief Minister in the Legislative Assembly on 6th April, 1968. This Bill proposed amendment to the provision in article 14 of the Decree of 1880 which stipulated 6 months period as maximum term for a Commission into one year. The period is extended. But this Bill was not taken up for consideration on the date fixed. Instead, the Chief Minister moved entirely another draft Bill under the same title which was distributed to Members of the Assembly on the evening of 7th April, 1968 though the circular was ante-dated—that is how the Congress behaves—as 6-4-68. On the April 1968, the new draft Bill was introduced by the Chief Minister without withdrawing the first draft. When the Opposition pointed out this flaw, then he moved for withdrawal. Later the second draft Bill was permitted by the Speaker to be moved and passed on the same day without even giving the material time to study the new" draft Bill. The Opposition strongly protested against this. But the Speaker being a Congressman himself, permitted this thing to be done. Now I have got the draft Bills with me and any perusal of this would show in what absurd manner they are behaving. This new draft proposed many drastic changes from the provisions of the first draft. Instead of 6 months as term proposed for any Municipal Commission under article 14 of the original Decree, the new draft proposed the nomination to be extended to further period or periods not exceeding six months each. It is "periods not exceeding six months". This provision *ipso facto* provided powers to extend the life or tenure of the nominated body for an indefinite period. From six months and one year now it is for an indefinite period. This practically deprives the democratic right of election to municipal bodies.

Secondly, in the first draft Bill, it was provided that the Act shall be

deemed to have come into force on I the last of October, 1967. But in the I second draft passed, which became an Act now, it was provided that "It shall come into force at once."

Now you see how they behave. There the People's Front held two municipalities under its administration with a total majority and that party had also elected representatives ranging from 2 to 5 in almost all the municipalities. The new order of the Government—what is the effect of it?—the new order of the Pondicherry Congress Government had removed all elected members belonging to the People's Front and those who have recently joined us in the Legislature United Democratic Front and in their place appointed Congressmen who were defeated either in the last Municipal or Assembly elections held there in 1961 and 1964.

Now this is how the Congress Government is behaving in Pondicherry, you must know. The hon. Member is very happy and I am also happy that these measures are being passed but this is how . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. It is a small Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Small Bill but very mischievous Government. We are passing a law with a very mischievous Government in Pondicherry. That is my point.

It is obvious from the step taken by the Congress in Pondicherry that it is falling in line with the general policy of the Government to dissolve all representative bodies and carry on administration with the power at the Centre. Now this is the position. I have given you a concrete case as to how the Congress Government in Pondicherry on the one hand wants, understandably, certain things to be extended perhaps, and on the other hand is utilising the provisions of the

French law and the Decree in order to take away democratic rights and so on and to make imposition there. Now I should like to know how we are going to handle such a situation. I am all in favour of maintaining all that is good bequeathed to the people of Pondicherry under the French system. I am all in favour of their culture certainly, no question about it, and even those laws which are helpful to the people and are democratic should be retained and incorporated and adopted within our system of law. But what to do in such a case where the Congress regime took recourse to the French laws there in order to do something which did not fall in line with the present trends of democratic development and which in fact negated elections and so on and which made imposition and arbitrary administration possible for an indefinite period? Now it is a shameful thing, municipal bodies are being subverted and suppressed in this manner and I would only like Mr. Shukla to set things right. He may not be knowing this thing in detail, he is not expected to know, but I have brought it to the notice of the House. I had consultations with the Members of the Legislative Assembly in Pondicherry and on the basis of what I have been told by them, and on the basis of the drafts of the Bill and other relevant documents I have brought all this to the notice of the House here. They only show that the Congress Government there is interested in using both the local laws, the French laws and the Indian laws in order to suppress the People's Front and maintain themselves in power and in order not to have elections and face the elections. I think the matter should be gone into by the Home Ministry in particular and steps should be taken to see that such a fraud on this democratic system does not take place, no matter under what Government.

डा० भई महोदय (फिल) : उपसभा-
पति महोदय, जो विषय हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत

है उसके संबंध में मैं उतना लम्बा भाषण करने के लिए खड़ा नहीं हुआ जितना लम्बा भाषण अभी हमारे सामने हुआ है। मैं इस बिल की भावना का अनुमोदन करता हूँ परन्तु मैं समझता हूँ हमारी सरकार ने यह जो नीति अपनाई है कि अपने देश का कोई छोटा सा भी टुकड़ा अगर फ्रेंच या पुर्तगाल कब्जे के अन्दर कभी रहा था, तो उसको देश के बाकी हिस्से से अलग बनाकर रखें और उसके साथ के जो राज्य हैं उनमें मिला देने की बजाय सदा के लिए एक राज्य बनाए रखना कि यहाँ पर किसी समय फ्रांसीसियों का या पुर्तगाल का कब्जा था, यह किसी भी कारण से, किसी भी ढंग से, देश के एकीकरण के लिए न उपयुक्त है न उन लोगों की भावना को किसी प्रकार संतुष्ट करता है। और जब मैं यह कहता हूँ तो मझे स्मरण आता है कि गोवा के प्रश्न पर इस संबंध में काफी वाद-विवाद हुआ, एक चुनाव इस सवाल पर लड़ा गया कि गोवा को अलग रखा जायेगा या वह महाराष्ट्र के अन्दर सम्मिलित कर दिया जायेगा। यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि उस समय स्थानीय कांग्रेस ने संभवतः अपने बड़े नेताओं के आशीर्वाद से या उनके निर्देशन से वहाँ पर यह दृष्टिकोण लिया कि गोवा को अलग इकाई के तौर पर रखा जाय। यह देश के एकीकरण के लिए अनुकूल नहीं था और मैं समझता हूँ कि आज यह जिसको हाफ-हार्टेड कदम कहा गया और अभी हमारे मित्र श्री चन्द्र शेखर ने जो बातें कहीं, मैं समझता हूँ कि उन बातों का समर्थन ही करना इस समय सबसे आवश्यक, सबसे उपयुक्त बात उनको मालूम होती है कि हम अपने देश के जन जन में जहाँ लोगों की भावनाओं को उठा सकते हैं वहाँ हम देश के बाकी हिस्से में अपने अलगाव को, अपनी पृथक्ता को, यह जो हमने अपने देश के माथे पर निशान रखा है, टिकट लगाया हुआ है, मोहर लगाई हुई है, मिटाकर उसको भुला सकते हैं। इसका

[डा० भाई महावीर]

मतलब यह नहीं है कि उनको जो सुविधायें पहले मिली हैं उनको छीन लिया जाय। जो उनकी व्यावहारिक कठिनाई है भाषा के संबंध में, शिक्षा के संबंध में, उसकी हम व्यवस्था करें लेकिन उनको अलग इकाई करना मुझे देश हित में नहीं मालूम होता और मेरा सरकार से अनुरोध है कि इस बारे में विचार करे कि इस तरह का अधूरा, अधकचरा और आधे मन से लाने की बजाय, किसी भी ऐसे विधेयक को लाने के लिए उनके बारे में स्पष्ट निर्णय करें और ऐसी छोटी छोटी इकाइयों को साथ के प्रदेश में शामिल किया जाना चाहिये ताकि वह देश के एक राष्ट्रीय जीवन के प्रवाह में पूरी तरह समा सकें।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am happy that this measure has received the unanimous support of all the Members that have spoken so far. The progress made in the Union Territory of Pondicherry after liberation is well known to the Members. When Pondicherry was transferred and the *de jure* transfer was being negotiated with the French Government, we had given the assurance that we shall see to it that there were no sudden changes brought about in this territory. It was not done so much to satisfy the sentiments of the French people or the French Government, but it was mainly done to remove the apprehensions in the minds of those people who for many decades had learnt to live under the French laws, French customs and several things like that, and we did not want that there should be a sudden change which might upset their way of life and their way of functioning. And that is why 5 P.M. we have allowed a reasonable period of transition and slowly we are integrating this Territory with the rest of India by exten-

sion of laws and various other things. Madam Deputy Chairman, the point is brought up often that we are half hearted in such matters. I would say that we are not half-hearted. We are being very careful and we are very sensitive to the needs of the people whose lives have been patterned in a certain way. Even in Goa or in Pondicherry or Mahe or Karaikal, it is undisputed that the people there had a different system of things, a different legal system, a different system of administration and so on, from the rest of the country. If we had changed them all of a sudden we would have created more troubles than solved them. That is why we go slow and I do not think there is any justification in the criticism that we are halfhearted in the matter of the integration of these areas with the rest of the country. The very fact that this is kept as a Union Territory indicates that there are special circumstances existing here and our long-term policy is to slowly integrate such areas with the rest of the country without disturbing the normal life of the people or without upsetting it unduly. As soon as these special conditions cease to exist they will be even merged with the adjoining State. We are not at all interested in keeping various areas as Union Territories. As a matter of fact, we shall be happy to see conditions created soon enough when those areas could be merged with the adjoining areas and they could take part in the common process of development. This is our long-term view about these matters.

Shri Chandrasekharan, while speaking on this Bill mentioned about the question of land reform. I may mention here that what he was pleading for has already been done. The Pondicherry Legislature passed a Land Reforms Act which brings the land reforms in Mahe more or less on the same lines as those existing in Kerala. So there is not much for Shri Chandrasekharan to worry about as far as this matter is concerned.

Another point that Shri Chandra-sekharan mentioned was how a Resolution that was moved in the Legislature was not passed. It is not unknown to Parliamentarians that Resolutions are sometimes moved like that and even when they receive the unanimous support of the members they are withdrawn. The same thing happened here. The Resolution moved in the Pondicherry Legislature received the support of almost all the Members of the House. But on the assurance given by the Government that they would do their best to see that the Central laws are extended quickly, that Resolution was withdrawn. So there is nothing unusual about a Resolution being moved and then withdrawn.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta mentioned something about the municipal affairs there. I am afraid what he said is substantially correct. We ourselves are very unhappy about this matter and we have directed the Pondicherry Administration to correct the situation by holding the elections within the stipulated time, that is to say, within six months and I think by September or October of this year the elections to the local bodies in Pondicherry will be held.

As far as the extension of Central laws is concerned, I have already said that our policy is to go slow in this matter. Before concluding I would like to assure the House that we shall try to expedite the process of integration without upsetting the normal life of the people there. This is our policy and I hope we will have the support of the House in pursuing this policy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to extend certain Central Acts to the Union territory of Pondicherry, as passed by the Lok Sabha be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 7 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE CENTRAL LAWS (EXTENSION TO JAMMU AND KASHMIR) BILL, 1968

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of certain central laws to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Madam, this also is a short Bill which seeks to extend certain Central laws to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. As the House is aware, from time to time, we have been extending the necessary legislations and provisions of the Constitution to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. There has been some criticism as to why we have not been doing, so more often and why we do not extend the entire provisions of the Indian Constitution and all the Indian laws to the State of Jammu and Kashmir? Madam, any hon. Member who realises the special circumstances under which the State of Jammu and Kashmir became part of India and the peculiar circumstances that exist there even now, would know without difficulty why the Government is careful about this matter. As far