

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

other competent person, some high legal luminary, to see whether really a criminal case can be instituted or not?

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, he has only repeated the same question, which I have replied. And it is not the same advocate. This is a different person. He has nothing to do with Mr. Ram Ratan Gupta. So far as the other cases mentioned by him are concerned, they pertain to another Ministry and we are not concerned with them.

REFERENCE TO STATEMENT ON RHODESIA

श्री राजनारायण : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं . . .

श्री सभापति : नहीं, नहीं ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मुझे एक और सवाल पूछना है ।

श्री सभापति : आपने मुझ से इस बारे में पूछा नहीं ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह बात तो कल हो गई रोडेशिया के संबंध में । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस बारे में यहां पर बयान देगी ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He will make the statement.

श्री राजनारायण : कब ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): I will try and make it tomorrow or the day after. I am waiting for certain information and I would like to make a full statement.

ENQUIRY RE. STATEMENT ABOUT SWAMI KARPATRI

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब श्री करपात्री जी के बारे में बयान देंगे?

श्री सभापति : मगर उनके पास जानकारी नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : कल होम मिनिस्टर ने कहा था कि इसके बारे में पता लगायेंगे ।

श्री सभापति : जब जानकारी हो जायेगी तो वह यहां पर आ जायेगी ।

THE GOA, DAMAN AND DIU (OPINION POLL) BILL, 1966—contd.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, just before the House adjourned yesterday evening we passed on to this part of the agenda, the consideration of this Goa Bill and while speaking and moving my amendments I was beginning with my first amendment. The first amendment I propose to move, Sir, with your permission, is that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. In giving my reasons, I tried to explain to the House that it was not fair, if not dishonest, that the House was told at 18 hours, i.e., at six o'clock that further consideration of the Bill would be taken up the next day. I do not know what happened within an hour and a half and suddenly that Bill was taken up for consideration. My objection is that this was not very fair or honest with the House, particularly when amendments were tabled by my colleague, Mr. Dandekar, in the other House and he left when it was said that the Bill would not be taken up. Then suddenly at 7.20 the Bill was taken up and those amendments could not be moved because Mr. Dandekar had left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, we do not discuss things that happened in the other House.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I have gone through the rules. I am not trying to discuss what happened in the other House. I am trying to move an amendment that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee and I am giving my reasons why I want it to go to a Select Committee. One reason is that the Bill was not properly considered and in proving that the Bill was not properly considered, I referred to this. The hon. Deputy Minister, Mr. Shukla, did raise a point of order and I pointed out that I was entitled to point out the reason why I wanted the Bill to go to a Select Committee. One reason for that may be you will concede, that the Bill was not properly considered and in proving that I pointed out that this was what happened. I am not trying to comment, but just point out a statement of fact. For these reasons I think you will agree with me that I was fully justified in pointing it out.

I do not agree with the hon. Deputy Minister, Mr. Shukla, on many matters. Hon. Deputy Minister, Mr. Shukla, spoke about the Bill just before this, the Preventive Detention (Continuance) Bill. We have our different views. Mr. Shukla is entitled to his views and I am entitled to my views on that. That makes no difference. But just as in this case in the other case also I do not think he was fair to the House. Did he prove in one single instance where a person who was arrested under this Ordinance for anti-social offences. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which Ordinance?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The previous Bill. Similarly, in this case, I am giving an analogy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can refrain from referring to things that have already happened.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am saying that Mr. Shukla has not been fair to this House when he made those remarks. The people of Goa have an entity and existence. There can be no going away from that. The opinion poll that has been sought to be taken is a fraud. It is misleading the people. What really should be done is the vote of the people of Goa, not the present residents of Goa, but of the people who were residents of Goa before it was merged with the Indian Union. It is quite possible that some of them have left Goa and settled down in Bombay. That should not prevent them from exercising their vote, because what is required, under the assurances that have been repeatedly given from the highest quarter to the people of Goa, is that their vote would be taken, not the vote of a large number of Maharastrains who have now gone and settled down in Goa, for business, for Government service and for other purposes. No effort has been made honestly to get their vote.

I referred to the assurances that were given to the people of Goa. Some of them were by the Prime Minister. Prime Minister Nehru on the eve of elections said:—

“Ultimately it will be for the people of Goa to decide their future. That opportunity will be theirs, but let that be taken when the time comes for it. Any attempt to take it before that time will be harmful to Goans.”

This was the assurance that the Prime Minister gave in December, 1963.

Then, there is an assurance by the Congress Parliamentary Board. In 1964 the Board considered the future of Goa and decided that it should be made clear that for the coming ten years Goa would continue as a Union territory. Very humbly I ask. Where is that assurance today? I am quoting

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

from a resolution of the 18th April, 1964. Has that been done? Has that assurance been observed? If this resolution was passed in April, 1964, we are not in April 1974 by any stretch of imagination. Is it trying to go behind this assurance that was given by the Congress Parliamentary Board? I believe it is. It used to be at least—I do not know whether it is now so—the highest authority of the Congress that could deal with parliamentary matters. This is the assurance that was given. What is the reason for changing the situation and having this opinion poll? Prime Minister Nehru had given such assurances even before right from 1954. In 1954 he said:

“I would like to take this opportunity of stating once again that aspect of our basic approach in respect of Goa, when it will be come part of India.”

Now, when such assurances are available, when such assurances have been given repeatedly, I will not take further time of the House by quoting them. I have got quite a number of them. Is it right that under the name of an opinion poll, this sort of legislation should be sought to be rushed? The assurance was that it will be a vote of the people of Goa, not people from Maharashtra, who have rushed into Goa for business, because it is possible for them to go there now. It certainly tilts the vote. The other aspect, a very important aspect, is this. A large number of citizens of Goa, who were citizens of Goa, were not registered voters in the Indian territory. I know it for a fact because I have got a lot to do with Bombay, with the Bombay Municipal Corporation. They were not registered as voters, because they were not considered as Indian citizens.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE (Nominated): They wanted to be Portuguese citizens.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Whether they were considered as Portuguese citizens or not, they were not registered. That was the way in which it was done. Is it not but fair that these people who hail from Goa, who came to Bombay temporarily for business, should be given an opportunity? Many people go to many other places. We come from Gujarat. We are here for doing our work in Parliament. Like that so many people are here. Our families are here. My wife stays with me. In the voters' list in Baroda her name was not there. I had to write to them and get her name registered there. So, where is the guarantee that such a thing has not happened in the case of the real people of Goa?

AN HON. MEMBER: They can get themselves registered.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes, they can, but will you give them enough time? That is the point. I think the little time that is given is not enough to get all these people registered as voters of Goa. If the assurances that have been given from the highest quarters, from the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, the Congress President and the decision of the Congress Parliamentary Board, are real and genuine, the opportunity promised to the people of Goa must be given. The people of Goa have a certain separate entity. There is no denying it. It is not necessary to ride rough-shod over them in this manner. You are giving this opportunity to the people of Kashmir or Nagaland and then why not the same fair treatment be given to the people of Goa? On the contrary, the people of Goa suffered worse exploitation than many of us suffered under British India. Some of their leaders, at least one or two, are still languishing in jail in Lisbon. Is this what this Government is going to do with them? I plead that this is a retrograde measure. It is taking away the fundamental rights of the people of Goa who stood valiantly by us in

the struggle for freedom and afterwards under worst conditions fought to overthrow the foreign rule. This country is supposed to be the beacon-light for all oppressed countries all over the world, which helps them to overthrow foreign rule. Have we helped the Goans to overthrow foreign rule to do this to them, to perpetrate this injustice on them?

Sir, this piece of legislation is dishonest. I hope reasonable people in this House will give due consideration to this and support my first amendment of taking it to a Select Committee. Heavens are not going to fall if we do not pass this Bill immediately in this hurry. Let us give sufficient opportunity to the people of Goa to express their free will, not this fraudulent opinion poll that is sought to be rushed roughshod at the fag end, in the last two days in this session. Sir, I have already elaborated how it was passed in the other House. It was not a very honest way of doing it. I am sure you will agree with me. That is my strongest plea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I usually do not register my agreement. I listen.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Is it not possible to disagree with a certain thing like this when a responsible Minister gets up and says—when the Chairman says that we will take this up tomorrow, within an hour the Minister says let us proceed with this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have said that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: That is exactly what I am trying to say. Therefore, I repeat and protest most emphatically at the manner in which this Bill is sought to be passed. I speak with a certain amount of experience. I have lived for many years in Bombay, and I know that there is a certain section, perhaps that has become the dominant section in the Congress today, which just

wants things their own way. They begin by saying “झालाच पाहिजे”

That means this must be done in Maharashtra. झालाच पाहिजे ।

There is no understanding, no question, they just get together and shout

झालाच पाहिजे . Is it not what they are trying to do with Goa? They have done it in several ways. They have managed to get some of what they wanted in this way. Some of it may be justified, some may not be. This is surely not justified. Therefore, having experienced many of these things in Bombay I want to request this House to give a fair deal to the people of Goa. I am afraid I was not satisfied with the remarks that were made by the Minister in his opening speech nor with the remarks that we had on the previous Bill from the Home Minister himself. The Home Minister should look into this matter of the manner of treatment of people who are not styled as Maharashtrians but who have been living in Maharashtra for a long time. I have protested against the manner in which some of the things are happening. Even today I have received a number of telegrams about what is happening, and I just mentioned it once before. The shops of poor South Indians who serve ‘idli’ and ‘dosa’ were looted in Bombay. The shops of Iranis who serve tea were looted. They tell them openly, “You are not Maharashtrians, go away”.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shiv Sena.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Shiv Sena. That is exactly what is wrong with Maharashtra. I would appeal to reasonable people in this House to stop the march of Shiv Sena in this manner. It is not democratic. It is a sort of authoritarian rule. Do you want that to take place in this democracy?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): It is like the storm troopers of Germany under Hitler.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He reminds me of the storm troopers of Hitler. I hope we are not going to have any type of storm troopers in this country. There are many people who are anxious to have them, I know that. Let there be at least a few people in Parliament who could stand up and have the courage to protest against this, few people who will stand up and would not mind suffering for being able to express themselves. I know there are a large number of people on the other Benches who feel with me that what I am saying is reasonable. Let us put a stop to this storm trooping, this trying to just rush through this measure during the last days of the session contrary to all the assurances that you have given during so many years, during the last five years repeatedly in both the Houses publicly, on the platforms, everywhere, the assurances given by the highest of your people. We cannot let down the people of Goa, and I would appeal to all reasonable people in this House, particularly those on the Treasury Benches, to desist from doing this. It is an atrocity of the worst order.

Sir, I hope I have made myself sufficiently clear.

The question was proposed.

SHRIMATI LALITHA RAJAGOPALAN (Madras): Mr. Chairman, as we are discussing this Goa, Daman and Diu Bill of 1966, opinion poll Bill, the atmosphere for the poll has been created by the present Ministry's resignation and the introduction of President's rule. This has also been made possible by the leader of the United Goan Party coming to the realisation that the future of the people of Goa should be decided once and for all.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

The leader of the United Goan Party had been opposing the merger for a very long time, and on the 6th May, 1966, he met the Prime Minister and stated that if there was to be a

change in the earlier decision of having a *status quo* the decision should be taken on the basis of a referendum. So, this Bill has been introduced with the consent of the United Goan Party also and there was no pressure as suggested by some people. But at the same time I would like to admit and I would also concur with the view of Mr. Patel that this Bill has been rushed in a very hasty manner.

In supporting this Bill I would also like to air my views regarding this opinion poll. Goa, Daman and Diu had been under the oppressive rule of the Portuguese for a very long time and was liberated in 1961, and one should not forget the fact that before the Portuguese settlers came there, it was part and parcel of one State or the other. In my opinion this issue should have been settled then and there when the liberation took place, but we did not do it and this has led to so many controversial problems now. Instead we ourselves inculcated in the minds of the people of Goa that Goa would remain as a separate entity for ten years to come. Long ago during the Bhubaneshwar session the Maharashtra people raised the issue of reconsidering the future status of Goa. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's reaction was as I learned from the Honorary Secretary, Bombay Opinion Poll Committee: "The world should know that there is some honour left among us in India". During the same period the Parliamentary Board also decided that the future status of Goa should be decided by the people of Goa and that the time limit should be ten years. In 1964 the same year the late Prime Minister Nehru answering a question in the Lok Sabha regarding the future status of Goa stated that the future status of Goa should be decided by the people of Goa maybe after five years or ten years. So, the rigidity of five years or ten years does not come in and we have every justification in introducing the Bill. But we cannot deny the fact that we created an impression in the minds

of the people of Goa, Diu and Daman that their future will be decided only after ten years and that they will not be disturbed. In this connection, I would like to state that the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, had foresight and vision and he always left the decision to the will of the people. Even regarding the language issue, he took such a stand knowing the sentiments of the non-Hindi-speaking people and in both the Houses as well as outside stated that English shall remain as the official language so long as the non-Hindi-speaking people wanted it and that it was these non-Hindi-speaking people who should decide the issue. So, he emphasised on the will of the people and considered it more important than anything else. I think the opinion poll in this aspect does not comply with this theory fully. I would also like to state that after his death many changes have taken place, politically, economically and internationally, and this issue has come to a stage when a decision should be taken. But I would also submit that this decision can be postponed after the General Elections. We can pass the Bill now but I think the opinion poll can be held after the elections.

Now, I come to the opinion poll. In this, one should not bring in linguistic attitudes and other factors which would create controversies and will also jeopardize this poll at this stage. But the opinion poll as envisaged has many defects. The opinion poll is not the same as a general election, as envisaged in this Bill. A general election is held every five years but an opinion poll whether a territory should merge with a State or whether it should remain as a separate entity is a vital matter in deciding the future of this territory itself. In my opinion, the outlook should be broadbased but the Bill restricts itself only to the electors of Goa, and the electors of Goa are the only people who have the right to vote in the Assembly elections, and those people have only residential qualifications there. In this connec-

tion, I would like to state that more than 80,000 people are in Bombay and they are deprived of this right. And if we are to understand that the opinion poll is to be conducted only by those people, those electors of Goa, I just cannot understand why they call it as opinion poll. I hope that the Home Minister will take measures to see that these one lakh of people in Bombay are also enlisted as voters and that they also have their views expressed. In exercising their franchise, they also have the feeling that the opinion poll has been conducted in a fair and just manner.

Now, I come to the other point, on a hypothetical basis, about the ten years' time. I have already said that the people of Goa as well as others, even the entire country, were under the impression that the people of Goa will not be disturbed up to ten years. Now the decision of the United Goan Party leader was given in May. Goans and we have introduced this Bill now in December, when we are coming to a close. I do not know why there was such a delay in introducing the Bill, creating all sorts of controversies regarding this Bill. In this connection, I would like to state about the hypothetical base of ten years that the Catholic population in Goa is not in favour of a merger; I do not know whether they have changed their views now. Now, this opinion poll is going to decide whether it is going to be in favour of the merger with Maharashtra or it is for being a separate entity. If the opinion poll is adverse to the views of the Government of India, then I do not know what will happen. Goa may remain as a separate entity. I think the Government has also to give thought to this matter.

I come to the point of simple majority. This is a very ambiguous term as far as this Bill is concerned. Can a simple majority decide the future of a State? Is it fair on our part to take that view? Why should only 50 per cent of the electors decide whether to remain as a separate

[Shrimati Lalitha Rajagopalan.]

entity or to merge with Maharashtra? I support the views expressed by the Chief Minister of Mysore that the percentage should not be 50 but it should be 75, and it is necessary in such a vital matter as this. I am sure the Government would also give thought to this aspect.

As I have previously stated, I hope that all the Goans who are residing outside Goa, as suggested by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, should be entitled to vote in this opinion poll and they should not be left out whether they have registered themselves within six months or not.

In order to create a proper atmosphere, the withdrawal of all outside officials from Goa is imperative. I find that there is a large infiltration of Maharashtrians in the administrative services and I am sure that it will really affect the poll and it is unfair on our part to keep them there when the opinion poll is going on.

I would also like to state that the opinion poll is really welcome to the people of Goa, it is really welcomed by those people in the belief that it will really do some justice to them. But according to the Election Commission, there are only 30 days for the poll. I hope that all concessions and facilities will be given and I hope that the Home Minister will also take into consideration all the people who are residing outside Goa and see that they are also entitled to vote in this opinion poll. Government should give the concession to them that they should also enrol themselves as voters and I request all the Goans residing outside Goa to enlist themselves as voters and exercise their franchise in deciding their future.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the Government can pass this Bill but they can postpone the opinion poll, if the atmosphere is not proper or if there is to be any hurdle

in conducting the poll in a very peaceful manner. But if the Government is confident that the atmosphere is proper and that what they are doing is just and fair, they can go on with the opinion poll. But one thing I would like to stress again and that is that this is a very vital matter and we should also remember the words of Jawaharlal Nehru when he said that the future of Goa would be decided by the people of Goa. He did not say 'the electors' of Goa. He said, 'people of Goa'. It means, it is not only the people residing there. But there are many Mysoreans, Maharashtrians, Tamilians, all residing there. He did not mean only a particular people but he meant the people of Goa. His mind was about the people who are really Goans and who were really under the oppressive rule of the Portuguese. So, I think we should not set aside this factor and we should see that we conduct the poll, in a fair and just manner. Otherwise, it may cause havoc later on.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:
Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to make some observations on this Goa, Daman and Diu (Opinion Poll) Bill, 1966. We all know that many people in Goa . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I just inform the House that the House will sit through the lunch hour?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:
. . . made many sacrifices for the liberation of Goa from the Portuguese rule. Many people left Goa to seek their livelihood outside Goa. And because of the restrictions imposed by the then Government in Goa, most of them could not go to Goa at all. So, whatever future set-up of Goa is to be decided, it should be decided by the people of Goa, whether they are residing in Goa or whether they are now residing outside Goa. It should be the primary concern of the people of Goa and not the people of Maharashtra or

Mysore or any other part of this country. It is a distinct unit by itself. The people of Goa, who were under the Portuguese rule, have acquired a distinct culture of their own. Their language is Konkani. The Maharshtrians claim that it is akin to Marathi. The Mysore people claim that it is akin to Kannada.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): *അതാ* ।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: That has been the statement made by the Chief Minister of Mysore in a memorandum submitted to the Government of India. So I am not going into this question. The question is that Konkani is a different language by itself, and the people of Goa who speak this language have their own characteristics and culture. Around Goa there are other territories, other areas which are now in Mysore as well as in Maharashtra. It is time for them to consider why a separate State should not be carved out for the Konkaneese under the States Reorganisation Act. It was given to be understood that States should be carved out on the basis of language. And if the Konkaneese-speaking people want a separate State for themselves, it is not proper for this Parliament or the Government to deny that right to them.

Madam Deputy Chairman, we are all aware that a solemn promise was held out by the late Prime Minister that sufficient time should be given to the people of Goa to settle themselves and take a decision whether they should like to continue as a separate entity, in the Indian Union or they should merge with any one of the neighbouring States. That solemn promise today has been given a go-by. Because of pressure tactics the Central Government appears to have yielded to the pressure and has brought this Bill before this House. There are many Union territories today. There is Pondicherry. I know that the people of Pondicherry want to merge with Madras. But no such Bill has been brought forward.

They are taking it as a separate entity and treating it as a Union territory; there is no question of its merger with Madras.

Then in the case of a territory which is a bone of contention, it is being converted into a Union territory. You know, Madam Deputy Chairman, that there is a bone of contention for Chandigarh between Punjab and Haryana. To avoid that it has been converted into a Union territory. So there is no reason why this area, Goa, should not continue as a Union territory at least for a period of another ten years so that the people of Goa can take a dispassionate view of things and decide their future.

Madam Deputy Chairman, what is happening in Madras, if it is backed by the entire people of Madras, then we are doomed to balkanisation of this country and we will cease to be one Indian Union or one Indian nation. Each linguistic State behaves in a manner that it is a sovereign State, and the feelings between the people who speak the major language in that State and the other minorities are so estranged today that people have begun doubting whether we did a good thing in having the States on the basis of language. It is time to ponder over these things. It was only meant for administrative convenience that the State should be formed on the basis of language. But the way in which things are moving makes us shudder whether we should still stand by this principle.

Madam Deputy Chairman, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, who comes from Bombay, has narrated the incidents that have taken place in Bombay. Sometime back when there was water famine, one of the Corporators appears to have said that all non-Maharashtrians should be asked to quit Maharashtra. Some months back some non-Maharashtrian hotels and establishments were looted, and today the linguistic minorities in Bombay are afraid of their lives. There is

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

insecurity. I know it is some important men who have done this, who have tried to tarnish the name of Maharashtra. But it is there. It is, therefore, the responsibility not only of the Maharashtra Government but also of the Union Government to see that such things will not occur again. If what is repeated in Maharashtra is repeated in other States, then we would be quarrelling among ourselves and we will be an easy prey for any aggressor nation across the border to commit further aggression on India. Madam Deputy Chairman, it is therefore necessary that these feelings do not run high and the friendly relations that should exist between linguistic groups should not be disturbed.

Madam Deputy Chairman, it is unfair on the part of the Union Government to have brought forward this measure at this juncture without giving proper opportunities for the people of Goa to develop themselves and to take a decision after consultations whether they should like to continue as Union territory or to merge with one of the neighbouring States.

Madam Deputy Chairman, yesterday the Deputy Minister was telling us that Goans who are already residents of Goa but now for purposes of business have gone out of Goa and are staying in Bombay or some other provinces of India, they will be entitled to take part in this opinion poll. That is not enough. Some of them left Goa some years back and they have settled down in Bombay for business purposes. They have taken employment there to eke out their livelihood. I say . . .

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: Some have gone outside India. What about them?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Those who have gone out of India, if they have taken up the nationality

of the country where they are living, that question does not arise at all but if they have gone out of India on some business purpose, they should be free to exercise their franchise in this opinion poll but there might be one or two persons. That does not alter the situation at all.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): May I know whether Goa is a part of India or it is a different country? If it is one country, then those who are residing there must have the right to vote.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: If the hon. Mr. Dharia is so reasonable, I do not know why he is fighting so much for the merger of Goa with Maharashtra.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I am not fighting. It is for the people of Goa to fight.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: It is this sort of parochialism that is reasonable for the present state of affairs to-day. It will be improper and height of folly to deny this right to the thousands of Goans that are now living in Bombay to exercise their vote in this opinion poll. It is their fundamental right and when we concede that the people of Goa should decide the future of Goa, it will not be proper for the Government to deny that right to Goans living in Bombay and in other parts of India. Mr. Patel said that some of the Maharashtrians have gone and settled down in Goa. It is likely that most of them have gone there to influence the people of Goa in their favour, that is for the merger of Goa with Maharashtra. For this purpose if we include those who are now living in Goa, who are non-Goans, to exercise their votes, we will not be fair to the people of Goa. Goans who had registered their names in the electoral rolls before Goa was taken over by India in 1961 should alone be allowed to exercise their votes and such of those Maharashtrians who have gone there after 1961, if their

names are found in the electoral rolls, should not be allowed to exercise their votes in this opinion poll. If they are given that right, then the very purpose of this opinion poll will be defeated. Outsiders will be influencing the decision of the people of Goa. I therefore urge that what Mr. Patel said should be accepted that the Maharashtrians who have gone there and who have settled down in Goa after 1961 should not be allowed to exercise their votes and the people of Goa who are now living in Bombay should be allowed to register their names and registration offices should be opened in Bombay to register their names so that they can exercise their vote in this opinion poll.

Lastly,—and this is a very important thing—there should not be interference by the officers who are interested in one State or the other. There should not be any doubt about the impartiality of the officers conducting this poll. Any Maharashtrian officer that is now working in Goa or any Mysorean officer who is now working in Goa should not be asked or should not be entrusted with the work of the conduct of the opinion poll in Goa. Non-Maharashtrian or non-Mysorean officers should be entrusted with the task of conducting this poll and thus ensure that the people of Goa will exercise their free right in this poll. This Bill was hurried through and hustled through in the other House and therefore there is every justification for this House to consider this question in a dispassionate way and that can be done if this is referred to a Select Committee the motion for which was made by Mr. Patel.

1 P.M.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Madam, to my sorrow and surprise we as a nation, seem to have lost or are losing the power to distinguish between what is fundamental and primary in a situation and what is secondary. To my mind, the Goa Bill which is before us symbolises the attitude, the thinking, the

approach not only of this Government but also of all of us. I say this with great sorrow and pain. We are just raising this general question but whither are we going? Goa is very important, nobody denies. The wishes of the Goans are very important indeed. Likewise the wishes of other Centrally-administered territories are also important and there are problems and problems facing us but I ask, whether it is appropriate and timely to have a measure like this. I do not like to sound parochial and let me assure the House that I do not like to take a parochial view of things but I will be failing in my duty if I do not point out that we, as a nation, are slipping down and day by day we are exhibiting ourselves, proclaiming ourselves to the world. 'After all we are a small people and we are only interested in exercising our mind, energy and time in settling, in solving and finding solutions to parochial, small, local problems'. I say this because if there is any time which is most inappropriate and untimely, this is the time for such a measure and we are also introducing a very unprecedented and extraneous factor into the political life of this country. Never in the past, since independence, even at the time of independence, an opinion poll was taken. The partition of the country was not done on an opinion poll. The formation of Andhra was not done on the basis of an opinion poll. Subsequently the overall reorganisation of the States was not done on the basis of an opinion poll. All these major decisions were taken on the basis of political assessment and judgment after commissions, committees going through the various materials available at the time. This is the first time we are introducing an extraneous factor into the political life of the country. It may appear very democratic and very progressive indeed, but if you analyse the pros and cons of this issue, the step that we are taking, I feel that we are sowing a dangerous seed in the body politic, and this may be quoted or taken as

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.] a precedent to settle various other parochial issues. When we have already got plenty on hand, more such issues will crop up, and I think we will be encouraging such forces to demand settlement of these various parochial claims and counter-claims, and border disputes on the basis of an opinion poll. So on this ground I hold that it is a very wrong step, a politically unwise move that has been taken. Secondly, also the other House has debated that point, and I think there is a lot of strength in that point, namely, that we are doing something unconstitutional. There is nothing in the Constitution which says that opinion poll may be permissible to settle regional disputes, regional claims and counter-claims, and there is no place for an opinion poll at all in the Constitution. When the question of referendum and plebiscite was discussed, it was specifically ruled out; it was said that such a possibility should not be allowed to be there in the Constitution of India. opinion poll borders on this very aspect. I think even from that point of view it is constitutionally improper, constitutionally wrong to have resorted to this kind of means for deciding the future of Goa.

Surely, what are we doing today, and what is the situation we are confronted with? There are various forces operating in the country, which are not conducive for such a step. We have got enough problems, more important—I said—than this. The economic situation in the country is so grave and critical that it requires the total energy and attention of the entire nation, and the forces of disruption are operating everywhere. There are agitations, demonstrations and forces of obscurantism, and trends of reaction are everywhere coming to the fore. Is it the climate in which we should have a poll? Will there be a proper peaceful poll? Apart from the constitutional impropriety which can be taken up in a court of law, it may be questioned tomorrow by taking out a writ, and there might not be the poll at all. Apart from

this, I say that the atmosphere, the political, economic and social atmosphere, the climate in the land is not simply favourable for taking such an opinion poll in Goa. And what are we doing there? There is a section of Goans which is not reconciled to an opinion poll at all. It might be reconciled to an opinion poll in course of time; they might not object then. Granting that there should be a poll, there may be reconciliation by the Goans to the principle, but at the present moment there is a sizeable section in Goa which does not want an opinion poll at the present moment; they want at least a postponement of it for various reasons. Those friends who talked before me, the lady Member here, my friends there, have pointed out that there are misgivings, doubts in the minds of quite a sizeable section in Goa about the fairness, impartiality and objectivity of the coming poll, and the Bill, as it is, drafted, does not permit, does not allow all Goans to enlist themselves as Goans, and my friend, Mr. Vidyacharan Shukla, had a very painful duty to perform, and he has done it well. He tried to point out that facilities will be created for all Goans who are ordinarily resident in Goa to enlist themselves as voters. That is according to the Representation of the People Act. But may I point out that this is not going to be an ordinary poll? This is not a General Election. This is not an ordinary way of taking the people to the polls. This is something abnormal, unprecedented and never thought of before anywhere in India. Therefore, it is all the more necessary that all those people who are Goans, whether they are ordinarily resident there or not, if they are Goans, even if they are staying elsewhere, they must be allowed to register themselves as voters and to vote. What is the purpose behind all this. Of course I share the concern of the Home Ministry. They want to ensure impartiality and fairness in the poll. They want to allow as many people as possible to become voters in time. But with this overriding provision in

the Representation of the People Act it will be very difficult to bring in the large number of Goans who are resident outside. They suffer from a technical flaw of not being ordinarily resident there and of not being voters. It is not one thousand or two thousand; it may be more than fifty thousand; we do not know the correct figure. Whatever it may be, I think, in fairness to them, this provision should be waived in this case. Also the existing electoral roll has got to be screened, because I am told that a lot of irregularities has entered, that wrong names have been printed, and wrong addresses have been given, as a result of which the local polling officers, the presiding officers, whoever are there, will not be able to exercise their judgment fairly in favour of those people. Therefore, it is very necessary that the Bill has to be amended as radically as possible from this point of view, to allow the various elements who are resident outside Goa to participate in this poll if the poll is at all felt to be necessary, if the poll should be held at all.

Now there is another important aspect which has been touched on by various friends in both the Houses, that is, if the Bill is passed, if the Bill should be passed at all, then the poll may be held some time in future. I think there is validity in that statement. The Bill has been passed by the Lok Sabha, and if this Bill has to be passed at all here, then the amendment which I have suggested—there are other amendments too—may be incorporated in the Bill. If this Bill has to be passed at all, it may be passed with this understanding that at some future date the poll may be held. In the meantime all the various steps necessary to make the poll as fair as possible may be taken. I do not want to go into the details as to what should be taken and what should not be taken. Already these points have been covered. But I insist that we are taking a very unprecedented step that this is not an ordinary election.

Therefore all care has got to be exercised to see that there is no outside influence exercised on Goan voters in respect of their votes.

Lastly, Madam, I want to point out that option has been given to Goans in the Bill whether to merge with Maharashtra or remain as an independent territory in the Union. Even this, I think, is a wrong and dangerous thing. Suppose they decide against merger with Maharashtra. A time may come when they may not like to remain as a Union Territory, say after ten years. Does it mean that if 51 per cent of the people there decide not in favour of merger with Maharashtra, that for all time to come they will not have their opinion changed; that they will not be able to join either Maharashtra or Mysore, but remain independent of them? What is going to be the position? So this implication is there. I think the opinion poll, though it looks rosy, attractive, democratic and progressive, brings in it some elements of uncertainty. In case 51 per cent do not want to join any State now, they will be barred once and for all, on the ground that their opinion poll was taken, from joining any State in future. Therefore, from that point of view also, I feel that this is politically an unwise step that we are taking.

May I in the end say that the heavens will not fall if Goa remains as it is and joins later any one of the States. History will not change if Goa's position is not changed now. We would be doing a great act by postponing the issue because we would not only be honouring the pledged word of honour of the late Prime Minister, but we would also be appreciating the present position and the economic, social and political situation that is facing us. Otherwise we would be only exhibiting ourselves that we are a small people with little minds, nibbling at small issues, not caring for greater challenges which are around us. May I, therefore, appeal to the Home Minis-

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy]
try, though it is too late, to consider these various questions, ponder over these various issues and then exercise their cool judgment so that at least the opinion poll may be deferred and deferred to a very convenient date in the future.

Thank you very much.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश): आदरणीय उपसभापति जी, अभी सदन के सामने गोआ, दमन और दीव इनका विलय किस प्रकार और कहाँ से हो, इसके बारे में मत जानने के लिये सदन में बिल विचारार्थ प्रस्तुत हुआ है। बस कि बिल में बताया गया है और इसके सन्दर्भ में बहुत सी बातें पक्ष में और विपक्ष में कही गई हैं, उससे यह विदित होता है कि देश में कुछ शक्तियाँ अब भी ऐसी हैं जो यह चाहती हैं कि जिम तरह से देश में बहुत से इश्यूज बिना किसी निर्णय के पड़े हुये हैं उनमें एक और इसी प्रकार का इगू यह भी जोड़ दिया जाय। बास्तव में हमारी सरकार की यह धिलाई है और सरकार की यह परम्परा इन 19 वर्षों में रही है कि जितनी समस्याएँ उसके सामने आईं उन समस्याओं का कभी उसने समाधान नहीं किया, उन समस्याओं से किसी न किसी किनारे से बचकर, भाग कर खड़े होने में अपनी चतुराई समझती रही और यही कारण है कि इन 19 वर्षों में जो-जो, जब जब समस्याएँ आईं, उनका उसी समय निकाल नहीं किया गया। उसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि वे समस्याएँ आज भी ज्यों की त्यों खड़ी हैं और ज्यादा विकराल रूप में खड़ी हैं।

गोआ, दमन और दीव किसी समय भारतवर्ष के थे। बीच में बाहर के लोगों ने उन पर अपना आधिपत्य कर लिया और आधिपत्य करने के बाद अगर कुछ वर्षों तक वे दातता की येड़ियों में जकड़े रहे, तो उसका मतलब कभी भी यह नहीं समझा जाना चाहिये कि उनकी संस्कृति अलग हो गई। आज बहुत से मित्रों ने संस्कृति के बारे में भी बात की। पिछली लोक सभा में भी इसी

तरह की बातें उठाई गई थीं। हम समझते हैं कि गोआ, दमन और दीव भारत के उसी प्रकार के अंग हैं, जिस प्रकार कि उत्तर प्रदेश या केरल का प्रदेश या बंगाल का प्रदेश है और अपने देश में अलग-अलग प्रवृत्तियों को एक साथ समाप्त करना चाहिए। यह अलग रहने की जो प्रवृत्तियाँ हैं, वे देश के लिये सबसे ज्यादा खतरनाक हैं और उनसे देश की एकता के लिये बहुत भारी खतरा रहता है।

गोआ, दमन और दीव के बारे में हमारा इतिहास 1961 से प्रारम्भ होता है। 1961 के पहले इसे स्वतंत्र करने के लिये हमारे यहां के लोगों ने बहुत से आन्दोलन किए और बहुत से भाइयों को बड़ी बड़ी सजाएं भी हुईं। 1961 में एक बड़ा क्रांतिकारी पग उठाया गया और उस क्रांतिकारी पग के पश्चात् जब गोआ, दमन और दीव भारतीय शासन के अन्तर्गत लाए गए, तो उस समय कई लोगों ने कई प्रकार की इस प्रदेश के बारे में भविष्य प्रार्थनाएँ कीं। बहुत से लोग यह विचार करते थे कि गोआ, दमन और दीव को अलग स्वतंत्र रहना चाहिये। बहुत से ऐसा विचार करते थे कि चूंकि उनकी संस्कृति अलग है और पश्चिम की परम्परा वे अपनाते रहे हैं, इसलिए भारत-वर्ष में भी पश्चिमी परम्परा के अनुसार उनकी एक प्रवृत्ति रहना बिल्कुल आवश्यक और अटूट है। बहुत से लोग यह कहते थे कि वहां पर महाराष्ट्रियन भाषा बोनी जाती है और बोली जाती रही है और कोंकणी महाराष्ट्रियन का पूर्व स्वरूप है और इसलिये उन लोगों को जो महाराष्ट्र से सम्बन्धित हैं, महाराष्ट्र से मिलाया जाना चाहिये। बहुत से मित्रों को राय थी कि इसे मैसूर से लगे होने के कारण मैसूर में जाना चाहिये। उस समय से लेकर यह प्रश्न आज 6 वर्ष हो गये बराबर चला आ रहा है। बहुत से मित्रों ने यह कहा कि कोंकणी के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध मैसूर के हैं और कोंकणी एक अलग ही भाषा है। तो जिस तरह से भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना हुई, उसी प्रकार कोंकणी का

जो हिल का एरिया है, उसको लेकर एक अलग राज्य कर दिया जाय फिर इसके दो टुकड़े कर दिये जायें ।

गोआ, दमन और दीव की एक विशेष प्रकार की स्थिति है । हमारे देश के किनारों पर जितने भी प्रांत हैं, हमारी सीमाओं के पास के जितने भी प्रांत हैं, उनको छोटे-छोटे राज्य में बनाए रखना खतरनाक साबित होगा । उनको किसी न किसी तरह से बड़े प्रांतों के साथ रखना ठीक होगा । गोआ तो निश्चित रूप से महाराष्ट्र के साथ पड़ोसी के रूप में रहता आया है और अगर उसकी हिस्टरी देखी जाय, तो उसका पार्ट मालूम पड़ता है । दमन और दीव, गुजरात प्रांत में पड़ने के कारण उसकी भी एक अलग स्थिति है । हमारे योग्य मित्रों ने कुछ देर पहले यहां पर यह बताया था कि श्री जवाहरलाल जी नेहरू, जो उस समय यहां के बड़े नेता थे और प्रधान मंत्री थे, उन्होंने गोआ के सम्बन्ध में दो-चार बातें कहीं और उसमें उनके भाषण के कुछ अंशों को पढ़ कर बताया गया । एक स्थान पर जो उन्होंने एम्प्योरिस दिया था उसके बारे में उन्होंने यह कहा :—

"I would like to take this opportunity of stating once against some aspects of our basic approach in respect of Goa when it becomes a part of the Union."

और उसके सन्दर्भ में जो दूसरी बात हमारे योग्य मित्रों ने नहीं बतलाई, उसके सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि—

"As for instance, all cultural, social and lingual relations and the sense of a territorial grouping which history has created, will be respected. Laws and customs which are part of the social pattern of that area and which are consistent with fundamental human rights and freedoms, will be respected and modification will be sought only by negotiation and consent."

इसके पश्चात् जब वहां पर चुनाव हुआ । तो चुनाव में वहां पर गोमंतक पार्टी बनी,

उसके घोषणा पत्र का यह क्लियर आशय था कि गोआ को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया जाना चाहिए और गोमंतक पार्टी ने वहां पर विजय प्राप्त की ।

पंडित श्याम सुन्दर नारायण तण्डा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : बॉटिंग जो हुआ है वह ईश्यू पर नहीं हुआ है ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मेरे मित्र को सम्भवतः इसमें संदेह है, ईश्यू और भी बहुत से थे, लेकिन सब से बड़ा ईश्यू यह था कि गोमंतक पार्टी वाले अपने आपको महाराष्ट्र में विलय करना चाहते थे । इसी बीच यह बात बताई गई कि बहुत से आदमी गोवा के निवासियों पर प्रेशर डाल रहे हैं, वहां की सरकार के ऊपर प्रेशर डाल रहे हैं कि गोवा महाराष्ट्र में मिल जाय, इसलिये उनके कदम का स्वागत नहीं किया जाना चाहिये । वास्तव में बात यह है कि एक बार जब वहां चुनाव हुआ और चुनाव होने के बाद जो पार्टी थी, उस पार्टी ने तथा कांग्रेस की पार्टी ने बहुमत के आधार पर यह फैसला किया कि हमको महाराष्ट्र में ही विलीन कर दिया जाना चाहिये, तब भी भारत सरकार ने यह बात नहीं मानी । अब अगर इस समय मत जानने के लिये कहा जाता है, तो इसी तरह के भिन्न भिन्न मुद्दों पर भी हमारी सरकार मत क्यों नहीं लेती, इसमें हमें बड़ा आश्चर्य है । अगर मत लेने की परिपाटी ठीक है, तो हम समझते हैं कि इस समय देश में जो सबसे बड़ा आन्दोलन चल रहा है उसके बारे में, गो रक्षा आन्दोलन के बारे में भी जनता का मत क्यों न ले लिया जाय । अगर सरकार एक विषय पर एक बात को ठोक समझती है, तो उन्हां सरकारमस्टासेज में अन्य बातों को स्वीकार करने में क्यों हिचकिचाती है, यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता ।

इसी तरह से हमारे दूसरे मित्रों ने अभी अपने भिन्न-भिन्न प्रकार के विचार रखे

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

है। श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने भी प्रधान मंत्री के रूप में एक बार पहले कहा था :

"It will have to be decided by the people of Goa."

तो हम समझते हैं कि जो बिल अभी आया है इस बिल में यह गुंजाइश रखी है कि गोवा के लोग इस बात के ऊपर आपस में बैठ कर के निश्चय करें, मत के द्वारा अपनी मनोभावना का प्रदर्शन करें कि वह किस प्रकार रहना चाहते हैं, लेकिन जो लोग येन केन प्रकारेण किसी भी तरह से यह चाहते हैं कि इस ईशू को अधिक दिनों तक लटकाये रख कर उसको किसी राज्य में मिलने न दिया जाय और गोवा की स्थिति इसी प्रकार बहुत समय तक लटकने दी जाय वह बिल्कुल सही नहीं है और ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये।

अभी गोवा के बारे में छः महीने में दो तीन प्रकार की भावनाएँ देखने को मिली जो प्रतिक्रियावादी तत्व हैं, वे आज से छः महीने पहले चिल्लाते थे कि गोवा महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया जा रहा है। महाराष्ट्र के नेताओं और गोवा के मुख्य मंत्री का आपस में तालमेल बैठ गया है, इसलिये गोवा में मत-निर्वाचन होना चाहिये और दो महीनों में इन लोगों ने अपना रूप अब और बदल लिया है और 15 दिनों के बीच में कुछ गोवा वालों की तरफ से तीन चार पक्ष प्रकाशित किये गये हैं और बहुत से संसद् सदस्यों में बाँटे गये हैं और उसमें उन्होंने जोर शोर से यह अपील की है कि गोवा में किसी प्रकार से भी मत नहीं लिया जाना चाहिये। इस तरह जो प्रतिक्रियावादी तत्व हैं उनसे कभी घबड़ाना नहीं चाहिये। किसी प्रकार से गोवा के प्रश्न को लम्बे समय तक नहीं टालना चाहिये, जैसे कि और प्रश्नों को लम्बे समय तक टालते रहे हैं और उसका परिणाम यह आया

कि उन प्रश्नों से ज्यादा से ज्यादा हिन्दुस्तान का नुकसान हुआ, उस तरह से इस प्रश्न को भी बहुत देर तक लटकते रहने नहीं देना चाहिये और जिस प्रकार से बिल में बताया गया है, उस प्रकार से जल्दी से जल्दी मत क्रम के अनुसार वहाँ पर पोलस होना चाहिये और उनको इस बात का मौका देना चाहिये कि वह निर्णय करे कि किसके साथ मिलना चाहते हैं, महाराष्ट्र प्रान्त में या कन्नड़ प्रान्त में या किस में जाने के लिये उत्सुक है यह निर्णय करने का उनको जो अधिकार मिला है, उसका उपयोग होना चाहिये।

अब एक बात और भी मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि जहाँ तक इस बिल का प्रश्न है इस बिल की धारा 23 उपधारा 3 में लिखा हुआ है :

"No person shall vote at an opinion poll if he is confined to any prison, whether under a sentence of imprisonment or transportation or otherwise, or is in the lawful custody of the police:

Provided that nothing in this subsection shall apply to a person subjected to preventive detention under any law for the time being in force."

तो अगर कहीं पर कोई मामूली झगड़ा होता है और उस झगड़े के कारण वहाँ पर धारा 144 लगा दी जाती है और धोके से भी कोई आदमी अगर उसे तोड़ देता है, तो पुलिस उसे लाक-अप में, अपनी कस्टडी में ले लेती है, तो ऐसे लोगों को मतदान से क्यों वंचित रखा जाय इसका कोई भी कारण नहीं बताया गया है ? जब प्रिवेंटिव डिटेंशन एक्ट के अन्तर्गत जो व्यक्ति नजरबन्द है उनको भी मतदान से वंचित नहीं किया गया, तो जो लोग पुलिस की लाफुल कस्टडी में हैं, उनको मतदान से क्यों वंचित रखा जाता है, इसके बारे में भूमिका के रूप में हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया था

उसमें भी बिलकुल नहीं बताया? हम समझते हैं कि इसका आशय बिलकुल स्पष्ट होना चाहिये और ऐसे लोगों को भी जो कि पुलिस कस्टडी में है, मतदान में भाग लेने देना चाहिये। यह बात सही है कि गोवा के बाहर के लोग चाहे वह हिन्दुस्तान के किसी भी प्रान्त में रहते हों, वहां रहते हुए भी गोवा में बारम्बार जा जा कर वहां के मतदान में भाग लेने की कोशिश करेंगे और तरह तरह के आवेजेशन बतायेंगे। लेकिन जिस प्रकार से हम बम्बई में रहते हैं और हमें मतदान करने का अधिकार मध्य प्रदेश में है। तो अगर बम्बई में कभी मतदान का अवसर हो, तो उसमें अइंग्लैंड की करने का हमें अधिकार नहीं है, उसी तरह से गोवा से बाहर जो तीन तीन, चार चार पीढ़ियों से रहे हैं, उनको भी मतदान के सम्बन्ध में अधिकार नहीं मिलना चाहिये।

अंत में मेरा निवेदन है कि जो बिल लाया गया है, वह यद्यपि बहुत देर से प्रस्तुत किया गया है, तब भी उसका परिणाम निकलेगा, इसमें हमें किसी प्रकार का संदेह नहीं है। धन्यवाद।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, मैं इस बिल को सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भेजने के पक्ष में हूं। लेकिन उन कारणों से तो नहीं, जिन कारणों से श्री डा. ह्याभाई गेटेल ने यहां पर उसका प्रस्ताव किया है। मैं चाहता था कि गोवा दमन एंड ड्यू (ओपीनियन पोल) बिल के बजाय हमारे सामने सिर्फ ओपीनियन पोल बिल 1966 आया होना और न सिर्फ गोवा दामन ड्यू में ओपीनियन लिया जाता, बल्कि सारे देश में ऐसी मशीनरी की जाती, जिससे कि हर बड़े मसले पर हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों की ओपीनियन ली जाती; क्योंकि आज किसी मसले पर अगर सरकार अपनी असमर्थता की वजह से इस तरह का एक बिल हमारे सामने लाती है और कहने लगती है कि गोवा दामन ड्यू का ओपीनियन

लेंगे, मत लेंगे, तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हिन्दुस्तान भर में जो बड़े-बड़े मसले हैं, उन सब पर भी क्यों नहीं मत लिया जाता। जैसा कि हमारे एक आदरणीय मेम्बर ने कहा, गो रक्षा के बारे में जो अभियान चल रहा है, उसके बारे में भी मत हो जाता, तो यहां पर यह मंत्र प्रदर्शन बगैरह नहीं हुआ होता, उसी ढंग से और भी बड़े-बड़े मसले हैं, जैसे कि हिन्दुस्तान के कारखानों का नेशनलाइजेशन का मामला है या हिन्दुस्तान में जिस ढंग की अर्थ व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये, उस मसले पर भी हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों का मत लिया जाता तो जो बड़े-बड़े मसले हिन्दुस्तान के सामने हैं, उन सबके बारे में भी लोगों की राय जानने का काम होता और तब जा कर मिनिस्टर लोग आ कर यह कहते कि हम लोग बंद न करें या यहां पर प्रदर्शन न करें। तो फिर कोई तत्व की बात भी होती। इस ढंग से कोई मसला हल करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। लेकिन गोवा के मसले पर चूंकि आपकी असमर्थता वहां पर प्रकट हो गई है। यहां पर ला कर एक बिल सामने रख दिया और वह भी तब जब कि लोक सभा का सेशन खत्म होने वाला था और राज्य सभा का सेशन दो दिन रह गया है। अभी हमारे सामने एक बिल ला कर रखा गया और कहते हो कि पास हो। अब सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भी जायेगा, तो सेलेक्ट कमेटी कब काम करेगी और कब रिपोर्ट देगी, इसकी कोई गुंजाइश नहीं रखी गई है, तो मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि इस ढंग का एक ओपीनियन पोल बिल रख कर कि इस हाउस को और दूसरे पदन को क्यों वापस किया कि इस बिल को पास करो; क्योंकि सेलेक्ट कमेटी में रखने की कोई गुंजाइश रही नहीं और जो पास हुआ होने वाला है उसके उपरान्त ही डा. तरह से हो सकेगा, जिसकी कोई गुंजाइश रही नहीं और मैं तो चाहूंगा कि इससे अभी भी सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भेज दिया जाय और जल्दतर पड़े, तो एक स्पेशल सेशन बोलो और ऊपर डिस्कशन हो जाय, तो...

[श्री गोडे मन्. रि.]

तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा, जब आन्ध्र प्रदेश में आन्ध्र के निर्माण के बारे में पोर्टू श्रीरामूलू का वहां पर अनशन हुआ था, उस वक्त क्यों नहीं कोई 'ओपीनियन पोल' लिया गया और उसके बाद जब महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात का मामला था, तो उस वक्त क्यों नहीं कोई ओपीनियन पोल लिया गया, कई सौ आदमी मारे गये, गोलीकांड हुआ, जगह जगह पर पुलिस की गोली चली, इन सब चीजों को होने दिया और बाद में वहां आन्ध्र प्रदेश का, महाराष्ट्र का और गुजरात का अलग अलग राज्य कायम किया गया।

गोवा के बारे में भी मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि चौदह साल गोवा के प्रश्न को आपने लटकाये रखा और पिछले आम चुनावों में असर डालने के लिये हमारी सेना को गोवा के अन्दर भेजा गया। चौदह साल तक उसको लटकाने का क्या मतलब था? हिन्दुस्तान का कई करोड़ रुपया उस पर खर्च किया गया, इन चौदह सालों में उसके बारे में कोई कार्यवाही हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की ओर से नहीं हुई और गोवा के इतिहास को आप जान लें। वहां पर जो आजादी की लड़ाई चली, वह बहुत पुरानी लड़ाई है और जब हिन्दुस्तान में सन् 1942 का आंदोलन हो गया और हिन्दुस्तान को आजादी मिलने का कोई कदम उठा, तो उस वक्त डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया वहां गये, उनकी गिरफ्तारी हुई, उस वक्त भी सरकार चुप रही और सिर्फ महात्मा गांधी ने उस वक्त ऐलान किया कि जब तक डा० लोहिया जेल में अंदर है, आंदोलन करता रहूंगा। उसके बाद जो कुछ हुआ है, गोवा में वह सबको मालूम है और गोवा में जब हमारी सेना गई, तो वहां सबसे ज्यादा नारा यह सुना गया "डाक्टर लोहिया जिन्दावाद"। लेकिन इतिहास को भुलाने के लिये जैसा कल हमने कहा फिल्में बनाई जाती हैं, उसमें सारे इतिहास को धोया

जाता है। खैर यह तो बात हमने वैसे ही कह दी इसके सम्बन्ध में, लेकिन इस बिल के जो प्राविजन हैं उनको अगर देखा जाय तो हर एक प्राविजन, सेल्फ कान्ट्रेडिक्टरी है। मैं नहीं जानता कि इस ढंग के बिल को हम क्यों कर पास करें। एक जगह कहते हैं कि जो त्रिबेचल, डिन्टेशन में होगा, उसको बोट मिल सकता है दूसरी जगह कहते हैं :

"No person shall vote if he is subject to any of the disqualifications referred to in section 16. . ."

फिर कहते हैं कि कोई भी आदमी, कोई भी परसन हो, चाहे उसका गुनाह कुछ भी हो, उस आदमी को वहां वोट देने का अधिकार नहीं होगा। तो धारा 144 तोड़ कर कोई आदमी जेल चला जाता है, उसका कान्विक्शन एक हफ्ते के लिये हो जाता है; क्योंकि वहां कोई प्रदर्शन होता है या मीटिंग होती है, इसी ओपीनियन पोल के ही सम्बन्ध में तो फिर उस आदमी को जेल में रखा जायगा—तो क्या उसको कोई अधिकार नहीं होगा, वोट देने का?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

साथ साथ मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जो असेम्बली और पार्लियामेंट के इलेक्शनों में वोट देते हैं सिर्फ उन्हीं को क्यों अधिकार है इस ओपीनियन पोल में भाग लेने का? मैं तो चाहूंगा जितने भी लोग गोवा में हैं, वहां बसे हैं और जिनकी नामशु तरी गोवा में हुई है, रेगुलर में, उन सबको उसमें भाग लेने का अधिकार होना चाहिये। जब ओपीनियन ही लेनी है, तो गोवा में जितने लोग हैं, जो 18 साल से ऊपर के हैं, सबको अधिकार होना चाहिये कि ओपीनियन पोल में भाग ले सकें। लेकिन यहां पर जैसे पुराने ढंग की बात इलेक्शन में चली है, जो असेम्बली और लोक सभा के लिये वोट देते हैं, सिर्फ उनको वोट देने का अधिकार

दिया गया है। इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा कि इस बिल को सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भेज कर इसको ठीक-ठाक करें और उसमें गोवा दमन और ड्यू का प्रश्न सारे देश के सामने पोल ओपीनियन के लिये आ जाय, तो अच्छा होगा। देश के लिये कल्याणकारी होगा। दमन और ड्यू के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर पोल लेने की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। दमन और ड्यू को एक अलग एन्टीटी बना कर रखने में क्या दिक्कत है ? अगर आप चाहते हैं कि गोवा को महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया जाय, दमन और ड्यू को गुजरात में मिलाया जाय तो दमन और ड्यू को कम से कम सीधा मिला दें, वहाँ ओपीनियन पोल की गुंजायश क्या है ? छोटी सी एक चीज है। वहाँ पर एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन ठीक से नहीं चल पायेगा, वहाँ का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन इस पोल में मिला दिये हैं। तो मैं चाहूंगा इस सारे बिल के बारे में ठीक-ठाक ढंग से कोई विचार हो और वह सेलेक्ट कमेटी में ही हो सकता है। इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा, इन बिल को सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भेज दिया जाय।

एक चीज अंत में मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान भर में जो मत लेने की मशीनरी के लिये हमने मांग की है, उसके बारे में सेलेक्ट कमेटी में इस बिल में तबदीली करके यह बिल सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लिये लागू हो। ऐसा कोई बिल बने। तब कोई चीज बन सकती है वरना इस तरह का बिल हमारे सामने लाने से कोई फायदा होने वाला नहीं है और मैं नहीं समझता हमको इस बिल को इस रूप में पास करना चाहिये।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, before I speak on the Bill itself, I would like to clarify some points which have strained my mind, particularly the remarks made by my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, regarding the looting of shops of South

Indians and all that in the city of Bombay. It has disturbed me. I would like to make it very clear and I know the feelings in Maharashtra as much as anyone else. Some minor incidents might have taken place, but to say, after such incidents have taken place, that in the whole of Maharashtra the people have started looting those who have come from other States will neither be fair nor proper. I can say today that in the city of Bombay and in several other cities of Maharashtra there are persons who have come from various States of this country. It is not as if those who speak Marathi only are Maharashtrians. I would like to assure this House that those who have come and settled in Maharashtra are Maharashtrians. They may be carrying on some profession. They may be in service. They are all Maharashtrians. Those who belong to India are all Maharashtrians. We are all Indians. Some minor incidents might have taken place. I would like to say that such acts are condemnable. I do hereby condemn it. The Chief Minister has also condemned it. The then Defence Minister and now the Home Minister has also condemned it in very categorical terms that this cannot be the approach towards our own brothers and sisters. I would also like to make it clear that this charge and allegation that Maharashtra and its leadership is parochial has come to my ears on several occasions. I would like to make it clear today that there are some problems being faced by Maharashtra. There was the problem of creating Maharashtra on the linguistic basis. That was a pledge given to the country by the All India Congress Committee right from 1926 or 1930 onwards and of the people of Maharashtra made that demand, to say that they are parochial, will not be right. When it was created as a bilingual State, again some agitation was there, not only in Maharashtra but also in the Gujarat area and so it was bifurcated. The States of Gujarat and Maharashtra were

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

created. The order areas were not settled according to some principles. There was some dispute between Andhra and Madras and it was settled according to the Pataskar Award. No such award was possible and again there was some agitation. In case an agitation is made and a very legitimate demand is made to say that the State is parochial or the State's leadership is parochial will not be correct.

So far as Goa is concerned, it should be merged in Maharashtra, not because it is the claim of Maharashtra, but because it is the claim of the people of Goa itself. It was in the election of 1964 it happened, if you look at the result. I will not take much of the time of the House by going through all those things that happened then, but I can say that the Maharashtra Gomantak Party secured 44 per cent of the votes. It was the Congress which secured 16 per cent of the votes. In the manifesto itself the Congress Party had made it absolutely clear, whether Goa should be merged in the adjoining State of Maharashtra or whether it should be a separate Union territory, would be decided according to the desires of the people of Goa. At that time I had gone to Goa, because I was instructed by the AICC and because I was invited by the Pradesh Congress Committee of Goa. It was against my desire, but because the order of my Party was there I was in Goa at the time of the election. I can say that at that time several prominent Congress workers were on the verge of leaving the Congress. We requested them: Please do not go out of the Congress Party. Out of 28 members of the PCC, 22 members were absolutely of the view that Goa should be immediately merged in Maharashtra. They brought forward a motion of no confidence against Mr. Kakotkar, the President of the Goa PCC, I would say against the AICC. I am

stating these facts because the majority of the Congress in Goa and its leadership in Goa, is in favour of merging Goa in Maharashtra and those votes which were cast for the leaders of the Congress shall have to be counted as if they were in favour of Maharashtra. Besides, some independents have also secured the votes who have categorically stated in their own manifesto to the electorate that they are in favour of merging Goa with Maharashtra. If we count those votes, we find that nearly 60 per cent or more were then polled by the people for the merger of Goa in Maharashtra. So, to be frank, having regard to the results of the elections, Goa should have been merged with Maharashtra long ago. Besides, the Assembly of the Goa Union Territory has also passed a resolution stating therein that the territory of Goa should be merged in the adjoining State of Maharashtra and Daman and Diu should be merged in the adjoining State of Gujarat. When it has been made absolutely clear by the people of Goa, there was no need at all of having a sort of opinion poll Bill. Unfortunately it was not possible for us to convince the Central leadership and therefore it was decided that we should again go through it, because ultimately in democracy it is not your desire or my desire that counts; it is the desire of the people at large that will have to be respected. What I as a Maharashtrian would urge is not that it should be immediately merged, but I say that the desire of the people of Goa should be respected, and as per my information the desire is that it should be merged in the adjoining State of Maharashtra.

Again other allegations are being made. I can say today that out of 10,000 officers who are working in Goa, hardly 300 are from Maharashtra.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, he is on a very interesting point. His time will not

be taken. He gave us some calculation regarding the pro-merger opinion in Goa by adding 44 per cent with 16 per cent or something like that. All opinion that went against Goa staying out of Maharashtra was taken together. Do you follow the point?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I would not like you to make a speech. If you want some clarification, you can ask.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I want to make the point intelligible to him so that he can reply to it. In the case of the last election results in the country the opinion expressed in the country was 56 per cent against the Congress.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): We are dealing with Goa.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He is the General Secretary of the Maharashtra Congress Committee. That is why, as one of the office-bearers of the Congress Party, I will put to him this question. If a particular argument holds good when it favours Mr. Dharia, will it also hold good when it favours me? The 56 per cent opinion expressed in the country against the Congress should have been respected by Mr. Dharia if he wants us to respect an opinion expressed during the last election that suits his purpose.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I am coming to it. I have no objection to it. When I say that the Ministry formed in Goa belonged to the Maharashtra Gomatank Party, in that case Mr. Misra is supporting my argument that a popular Ministry was there in Goa, that the party in power in Goa have passed a resolution for its merger; then what is the need of all this new Act? He is supporting my contention and besides that I am going a point further and say—leave aside that there was a Ministry and that a resolution has been passed—if we take

into consideration the votes, they were again in favour of the merger of Goa. That supports my argument, and I am sure Mr. Misra will agree with me.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In the entire country of India the Congress has only got 44 per cent votes.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: To that my reply would be that we have adopted a Constitution; we have our own rules and regulations. It is according to the Constitution that people cast their votes. Unfortunately even if the votes are less than 50 per cent, a Ministry is possible. It is for the opposition parties to consider, and if they want all these 60 per cent votes should be jointly polled together, they can have their way. The other day I told Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that there was a difference between Left and Right, what can we do? Even if we look at Goa, what do we find? We find that the Konkani language is the dialect of the Marathi language.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Question.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: It may be a question from Mr. Reddy. When there is not a single Kannada-speaking man in Goa, our hon. Chief Minister of Mysore has been making a claim on the territory.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I will quote chapter and verse...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Reddy, you will have your chance.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: It is most unfortunate that it was the Chief Minister of Mysore State who said that a poll should be taken, and when this leadership has according to his desire taken that decision of the poll, now to say that this poll should not be taken just now but should be postponed—there are some other reasons for it; they are not fair. The

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

minds of the people in Goa are definitely agitated and if we want to respect the desire of the people, in democracy it is the only way out. We have experienced on several occasions that whenever we have not respected the desire of the people, the people have revolted against us. We do not want to repeat that thing in Goa, and particularly in Goa I would like to urge today that we do not want to create a second Nagaland in this country. We know that there is an element in the United Goan Party for whom it is not Delhi but Lisbon which is nearer. They are having a feeling that they should have ties with Lisbon and not Delhi. When Goa was liberated, there were some people, anti-national elements in Goa who were not at all happy. On the contrary they were crying because Goa was liberated. That sort of elements are now mischievously trying for a separate Goa, for a separate Union territory. Those elements should not be encouraged by anybody.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: On a point of order. We are now discussing the Goa Opinion Poll Bill. I never expected that the hon. Member, Mr. Dharia, would refer to a particular party in Goa to be pro-Lisbon to prejudice their case.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is one of his arguments.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: He is again misinterpreting. I said there is some element in that party. I did not say the whole of that party. It should not be misinterpreted. You can refer to the records. I say that there is some element in that party. Mr. Misra should have taken care to note that. I am conscious; at least while I am advancing my arguments, I am conscious. He should know that. I am referring that this sort of element should not be at all encouraged. That will be the element which will help again to have that sort of atmosphere in Goa which we are facing today in

Nagaland. I am not prepared to withdraw from that argument.

So far as the small Union territories are concerned, I feel that the time has come in the history of our country to take some firm decisions. Let us decide their future according to the desire of the people from those areas. There is no other option. But to say that Pondicherry should be a separate State, why? Why should these small territories be separate States?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Send it to the Select Committee. Everything can be covered.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: My contention is that these small territories should not be allowed to function separately as far as possible, and as early as possible we should take care to see that they are merged in the adjoining territories or States. Then, Sir, I would like to come to the other point which has been advanced here, the point regarding the percentage of the votes. Now, it has been stated by my colleagues, Shrimati Lalitha Rajagopalan and others, that if only 75 per cent of the votes are cast in favour of merger, then alone should it be merged. Why should it not be otherwise? (Interruptions) I can understand it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruptions.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: It was her argument. Is it not my duty to meet the argument of my colleague? So, my submission is...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Let the Congress Members iron out their differences in the Congress so that we can have the debate calmly.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: The argument that was advanced was that 75 per cent votes are necessary for merger with the adjoining territory of Maharashtra. It is not a fair argument. If I may quote one illustration of the North West Frontier Province, it was by 1½ votes that we lost

that State at that time, which you will recollect. There are instances in history. Besides, in a democracy, when we have to ascertain the desire of the people, if it is more than 50 per cent it shall have to be stated that they have voted accordingly. How can we put that bar? That means that there should be no merger and there should be no respect for the desire of the people and that sort of bar should not be there.

Now, one more argument advanced is that it should be postponed till after the elections are over. There is no need for such a postponement. A lot of time has been given to the people of Goa to consider their own future. Sir, on the contrary, they are demanding, they are insisting, that this decision should be immediately taken. This delay itself is too much. It should not have taken so much of time and the matter should not be delayed any further. I entirely agree with the hon. Deputy Minister that as has been planned by the Government, the Government should go ahead and I am here to support the Government.

Again, another argument advanced is that the people of Goa should be given more opportunities for their own development. Whether the people belong to this particular territory, this State or that State, is immaterial in this country of ours; we have to assure the people at large that they shall have enough scope for their own development. And if I may make a reference to Goa, fortunately, the position in Goa is not so bad. If we refer to the *per capita* income, we find that when in India the *per capita* income is to the tune of Rs. 350, in Goa it is more than Rs. 550. That is the state of affairs there. It should not be the impression here that Goa is just a State or a small territory which is lagging far behind.

I would like to bring to your kind notice one more aspect and that is regarding this feeling. If this is allowed to the saturation point, again there

1349 RS—6.

will be a lot of complications. It will be inevitable. In order to avoid these complications again, it is much better that the issues are solved in time. By solving these issues in time, it will be possible for us in this country to create that atmosphere of integrity and solidarity which we need. Unfortunately, we do not adhere to some principles in solving disputes between two or three States, we do not adhere to these principles in solving the problems of the distribution of waters and we are treated as if we are children. But I may tell this House that when the average irrigation potential of this country of ours is 23 per cent the average irrigation in Maharashtra is 6 per cent. The Godavari, the Krishna, the Koyna, all these rivers flow through Maharashtra and the people there feel that in spite of the water flowing before their own eyes, there is no irrigation. And in this connection . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That is irrelevant.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: If a demand is made in this context that there should be more irrigation and more water should be made available, that genuineness of the demand, that demand for justice, is not taken into consideration but that is termed as if it is a parochial demand, as if people are making some aggressive allegations and demands. It is just cast aside. I would appeal to the House that whenever these allegations are made, let us be reasonable. I would like to assure this House that Maharashtra has never remained parochial. It never wants to be parochial. It has always remained on the forefront of the country and it shall not lag behind in making sacrifices. In this context, this would be my request to my friends, to take into consideration the feelings of the Maharashtrians.

I support this Bill and I would also like to request this House that it should support the Bill. I can assure them that if there is the merger of

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

Goa with the territory of Maharashtra, there will not be any injustice done, whether the individual belongs to this religion or to that religion. That I can say with authority. It is the treatment of Maharashtra, and it shall be the treatment of Maharashtra.

Thank you very much.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): It was quite interesting to hear the speech of Mr. Dharia wherein he tried to make a point that if the Congress has got only 16 per cent of the votes, that itself will clinch the issue as far as the question of the merger of Goa with Maharashtra or otherwise is concerned. Now, I say that it was interesting to hear that because, as an hon. Member made an interpellation in the course of his arguments, he is really interested in drawing the benefit for himself as far as the question of Goa is concerned.

I think the Opposition parties throughout India may claim that benefit inasmuch as it is quite clear that the Congress is ruling throughout India with only 44 per cent of votes. Well what is sauce for the gander should also be sauce for the goose. If Mr. Dharia thinks that in the question of Goa, the question of the very fact of the Congress having received less than 16 per cent of votes will clinch the issue of merger, then I should say that as far as the all India question of democracy is concerned, that question has already been clinched by the very fact of only 44 per cent of votes having been secured by the Congress, and yet the Congress is ruling over us like an octopus. Apart from that, I, of course....

AN HON. MEMBER: You have that misfortune.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I really was willing to compliment Mr. Dharia on this new light which fell from him. But I do not know how

the light came to him. In the course of his arguments, he said that he had to obey the mandate of the party. Perhaps darkness prevailed over his light which seemed to have enlightened him at the

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Party darkness.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: The darkness was momentarily off, which we saw in his references. Apart from that, I do not really understand one point made by Mr. Dharia. It is this. He said that when the question of merger has already been settled, there is no question at all of taking an opinion of this question whether Goa will form into another State or not. On this very question, I am very definite that Mr. Dharia is not correct. As far as Goa is concerned, it is quite clear that Goa has been maintaining a separate existence under imperialist rule for 400 years or for more than 400 years. Because of that separate existence though under an imperialist domination, Goa has evolved an entity of its own; Goa has evolved an existence of its own, and as a matter of fact, for that reason, it is not correct to say the Goanese and the Maharashtrians there are necessarily, culturally or ethnically the same population. As a matter of fact, if we look at the facts, we have to admit that in Goa the principal language spoken is Konkani. It is not exactly Maharashtrian. If that is so, I don't think why there should not have been an opinion poll also on this question whether the people of Goa should choose the form of a separate State. Really, I have given an amendment also on this question. You are giving a chance to the people of Goa to express their opinion only on two questions, whether they will merge in the adjoining State or whether they will continue to be a Union territory. Now, I do not understand why actually the other opinion also was not placed before them for the purpose of their own determination whether

they are ready or willing to form a separate State within the Indian Union. Now it may be said that Goa is a small territory and, therefore, it cannot be a viable State. But I think that is not the position taken by any of the persons who have spoken on Goa, and I think that may not be the position which may be taken also by the Congress Government, the Government which rules either in Maharashtra or in the Centre.

2 P.M.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Andaman is also a small territory. Why should it not be merged with West Bengal?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruptions, please.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, therefore I was stating that as far as Goa is concerned, the Goanese, with their cultural entity, with their own linguistic homogeneity should be given an option and a chance to express their opinion on this question also, namely, whether they want to form a separate State or not. Even Mr. Dharia said that Goa is not so backward as we may think it to be. The *per capita* income according to Mr. Dharia, is Rs. 550 or more. If that is so, then I should say that Goa should be a viable State if it is allowed to form a separate State.

Now, of course, it is true that as far as the present Bill is concerned, two options have been given for the people of Goa to express their opinion on, namely, whether they will merge in Maharashtra or whether they will form a Union Territory of their own. Now, I was submitting to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that to allow the people of a country only the choice of forming a Union Territory is a lame choice given to them because, as you know, Sir, as far as Union Territories are concerned, they have no power. The Union Territory Assembly is not so powerful. It has

not got that plenitude of power as the State Assembly has got. Now for other reasons also a Union Territory Assembly has not got that legislative competence which a State Legislature has. I was submitting that because of these reasons the power of a Union Territory, the scope of development for a Union Territory, is much more restricted than the scope of development for a State within the meaning of the definition given to "State" in the Constitution. Therefore, I say, why should the people of Goa be restrained and prevented from expressing an opinion on this question whether they will form a separate State or not? I may submit that this is a way of merely stultifying public opinion in Goa, Daman and Diu and therefore, I was submitting to the hon'ble Minister this for his special and particular consideration. And I am submitting emphatically that he should accept the amendment submitted by me in this House wherein I have submitted that there should be a choice given to the people of Goa to express their opinion on whether they should form a new State within the framework of the Indian Constitution, because unless we give that choice also we really do not give all the possible choice to the people of Goa and we will be really preventing the people of Goa from expressing their opinion in an unrestricted manner and in a free manner.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to raise another question. It is this that Goa has been freed not by a particular party. Actually all parties, all shades of patriotic opinion in the territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, were in the freedom struggle against the Portuguese, and it cannot be said that the credit for the freedom struggle should go only to the Congress Party. It cannot be said also that the credit for the freedom struggle should go to anyone or some individual party. If that is so, then it should be taken as assured that all the people of Goa, all the political parties of Goa, are

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee.]
given a proper chance to have their say in the opinion poll in Goa.

Now, I want to place before you, Sir, a very important question which is agitating the minds of the people of Goa. Of course, the gentleman is not a Goan but he is a Maharashtrian. But still he is as much a citizen of Goa as anybody else. I am referring to one of the heroes of the liberation struggle, Shri Mahan Ranade, who is still languishing in the Portuguese prison. He has been in the prison. In 1964—I may be mistaken about the date—there was an exchange of prisoners between Portugal and the Union of India. We do not understand why Mr. Mahan Ranade was left out when the exchange of prisoners was concluded between Portugal and the Union of India. Is it because that hero of the freedom struggle organised a guerilla struggle against the Portuguese in Nagar Haveli and Dadra? Is it because Shri Mahan Ranade was not wedded to the principle of non-violence and resorted to violence in order to drive the Portuguese out, is it because Shri Mahan Ranade did not believe in the soft words spoken, for example, by Mr. Jairamdas Daulatram to submit patiently to tyranny that he was not exchanged while there was exchange of prisoners between the two country? Shri Mahan Ranade took a rifle himself and went ahead against the Portuguese and freed Nagar Haveli and Dadra from the clutches of the Portuguese rule. Is it because Shri Mahan Ranade organised an armed resistance movement inside Goa to drive out the Portuguese that he was not exchanged? Is it because that does not tally with the so-called non-violence theories of the Congress that the Congress Government was afraid of getting him exchanged and getting Shri Mahan Ranade freed from the Portuguese prison? Now, Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will submit that the very lack of inactivity on the part of the Indian Government in getting Shri Mahan Ranade freed from the Portuguese prison establishes the mala

fides on the part of the Congress Government for this reason that Shri Mahan Ranade cannot be got freed by the Congress Government because the Congress Government thinks that the moment Shri Mahan Ranade is freed Mahan Ranade will not toe the line of the Congress, will not toe the line of the capitalists but will lift the standard of revolt against oppression, will lift the standard of revolt against tyranny. Perhaps also Mahan Ranade is not being freed by India, or I should say, perhaps the Indian Government is not taking any steps to have him freed from the Portuguese prison because the Indian Government feels that if Mahan Ranade comes out, then all this talk about non-violent struggle and success for non-violence will melt away and will be exploded by him, because wherever people have been freed either from economic or capitalist tyranny or from imperialist tyranny, it is not due to non-violence, it has been due to violent upheaval of the people against the imperialist rule. Whatever may be said by the Congress people on the other side, in whatever way history may be tarnished and distorted, it is true that our independence was won not by some Congress leaders sitting at the same table with Lord Mountbatten but because of the Royal Indian Navy leading the revolt, because of the mutiny of the troops throughout India, because of the Indian National Army revolt, because of the Indian people, inspired by the Indian National Army, taking to arms for the purpose of driving out the imperialists.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Excluding the Communists.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: That is why the British Government went out, and had to go out. It is not because like sheep and goats we were beaten by lathis, but because of all that I described that the British Government went.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, you remember when the Indian Independence Act was being debated in the House of Commons . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): We are discussing Goa now.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I am only submitting this because one of the heroes of the struggle against the Portuguese rule is not being released and yet an opinion poll is being taken in Goa. The opinion poll is being taken in Goa by putting patriots behind the bars. There are many other prisoners. I am only referring to one person. But there are several persons even now languishing in the Portuguese jails only because they rose against the Portuguese rule. I was referring to the debate in the House of Commons when the Indian Independence Act was being debated there and Mr. Atlee at that time, in reply to a question from one of the Members of the House of Commons said: 'I have no option but to grant independence to India because I find the ship of British rule is like a ship on fire in the Indian Ocean and if I do not quench the fire now by arranging a compromise with the Congress leaders, then the main engine room will catch fire and the entire ship will be burnt out. When we can save half of it, why not allow us to save half.' and they have saved half by coming to a deal with some of the Congress leaders across the table because the Congress leaders suppressed the independent struggle in India and thereby entered into a compromise with the British Government so that British interests will be continued here in India. That is the reason why they are not taking steps to have Mr. Ranade out of the Portuguese jail. When they come forward with a Bill of this kind saying that an Opinion Poll will be taken on the question whether Goa merge with Maharashtra or it will be a Union Territory, I submit that the Congress ruling party is coming with this Bill almost presenting itself as a Christian lamb, as if they submit it to public opinion or they respect public opinion. Even Mr. Dharma has said that the Congress Government does not respect public opinion. With only 16 per cent of the votes they are

carrying on but if you want to have a real Opinion Poll in Goa, then you must give them the choice of expressing an opinion on all the issues which are relevant for this purpose. That issue is whether Goa should form a separate State and that should also be there. I say that this Opinion Poll would be of no use whatsoever unless the patriots get released from the Portuguese jails, unless the political parties are allowed a free play within Goa, unless the Congress ceases to appropriate to itself by any means whatsoever by putting people inside jails and by suppressing facts, distorting truth and by creating all kinds of malicious propaganda, unless the Congress ceases to appropriate to itself, the fruits of the victory of the liberation struggle of Goa.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, soon after the Union Government took over the administration of Goa, Daman and Diu from the Portuguese, our late lamented leader and our former Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, gave a definite assurance to the people of Goa that their separate laws, customs and culture will be preserved and their territories will not be merged or amalgamated with any State of the Indian Union to their detriment within a period of at least the next ten years. As such it surprises me that the Government should have chosen to bring this Bill at this stage for obtaining the views of the people of Goa, Daman and Diu as to whether the people would desire to merge with the State of Maharashtra or would prefer their territory to continue as a Union Territory. Likewise the people of Daman and Diu are required to express their opinion as to whether they would like to merge with the State of Gujarat or their territory should remain as a Union Territory. I fully realise that in asking the people to express their opinion whether they would like to merge with Maharashtra or would prefer the continuance of their territory as a Union Territory the Government has not exercised any undue pressure on them regarding the ex-

[Pandit S. S. N. Tankha.]
 pression of their opinion but had left the matter only to their entire wish and discretion and they can, if they so desire, give the verdict that they would like their territory to continue as a Union Territory but all the same, I would have been happier if the assurances given to these people by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had been fully respected and given effect to by the Government and no change in the status of these territories had been thought of or contemplated by the Government within a period of less than 10 years. I am quite conscious of the fact that this earlier step of ascertaining the people's wishes has been compelled because of the pressures of the Government of Goa which has recently resigned but whatever the pressures on the Government of India may have been I would have been happy if it had the strength to bear these pressures and had not brought this Opinion Poll Bill at this stage, but now that such a Bill has been brought forward, I am sure the people of these territories will give expression to their free and frank desire on the question of merger, or otherwise, and will not be compelled at the instance of any people or party, in or outside Goa, Daman and Diu to say what they would not like to. The Bill, as framed, is very satisfactory Sir, and does not seem to be open to any defect or objection, but what strikes me is that even after this Opinion Poll the controversy of the people of Goa with the neighbouring territories may not come to an end, since there is yet another State besides Maharashtra, namely, the State of Mysore, which claims that Goa should be merged with it rather than with Maharashtra. There are also sections of people in Goa who desire that their territory should be merged with Mysore, the Chief Minister of which State had also vociferously made that claim some time back. As such I am unable to understand how it is that two options have been offered to the people of Goa as to whether they would choose to join Maharashtra

State or remain as a Union Territory. When I, along with a number of other Members of Parliament, went to Goa about 2 years back, the people of both sections of opinion, namely, those who wanted their territory to merge with Maharashtra and also those wanting to merge with Mysore met us and place their respective points of view before us. Some Members of the Bhandarkar Ministry also met us informally and talked to us about the matter and apprised us of their point of view. In these circumstances, I do not know how far the Government is justified in ignoring the wishes of those sections of the people who desire merger of Goa with Mysore. In giving only two options, that section of the people which desires merger with Mysore will get no chance to express what they have at heart and will have to vote that the territory should continue as a Union Territory and this Opinion Poll will therefore not be a true expression of their opinion. I might mention, Sir, that it was difficult for us, Members of Parliament, to ascertain the strength of the people of each of these groups with divergent opinions within the short period of our stay in Goa but the impression gained by us or at least by me was, that no class of people expressing contrary views were in a negligible minority and as such deserving of no consideration by the Government and it is for this reason that I say that even after the Opinion Poll contemplated under the Bill, the controversy of merging with one or the other State cannot after all be solved and will not be closed for all time to come. And as such it was that the Government took no steady direction unless ten years elapsed after the freedom of Goa from the abominable rule of the Portuguese Government. Sir, Goa is a beautiful country. It is rich in minerals, specially iron ore, and whether the territory is to remain a Union Territory for some time more in future, or is to be merged with any of the neighbouring States, I would ask the Government to do the best to

develop the State industrially. The people of Goa are wanting to have a steel-producing factory, and I think they are justified in asking for it since they have very large quantities of iron ore, and therefore I strongly recommend to the Government to keep this in mind when it finalises its Fourth, or even the Fifth Five-Year Plan.

The wishes of the people of Goa outside the territory of Goa, when an opportunity to express their opinion, I consider their views just and fair, and I do not think the Government would be justified in refusing their legitimate request.

Another matter, Sir, to which I would like to refer is a suggestion made by Mr. Chatterjee that the people of Goa should also be given an opportunity to state whether they would like their territory to be a full-fledged State within the Indian Union. I am unable to agree with this point of view as I do not consider that it will be in the interests of the country and the people or the economy of the territory of Goa to bear the burden of a full-fledged State and as such I think the Government has done a good thing in not offering this choice.

With these remarks, Sir, I support the Bill as it is.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: Sir, I have heard some of the speeches made on the floor of this House when we are considering this Bill for an Opinion Poll in Goa. I have been to Goa several times. It is a very nice country. It has a very beautiful harbour and as Mr. Tankha has said just now, it is rich in minerals, in iron ore. I am not surprised, Sir, that my friends from the State of Mysore are wanting Goa. We the Maharashtrians also, are wanting Goa. One of my friends, Mr. Chandra Shekhar—who was there—raised a voice to say that it should go to U.P.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Did he say that it should go to U.P.?

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: Yes, in the lobby, my hon. friend from Kerala, just now said that if Pakistan can be one State with a large chunk of India in between, why should not Goa be a part of Kerala. I quite understand everybody wanting Goa, but we are not considering today as to who wants Goa, or who should get Goa; we are discussing what the Goans want and that is why, Sir, we are considering this Opinion Poll, and we want the wishes of the Goans to be respected.

Sir, much has been said about what the late Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, said at different places about this "ten years". But I would like to point out that these "ten years" should not be quoted out of context. In that very speech Mr. Nehru has said: "It may be ten years; it may be five years or it may be any period." So when Mr. Nehru made this announcement of "ten years", it was when he was hoping to persuade Dr. Salazar to cede Goa to the Indian Union, as the French Government did in the case of Pondicherry and other French pockets. But that did not happen. Dr. Salazar was adamant, and we had to fight for the liberation of Goa. So, whatever he said in that context to placate Dr. Salazar just goes overboard and it does not hold any more.

Now if we look at the Portuguese Gazettes, I can say that the Portuguese Gazette, till the day of the liberation, was published naturally in the Portuguese language, and also in the Marathi language. What does that signify, Sir? Why should it be published in the Marathi language and not in the language of Mysore—not in Kannada, nor in Malayalam nor in Hindi? (Interruptions).

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: All right, I give up my claim.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: I am glad, Sir, but this very fact indicates that Marathi was the language, acknowledged even by the Portuguese, of the people of Goa. In the speech Mr. Shinkre made in the Lower House, he pointed out

[Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye.] that out of the eleven *talukas* which go to form the Goa district as it is now, only four *talukas* were under Portuguese rule for over 450 years. The remaining seven *talukas* were not ruled by the Portuguese for so long; they were ceded to the district as land given by different Rajas in the contiguous areas, and they were not under Portuguese possession for more than 150 years. And one of the territories belonging to Goa at present was fought for by the then Raja even up to 1915, just till fifty years ago. So we find that Goa is not one uniform pattern, is not one territory—as we have it now—which was under Portuguese rule for over 450 years. It was only four *talukas*; it was less than practically one-third of the territory of the present Goa which was under the Portuguese rule for 450 years, and it is the people who belonged to those four *talukas* who are very keen on wanting a separate State. However, the future will be decided by themselves, and we do not come into the picture. And there again, as I said, very many people are wanting Goa, and Maharashtra is also wanting Goa, but it is not demanding. Goans have got to decide that they want to join Maharashtra. That was what was proved in the last elections, because the elections were fought on this merger issue, and my friend, Mr. Dharia, has given figures and has shown that the fate of the future, or the luck, of Goa was decided there and then. But I do not know why the Government prolonged that date and delayed the merger of Goa in Maharashtra. But Maharashtrians, rather than being aggressive and all that, which my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, tried to make out, were very conciliating, and they gave in—did not insist on Goa's merger in Maharashtra. After that Mr. Shastri said that there would be a mid-term poll. We said, "All right." We acceded to that even though the Goa Legislative Assembly had passed a resolution saying that they wanted merger with Maharashtra. But Mr. Shastri said,

"Let there be mid-term elections." They were to be given effect to, and you know what happened thereafter. And now the Opinion Poll, and even to that the Bandodkar Government has agreed. Not only that; it has resigned. I would like to know why it was made to resign. That system has not been followed in any other case. Now if free elections are to take place, or if a free poll is to be taken only after the resignation of the existing Ministry. I would ask of the Government in every State to resign, even at the Centre, so that the forthcoming elections of 1967 could be held in an impartial manner. Does that then hold water, Sir? In Punjab the Assembly continued till the very last minute in suspended animation. It was not asked to resign. Why is Government applying one yard-stick for one situation, and another yard-stick for another situation? I am sorry to have to say this, but it is the case. Again, Sir I feel that the Bandodkar Ministry was made to resign. It was made to resign, I feel, because it was not a Congress Ministry. I would like to ask my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister: Had it been a Congress Ministry would it have been asked to resign? I very much fear that it would not have been the case, some other way would have been found.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: If there was a Congress Ministry, even if you would have asked them to resign, they would not have resigned. That is the pity of it; that is the difference.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: Now as regards the Kanarese language being akin to Goans, a lot has been made of this Konkani language. I know—and I also come from that part called 'Konkan' in Maharashtra State—people say that Konkani is a different language from Marathi. Here I would like the figures to speak. I am going to give my opinion, but I will let the figures speak. Here are the figures. When the poll was taken, the poll for Marathi was 72,000, for Konkani 2,000.

and for Kanarese only 20, just a two-digit figure. So that only shows that Marathi is the language of Goa. After all the agitation by Shri Kakasahib Kalelkar and others, that they wanted Konkani schools, they had some Konkani schools opened. But I know it for a fact because I attended an educational conference in Goa soon after its liberation, that in those Konkani schools no children were there. They did not attend the Konkani schools and those schools were absolutely empty, as empty as a shell. That only proves that Marathi is the respected language there, that Marathi is the language that everyone wants to learn and all this talk of Konkani is just a put-up story.

A lot has been said about Goans outside Goa being allowed to vote. It is very strange to me that Goans who remain outside Goa and who when they were asked to declare themselves as Indian citizens refused to do so and preferred to say they were Portuguese, even they—now that the picture has entirely changed, now that the situation is entirely different—want to vote for Goa. They want to have their cake and eat it too. Therefore, I feel that this idea of Goans outside Goa being allowed to vote is absolutely absurd. Why should Goans who have lived outside for centuries and generations be allowed to vote? As somebody said there are, for instance, Maharashtrians living in Madhya Pradesh, in Uttar Pradesh, and so on. When the Maharashtra election are going to take place, are they also to vote in the Maharashtra State election? Certainly not. This holds good in the case of this opinion poll also. I really cannot understand this kind of talk. Perhaps it would be said that even those Goans who died should be allowed to vote. Let us be practical. Goans now residing in Goa should vote. The Deputy Minister has said that every opportunity is being given even to those Goans who want to register themselves to do so. Those who want to enroll themselves as voters can get themselves enrolled. They need not go to Goa even. The

hon. Minister said, if I mistake not, that it can be done by post, by sending a letter. He has only to satisfy the Election Commission, the election officers. That is fair enough. Seamen on the high seas going to different ports, they also can get themselves enrolled. And a large time limit is given so that this could be done. I do not know why there is all this talk about injustice being done to Goans when they are no longer Goans.

Now I would also like to point out that Goa has not been defined in any statute whatsoever. That is a thing which many people tried to do, but they have not succeeded. I feel that this Opinion Poll Bill has come rather late. I will not say that it has come at the right time. I would say it has been delayed for a long time. There is no such thing as rushing it through. This Bill is not being rushed through. It has come after a very very long delay. This should have happened long ago. When the elections took place in 1963 and when the picture was as clear as day light, this should have happened. So I say this is late and it is not being rushed through.

I agree with my hon. friend Shri Dharia that small pockets like Pondicherry should not remain as Union Territories any longer. They should merge into the big complex and they should go to Madras or whatever State is contiguous to them and to which they are naturally allied.

I have to refer to it, but there has been some talk of this Siva Sena, of Maharashtrians being this and that. I would only like to point out to my friends from Mysore that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Not Mysore, but Gujarat.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: I do not want to raise these parochial issues, these State issues. I believe in all of us being Indian and I do not believe in parochial interests at all. But one has to point out that such awful incidents every good Maharashtrian has absolutely condemned, this agitation that took place in Bom-

[Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye.]

bay. I for one did it and many others who are responsible Maharashtrians did it. But events like that do happen. What happened at Belgaum when the people were kicked by police officers like Mr. Louis? But the occurrence of such incidents does not raise our stature. They only bring it down. The less we speak about these things the better for us all.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, as my good colleague Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye was speaking...

SHRI M. N. GOVINDA NAIR: You can come to this bench so that you may be away from Mr. Dharia.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: When Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye was speaking against the existence of Union Territories, I was reminded of the story of the fox that lost its tail. The fox that had lost its tail started advising every other fox in the forest that a tail was no more of any use, that it was a dead weight and so they should all get their tails removed. The hon. Member's plea also looks like that.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: Where is the tail here and where is the fox? I don't understand this analogy at all.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Sir, the story of Goa is a very important one because it was a thorn in the flesh of India before it was liberated. This anachronism was removed by the patriotic fervour of the Government of India which took bold steps to liberate it from the domination of the foreign rule. I remember, Sir, that our late lamented illustrious leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, moving a Bill after the liberation of Goa, said this. Then a very historic reference was made, one which will live for all time to come. He said this and I quote:

"A matter of great satisfaction is that this question has been settled."

That was the question of Goa:

"This anachronism—can I call it—of history, has been removed and the independence of India has become complete."

Thus, the independence of India was complete on the 16th of December, 1961 when Goa was liberated from the domination of a foreign rule. For this the credit goes to the great Indian National Congress as well, which was the ruling party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only to the ruling party?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I said "as well".

We had given the people certain assurances.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: This was clearly reflected in the Goa elections.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: We have given certain assurances to Goa at the time of its merger with the rest of India as a Union Territory. I would like to quote here a few remarks which have fallen from the mouth of that great statesman, the architect of Free India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. He said:

"We have made it clear that we want Goa to maintain its separate identity."

Please mark the words "separate identity"—

"and separate individuality."

So it is not only separate identity, but it is also separate individuality—

"Call them what you will, because in the course of more than 400 years Goa has had a separate identity. The course of history had imparted it some identity. We have no intention of changing that or suppressing that identity. In fact, some people have advised us to

make another change in the Constitution and recognise the Konkani language as one of the official languages of India."

Sir, this architect of the freedom of India has talked in these terms and it is a solemn promise given to the Goan people that their separate identity and individuality were going to be preserved. Sir, we are supposed to be having the honour of keeping our words....

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Only supposed?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY:and it is our duty to keep our words, especially the word of the hero of this country, the late lamented Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. What has happened to this assurance given on the floor of this great parliament of India to the Goans? Why should be have gone back upon it so soon?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is an insult; resign from the Congress.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: It is mis-quoting.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Sir, when I am opposing the Bill I am opposing it for reasons other than those that were adduced by the Opposition; certainly not on the ground of the Opposition's stand in this matter. I am tracing my arguments to that great leader to whom I owe a great deal as much as the country does. Once again he has talked of two things and there was a lot of advice given to him then. It was an unbiassed advice. Goa had a dominant language and that is the Konkani language. Advice was tendered to Jawaharlal Nehru that the Konkani language should also be recognised as one of the national languages of the country and thus improve the status of the Konkani language. Konkani is a very big language of the West Coast and it is seen that advice was tendered to him to recognise the Konkani language as one of the

national languages. Probably if it had been recognised then, it would have solved several problems, and undue claims on the basis of language would not have been made now, undue coercion would not have been used either on the powers that be or on the people.

Once again I would like to say because nothing better could be done. My speech may not be a substitute for the stand that was taken by the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. His words are pregnant with meaning and therefore I am quoting him again:

"In any event I want to make it clear that we want to give full place to the Konkani language in Goa and not to ignore or suppress it in any way."

What more do you require? An assurance was given that the Konkani language would be kept as a national language.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Madras): Would the hon. speaker explain whether the Konkani language has got a script to become a national language?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am quoting Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. If you think you are wiser than Shri Jawaharlal Nehru then I have nothing to say.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is a quotation from your leader; you cannot dispute it.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: That is the main language of Goa. He has also said that Konkani is the main language of Goa.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You confine yourself to your points; otherwise you will get lost.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Then he goes on to say:

"A number of people know Marathi as well and also Kannada but Konkani is the principal language and we propose to give it full recognition."

Are we giving full recognition to the Konkani language by merging it with Maharashtra?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Surely.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: We are not; if that is so by all means have it but according to my reading of the situation we are suppressing the Konkani language. That is what I feel. So that is the position. At the same time a lot of autonomy was promised to Goa and assurances were given from time to time by the Government as well. It was in March 1962 that these assurances were given by Prime Minister Nehru. Subsequently also the matter was considered at various levels.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Madam, a question was asked in the Lok Sabha about the status of Goa. Shrimati Lakshmi Menon answering the question said:

"The Government of India will certainly maintain the *status quo* (of Goa)....

Evidently the reference is to Goa; the words 'of Goa' are mine.

"That is the promise given and the Prime Minister has expressed that view..."

Here my friend Mr. Dharla was referring to the elections that were held and the verdict that was got. Here is the version given by the Government about those elections. It says:

"As for the rest we find that although this was an issue fought in the recent elections there is no majority opinion in favour of merger."

That was the opinion of the Government of India then.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Now they want the murder of Goa.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Please let me have my say. I also know at that time when there was the question of drafting officers to the Goan Government there was some talk about Mysore also. I was not able to trace it but I remember Shri Jawaharlal Nehru got up in this House and said that certainly on the basis of contiguity we know that Goa is contiguous with Mysore and it is exactly for this reason that weightage has been given to Mysore to draft more of Mysore officers to the Goan Government. This was what he said—I remember very vividly—on the floor of this House.

Apart from this Mr. Nanda the then Home Minister also has said....

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Apart from what Jawaharlal Nehru said, please let us know something about your claim on Goa.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I get able support from the leaders—I am of that opinion—and these are the commitments on behalf of the party, not of individuals.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, I would like to be recorded here that Mr. Sri Rama Reddy is of the opinion that the present Congress Government is insulting the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Why do you put words in my mouth? I did not say that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That is the impression we get.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: On the 25th November the Home Minister said on the floor of the House:

"The Government of India feel that the present is not the time to do it."

That is, to consider the question of merger. Whether it is desirable or not is another question but he said this is not the time to do it. He said it would require some time for feelings to settle down. He said there was a strong party there—though not in a majority—which was very much opposed to merger. That was the verdict of the Home Minister.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI V. C. SHUKLA): You should quote in full.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: All right.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, when I was pointing this out he raised a point of order and now he himself is asking him to read the proceedings of the other House.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: It is useful; therefore I am reading. He says:

"It creates difficulties, creates troubles, and diverts people's attention from the work of consolidation in Goa and it is better for a few years to elapse. Then the matter may be taken up and let them decide as they choose.

This is the position.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You come to your stand. You are just quoting.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Now, having said this on the position that we have taken up so far on the utterances of our great leaders, I would go to the question of the situation of Goans. Goa is situated in such a way that it occupies a very great strategic place in the Indian Union. Therefore, instead of allowing it to be merged with any other State, it ought to have been kept as a Union territory as it is. Not only that we had given them a promise. The Congress Parliamentary Board had said that for

ten years it would remain as it is. It was Jawaharlal Nehru's opinion as well that for ten years we shall allow them to exist as they are. After ten years only we will take up the question of merger or no merger or keep it as it is. With regard to the status of Goa, it was proposed to be considered only after ten years. In the meanwhile, within two years, I do not know what hurry there is, it is being considered. All right. For some reason it is being considered. Granted, but justice should have been done. States are formed on the basis of contiguity of territory, language, culture and the future development of the area concerned. These are some salient factors that are taken into consideration. There was a large amount of opinion in Goa as well as for the merger of Goa with Mysore. Maybe, it may not have been very vocal. There may not have been any fast. There may not have been appeasements on the score of fast, but still there was some amount of it. Contiguity is there. Consider Mysore's case, however small it may be. If it is the opinion of the Goan people that their territory should be merged with Maharashtra and not with Mysore, what harm would have been done to the cause of Goa if the issue of its merger with Mysore also was included? Nothing would have been lost. On the other hand, it would have been more broad-based. The opinion would have been very well expressed and everybody would have been satisfied.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You do not have anybody on the Central Parliamentary Board.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: The question of contiguity was completely ignored. The territories adjoining it were completely ignored. The poll was confined only to the issue of its issue of its merger with Maharashtra or remaining as a Union territory. That was all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken twenty minutes.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Madam I am finishing in another three minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have your amendments and you will get some time then also.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Shall I speak on my amendments?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may speak when the amendments come along.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Now, I am not speaking on them. So, on the basis of contiguity and language there is our case. Now, it is admitted that Konkani is the dominant language there. It is the claim of Maharashtrians that it is a dialect of Marathi and the Kannadigas claim it as a dialect of Kannada. One of the steps which ought to have been taken before proceeding further is to determine the basis of the language whether Konkani is a dialect of Kannada, as claimed by Mysoreans or whether it is a dialect of Marathi, as claimed by Maharashtrians. Now, it is fair if it had been considered at that level. Why are we in a mortal hurry about it. Why are you pushing it through before the general elections. Sixty days from today the general elections are going to be held. In the meanwhile this Bill is being rushed through. How do we understand the situation. It is not fair. I do not know what to say. It does not speak very well of the measure that we propose to take.

About culture, we wanted to keep the individuality of the culture of the Goans. We have promised to retain it and develop it on that basis. About this merger issue. I am not a very happy man. I do not believe in these "Vishalas". The Late Prime Minister at the time of reorganisation said: "I do not like the word "Vishala. It is very jarring to me." He said that. Then, why this expansion, for whose sake: Why not wait?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Its development potential will also be very much crippled. Goa is a very important place. It has a port and it has minerals. It has hydro-electric potential. All these things would have given Goans a fair deal if it remains in the Indian Union as a Union territory. I am not for Mysore either. What is there? There are so many Union territories in this country. If Goa also remains a Union territory, you would have developed it very well. We would have made it a very strong and strategic place. We would have helped it with all the resources of the Indian Union.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must Wind up.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I was very sorry to hear my friend, Mr. Dharia saying that there are in Goa persons who owe allegiance to Lisbon and who ought not to be in Goa. There are none in Goa who is an anti-Indian. Everybody in Goa is as much a patriot as anyone else. I am quite sure of it and I would like to quote:—

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,

Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land;"

That is the situation in Goa with regard to every individual there. We have no cause to suspect anybody, but I would only repeat. . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No time to repeat.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I repeat my charge that the problem was not fully considered in all its aspects and the matter was hustled through and a Government which is not prepared to be coerced by fast has or at any rate seems to have succumbed to the fast of somebody.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I do not know, at least hereafter, if we shall have to succumb to fasts. This is the warning I will give you. Thank you very much.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Madam, I am very glad . . .

SHRI G. M. MIR (Jammu and Kashmir): You are from Mysore or Maharashtra?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am from Kerala. I was glad to hear the speech of Shri Rama Reddy and to find that at least he remembers and his Party remembers this part of the statement he made about Goa, though everything else is forgotten. Now, I am not one supporting the Government. In the last election in Goa, the majority of the people in the region have expressed themselves in favour of its merger with Maharashtra. This is a fact.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is a fraud.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The Congress Party which at that time was very much against merger fared very badly in that election.

SHRI PATEL PUTTAPPA (Mysore): What was the percentage of votes?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It was 16 per cent and they did not get even one seat in Goa.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD (Maharashtra): Only one.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That was in the other region. There is a very strong section which wants to merge Goa with Maharashtra. This is a fact. Another point is, Goa is a very beautiful territory. It has very rich mineral resources. It has one of the finest natural harbours. All these exist, I agree. But at the same time Goa with such a small population and with such a small area, can it continue as an independent State. It

has at some time or other to merge with some other part. Even when the individuality of Goa was mentioned, that time limit was given up to ten years. After ten years it has to merge with some region or other, because such a small territory with a small population of 5 lakhs or so cannot continue as any other State in India. It has to merge. That is my second point for supporting this Bill.

3. P. M.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Man has to die some time. For that reason should he die to-day?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It is not just like that. Then there are two claimants. If merger is a necessity, then there are two claimants. One claimant is of course Maharashtra, and people are really afraid of the Maharashtrians in spite of all your pious speeches, your non-parochial and broad-minded approach, and all that. There is really some fear in the minds of people. I do not know to what extent it will pacify them because, for instance, the Shiva Sena—when I first heard of it, I thought it was some religious organisation; because Shiva is the God of destruction. Then I understood that it has something to do with Shivaji and then it is a very parochial organisation, it wants to drive out other sections of the people from Bombay and Maharashtra. If that is the approach of Maharashtrians, that is a very bad thing for them. That does not mean that a territory which was formerly a part of Maharashtra should not merge, I am not bringing these two things together, but I am telling that your pious speech alone is not enough. The behaviour should be there. Parochialism among Maharashtrians should not be developed. This Shiva Sena and such other organisations should not be built up and encouraged. I heard that it was the Home Minister of that State who inaugurated that organisation. If that is so and if they are going to have a crusade against all non-Maha-

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.]

rashtrians in Bombay, that will be a very bad thing for the country, bad thing for Bombay and bad thing for Maharashtra.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: What do you say about Kerala people?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: From time immemorial we are the only people who stand for the integrity of India even from the time of Adi Sankaracharya, do not forget that. So instead of making pious speeches you have to run a campaign among Maharashtrian friends that parochialism should not be encouraged. I think the present Home Minister will take note of this because he is also charged with parochialism.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: He is not even piloting the Bill.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That shows a guilty conscience.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDA NAIR: But my point is, that should not vitiate our taking a proper decision on the question of Goa. In spite of this parochialism when we deal with the question of . . .

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: He is taking it for granted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is his opinion.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAYAR: That is my opinion.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: What he is saying is on the basis of facts that are now prevailing in Maharashtra.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Facts like Shiva Sena. So, it is haunting the minds of everybody. Have we ever seen such an opposition for any Bill moved by the Congress side from the Congress Members? I see that except to Maharashtrian friends nobody also has supported the Bill. Of course the Minister is from Madhya Pradesh, he is helpless, he has to pilot the Bill. But in all the speeches, except two Maharashtrians, there is nobody to support. That is why I have come to your rescue.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: That shows that others are against Maharashtra.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Why are they against you?

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: You should tell us.

SHRI M. N. GAVINDAN NAIR: Coming back to the question of Goa, this question of language is again raised. I want this question to be settled once and for all by this opinion poll or any process show that questions which can be solved should not be allowed to remain like this vitiating the whole atmosphere and creating more problems. That is why I say it should be supported. Regarding the question of language Konkani is spoken in Goa. Konkani is spoken in other places, Konkani is spoken up to Mangalore. In other parts of Bombay also it is spoken.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In Cochin too.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: In my State also Konkani is spoken. Now an argument is whether it is a dialect of Marathi or a dialect of Kannada. If Konkani is a dialect of Marathi, Goa should go to Maharashtra. If it is a dialect of Kannada, it should go to Mysore. That is the

argument. Then it is going to create other problems. What about other Konkani-speaking areas? You will never allow this boundary question to be settled once and for all and turn your attention to other matters. Do not bring in this question of language. I heard the other day some gentleman from Kashmir saying that these Saraswat Brahmins belong neither to the Kannada side nor to the Maharashtrian side; they all came from Kashmir. Then the Kashmir people will say. "No, no. We also have some claim on the basis of language".

SHRI G. M. MIR: Since Mysore and Maharashtra are fighting. I make a suggestion that Goa be merged with Kashmir.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
काश्मीर के बारे में शेख सादिक का एक शेर है सुना दीजिए ।

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Do not bring in the question of language. This territory was under the Portuguese. It was liberated. It is a small State. It has to be merged with one part or the other. For these reasons, it is the opinion of the Goan people themselves that should weigh most and there, if an amendment is necessary, I think it should be there saying that if anybody wants to merge with Mysore, that also should be ascertained, apart from the opinion whether they should merge with Maharashtra or not. What is the harm? Now there are only two questions whether they are to remain independent or whether they are to merge with Maharashtra. Why don't you put in this clause also? What is the harm there? Nobody is going to object. In Goa, I do not think there are any people interested in a merger. But the point behind all this is not even this claim of territory, it is the question of port. Mysore feels that here is a small State. Let it remain like that and we will have an outlet. And if it becomes a part of Mysore, we can develop that port and compete with Bombay. That is the feeling

inside Mr. Nijalingappa and Mr. Sri Rama Reddy who put what was in his mind. So, why have all these things? All these ports are under the Centre. Mysore is not going to suffer much if it is in Maharashtra or in any other State. Such ports are under the control of the Centre. It is not going to create any problem for the Mysore people. So, on such small issues, let us not try to work up the sentiments of the people and their emotions and create difficulties and troubles. If the Goan people—of course, the majority of them—want the merger with Mysore, it should be there. If they want a merger with Maharashtra, it should be done. If the majority feels, that they should remain independent, that should be accepted. But somehow try to see that this controversy is ended by this kind of opinion poll. And the question of Goa . . .
(Interruptions)

Another thing is this. He is just reminding me of what some people say in the Lobby in private. I never expected my hon. friend will bring it before the House.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): That is not fair.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: He has been provoking me. I just said that since Goa is a very beautiful State just like. . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Miss World is also from Goa. That was what Mr. Chatterjee was saying.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: You do not know? You are out of date.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That does not mean that it should be left to the sweet will and pleasure of that girl whom to choose.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Even before Goa's maturity. That is why ten years is fixed.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Goa has matured. It has an individuality of its own. All this has been

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.]

accepted ten years ago. But even now you say that it has not matured.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
That is why I say it is ten years old.

SHRI M. C. SHAH (Gujarat): I feel that a new principle is being evolved by this Bill of taking pool from the concerned parties to ascertain their wishes and to finalise very important political problems. I do not know how far this is desirable. A country has several problems, formation of States, border areas, inter-State irrigation and water problems. And I would like to know from the Government whether it is going to take up this procedure in ascertaining all these problems. It is impossible. We have just seen in this House the views expressed by the various Members, how different they are from one another. Therefore, I think it is necessary that the Government should ascertain the wishes of the people in their own way and then come to a certain decision. Asking the people to decide such important issues will perhaps land us into chaos and the Government cannot shirk its responsibility to take decisions by taking a poll in this manner. I would therefore urge that this is not a desirable procedure. It is, of course, necessary that Government should ascertain in its own way the views of the people concerned, then come to a decision and then declare it and implement it. But this is not the way to run the Government.

Secondly, several hon. Members have stated that solemn assurances were given by the highest in the Government and by the highest in the Congress that Goa will maintain its own separate entity for years to come. I do not know why these assurances have been done away with and they are faced with this Bill. What was the necessity? Why has the Government been hustled in bringing this Bill forward in spite of the solemn assurances given to the people of Goa

to develop in their own way their economic sphere under the guidance of the Central Government. Mysore and Maharashtra may have their claims. But these assurances must be fulfilled and for years to come, at least for ten years this issue should not have been taken up. But somehow, some pressure from some quarter has compelled the Government to bring forward this Bill which is not a desirable practice.

The question arose as to who shall be able to vote. I feel that there is not an ordinary electoral roll to be prepared. The fundamental issue is to be decided whether Goa should merge, and therefore all persons who have an existing interest in Goa should have the right to vote. The voters' list should be so prepared that all persons, all Goans, who have an existing interest—I say all Goans who have an existing interest in Goa—should have the right to vote, and the ordinary procedure that you have laid down for our elections should be liberalised and these people must have the right to express their views so that the Government can come to a proper decision.

Then I come to the question of the merger about which Mr. Sri Rama Reddy and several other hon. Members have spoken. In the Bill two alternatives have been given, whether Goa should remain as a separate entity under the Centre or it should merge with Maharashtra. Why not put in a third alternative to merge it with Mysore? Mysore has also a claim. It is for the people of Goa to decide whether they desire to go with Mysore or with Maharashtra. Then that alternative must be there. I do not know why that alternative has not been provided.

Then, lastly, there is the question of a poll being taken in Daman and Diu. There is no difference of opinion among the people of Daman and Diu. A vote has to be taken when there is a difference of opinion, when two view-points are put forward before

the Government. But in Daman and Diu there are no two views about opting for Gujarat and I do not know why this procedure of taking a poll in Daman and Diu has been accepted by the Government.

That is all that I have to say. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gaikwad, Please be very brief.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Madam Deputy Chairman, I know the difficulty in getting time for speaking. But I shall be very brief.

Generally speaking, I had no desire to speak. But so many friends of mine have criticised the Maharashtra point of view. In view of that, I have to make my observations on that point only.

My hon. friend sitting behind me, Mr. Chatterjee, while speaking said that Goa should be a separate State. But if he had studied the whole problem, the population, the area and the income of Goans, I think he would not have said what he has said just now. You will find that the population of Goa is something like six to seven lakhs and the strength of the voters is something like 3,84,000 today. So, how can it be a State? It is very difficult for me to understand that. However, because Mr. Chatterjee said so I just wanted to reply him that it cannot be a State.

As regards area, the area is something like 2,000 sq. miles.

DR. B. N. ANTANI (Gujarat): What about Haryana?

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: It is more than that.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: And Nagaland.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: In Goa you will find that there are about one lakh students, and as far as my information goes you will hardly find any student studying in, what you call Canarese. All students study Marathi. Now under the circumstances, the question

arises as to what to do with Goa? The reply is that it should be joined to any adjacent State. But to which State it should be joined is the question. The adjacent State of Maharashtra says that it should be joined to Maharashtra, whereas the other State, Mysore says that it should be joined to Mysore. Now while saying so there are so many questions which arise. Now what State it should be joined to?

Madam, many people have argued about language. It is said that in Goa Konkani is spoken. You will find, Madam, that in Maharashtra there are two parts. One is called Konkan and the other is called Decan. In Konkan you will find that the people speak Konkani which is spoken in Goa. Not only that, I can go to the extent of saying that if you take a man from Maharashtra from any part to Goa, he will very conveniently understand the language which is spoken by the Goans. It is Konkani. Madam, I cannot understand the plea of my friends from Mysore to join Goa to Mysore. If a Mysorean is sent there, I think it will not be possible for him to understand Konkani. So on the basis of language you will find that it will be convenient to join Goa to Maharashtra because we have divided so many States up till now on the linguistic basis. If we have divided States on the linguistic basis, then why Goa should not be joined on the linguistic basis to Maharashtra? Of course, I support this Bill. Because Goa people are given the right to decide as to where Goa should be joined and not whether it is Mysore's demand or Maharashtra's demand, let the people of Goa decide their own fate, and that is why the provisions have been made in the Bill. . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: But there is no scope for a decision in favour of Mysore. It is barred.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: I heard in the morning the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel. He spoke very vehemently. Unfortunately

[Shri B. K. Gaikwad.]

I had to go out for some business and therefore, I could not hear him. But this is what he was saying that the Maharashtrians while demanding always say—"Zalach Pahije". He emphasised on that sentence, which means it must be done. This is what he was saying.

Madam, I just want to draw his attention to one fact, our national leader, Lokmanya Tilak, used to say that "Swarajya is my birth-right and I want to have it today"—स्वराज्य माझा

जन्मसिद्ध हक्क आहे व ते आज मितालेच पाहिजे। If Lokmanya Tilak says that "Swarajya is my birth-right and I want to have it today", similarly, the Maharashtrians say that this is our right and we must have it today. I fail to understand what Mr. Patej meant by saying that Perhaps he was just criticising Maharashtrians.

In this connection, Madam, there is a great deal of misunderstanding as regards Shiv Sena which has been formed in Bombay. I request all hon'ble Members to remove the misunderstanding which they are having in their minds. There are no aims and objects of Shiv Sena. Even if you go through its constitution you will find that they do not ask for the removal of any non-Maharashtrian from Bombay. You will find that in Bombay almost all classes of people from all the States are residing there peacefully. It is a cosmopolitan city.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must wind up. You wanted only five minutes.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Madam, the Congress got only 16 per cent. votes in the last electios. It is a fact. But I must tell you, Madam, that they got 16 per cent. votes only because they were not supporting the demand of the people in Goa; whatever the Goans were demanding, Congress were not supporting them. That is why the Goanese taught the Congress a lesson. They were defeated on this issue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: So let there be no misunderstanding. Generally speaking, the last elections were fought on the language issue if you just try to understand it. Generally speaking, Goa would have been merged in Maharashtra immediately after the results of the elections were declared. But the Government could not do it.

So many hon. friends. Mr. Sri Rama Reddy and others, were just referring to what Pandit Nehru had said. What Pandit Nehru said was the reason for the Congress defeat in Goa. Now the Congress people are realising that difficulty. Now they have come to the conclusion that they could respect the views of the people living in particular areas. Therefore, nobody should blame the Congress for what they are doing as regards Goa.

Then, my hon'ble friend, Mr. Sri Rama Reddy, says "Why not merge it with Mysore?" I have given my explanation So it is not necessary to say more.

SHRI K. K. SHAH (Maharashtra): The Mysore people are clever. They did not want to be defeated.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Madam, I whole-heartedly support this Bill on behalf of the Republican Party and I say that whatever the Government have done as regards Goa they are giving importance to the views of the people, and that is why we support the Bill.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very thankful to the hon'ble Members who took part in this debate. I am afraid that the provisions of this Bill have not been clearly appreciated by some of the hon'ble Members who have taken part in this discussion. As I said in my opening speech, this Bill is only restricted to the creation of a machin-

ery for ascertaining the wishes of the people of this territory. This Bill by itself does not determine the future status of these territories. For that purpose another Bill will have to be brought before this hon'ble House, and then all these things which have been now discussed today could be discussed. This is only for creating a proper machinery by which we can be assured about the wishes of the local people and the people who will be affected by this question.

Hon'ble Shri Patel said that the Bill was passed by the Lok Sabha in a very queer fashion. I must say that a whole day was devoted for this Bill and we sat extra time to finish off this Bill. Every opportunity was given to every Member to express his opinion and there was no discussion barred. And it was only after the fullest consideration that this Bill was passed unanimously by the lower House.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
After everybody had left.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: There was sufficient quorum and everything, and there was no question of everybody having left.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
There was no quorum in the House.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: This is very strange. No House can function without a quorum. The question of merit of whether Goa should go to Maharashtra or Mysore or should remain as a Union Territory is not the thing which is under discussion today. We are only discussing whether we can provide a proper machinery to the people of Goa to express their true wishes. In this respect certain points have been raised and I would confine my reply only to these points.

The most important point which has been agitating the minds of Members here and some people outside is whether all those who live in Goa would have a chance of participating

in this Opinion Poll. I have already indicated that all those who are normally resident in Goa will have a chance to participate in this Opinion Poll. If their names are not found in the roll which has been prepared for these elections and which is also going to be used for this purpose, they can apply even by post without any fees whatsoever and if they satisfy the requirement of 'ordinarily resident' in Goa, they will be included in the list and even a few days prior to this Poll their names can be included. There is no question of barring anybody from taking part in this Poll. Of course we are opposed to this view that people who were in Goa in 1961 or at the time when the Citizenship Order was issued only should be called Goans and nobody else. We do not want to be a party to this hypothesis that Goan is a race and anybody who went to Goa after liberation is not a Goan. According to us anybody who lives in Goa, who works in Goa, whether he is a person coming from Mysore or Maharashtra or Madhya Pradesh or Punjab or Kashmir is a Goan. He must be given full chance to determine the future status of his homeland. So we are very clear on this matter.

Allegations were made that we were trying to rush through this Bill here. There is no question of rushing through anything. Actually speaking Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was quoted to an extent by Shri Reddy but he stepped short of the most important thing he said in the Lok Sabha where he said:

"The Government of India does not see any need for any hurry in this matter. It is immaterial whether it is done after 5 years or 10 years' time."

That is to say it was never the intention of the Government nor of the Prime Minister to say that the Opinion

[Shri V. C. Shukla.]

Poll or the question of determining the question of the status of this territory should be taken after 10 years or 15 years or 5 years. It was left to the discretion of the Government and after the popular election in Goa, there has been a persistent pressure from the people of Goa themselves for a final decision about their status. Because of the lingering doubts, because of the uncertainties, the developmental work in the Union Territory was suffering. Because the future status was not certain, a lot of things were being postponed. So we came to the conclusion that it would be in the best interest of the territory if a final decision is taken about the future status as quickly as possible and therefore this Bill has been brought before this House.

Some Members raised the question of constitutional impropriety and other things but this matter has been satisfactorily cleared.

Some Members referred to the Ministry and asked why the Goa Ministry was made to resign. First of all, the Goa Ministry was not made to resign. They themselves took the decision to resign and we accepted that decision of the Ministry and it is not a question of any Ministry resigning before the elections. This is not an election. As the House knows, this is an Opinion Poll which will be taken for the first time here and if the Ministry decides that while the future status of this territory is being determined, they do not want to be in office, we are not going to tell them that they should remain in office and if it was a question of elections, the question of resignation of the Ministry does not arise because the Ministry is not the authority which conducts the elections either in the States or in the Centre. It is an independent Election Commission which conducts the elections. So the question of resignation of the Ministries does not come in.

Questions were raised about Konkani and other things. I do not think I should go into all those things because this Bill is not concerned with all that. We are only concerned with the machinery which should be provided for the people to express their views about this matter and I hope the Bill will receive the unanimous support of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall first put the amendment to the vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for taking an Opinion Poll to ascertain the wishes of the electors of Goa, Daman and Diu with regard to the future status thereof and for matters connected therewith as passed by the Lok Sabha, be referred to a Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha of eight Members:—

1. Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.
2. Shri V. M. Chordia.
3. Shri Rajnarain.
4. Shri Niren Ghosh.
5. Shri Chitta Basu
6. Shri Abdul Ghani.
7. Shri B. N. Antani.
8. The mover (Shri Dahyabhai V Patel).

with instructions to report by the first day of the next session."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the motion.

The question is.

"That the Bill to provide for taking of an Opinion Poll to ascertain the wishes of the electors of Goa, Daman and Diu with regard to the future status thereof and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

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

Clause 2—Definitions

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I move:

"That at page 2, after line 22, the following be inserted, namely:

'(ff) 'Goan' means a person born in Goa, Daman and Diu who became a citizen of India on the 20th day of December 1961 by virtue of the provisions of the Goa, Dman and Diu (Citizenship) Order, 1962."

(The amendment also stood in the name of Shri Loknath Misra.)

The question was put and the motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—Opinion Poll to ascertain the future status of Goa, Daman and Diu.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I move:

2. "That at page 3, line 4, after the words 'Union territory' the words 'or should form a new State be inserted."

I also move:

3. "That at page 3, line 7, after the words 'Union territory' the words 'or should form a separate State' be inserted."

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I move:

11. "That page 3, line 3, after the word 'Maharashtra' the words 'or Mysore' be inserted."

The questions were proposed.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: As a matter of fact I have given only this verbal addition to sub-clauses (a) and (b) of clause 3. Clause 3 says.

"An Opinion Poll shall be taken for the purpose of ascertaining—

(a) the wishes of the electors of Goa as to whether Goa should merge in the State of Maharash-

tra or should continue to be Union Territory".

I have added that another choice should be given to the people of Goa by saying 'or should form a separate State'. Similarly, I have added those words 'or should form a separate State' at the end of sub-clause (b). The reasons are obvious because as far as the question of the future status of the people of Goa is concerned, the people of Goa have been given two very restricted choices—whether they should form part of Maharashtra or should form a Union Territory. Now Goa, as I said earlier, has been an entity leading a separate existence for the last 400 or 500 years. It may be that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi or it may not be so. I am not going into that question but you will agree that even if a particular language may be, to all intents and purposes, a dialect of another language, still it has happened in India that a separate State had been formed. Look at Assam. Well, even Rabindra Nath Tagore had said that Assamese was a dialect of Bengali. But that did not prevent Assamese taking up this stand that Assamese language is a different language. And you know that Asam is a different State, and you know the language problem or the language difficulties that were caused there because Assamese, as a language, was not being given proper respect, due respect as it should have got. Therefore, the question whether a language is a dialect or not, that question is absolutely academic. The question is what the people think about their language. Do they think that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi, or do they think that Konkani should be regarded as a separate language and should be given the status of a separate language? Therefore, language is not the only question that is the criterion here. If you look internationally also, you will find that. Look at Sudetanland. The people there spoke German, and when Hitler wanted to annex Sudetanland, it was regarded as an infringement of the rights of the people of Sudetanland

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee.]

though they spoke German. Well, that was no reason why Sudetenland should form part of the Third Reich. Because the Austrians speak German, can it be any reason why the Austrian people should have formed part of the Third Reich? I do not say that the Goan people will not say, or cannot say in the Opinion Poll that their language is a dialect of Marathi and therefore they should merge with Maharashtra. I am not saying that, but what I am saying is this that you must give free choice to the people of Goa. It may be that Goan people may now say—if they are given that choice—that “though our language is a dialect of Marathi, well, we think, because we have led a separate existence for four hundred years, our language should be given separate status, should be given separate consideration, and we think that we should form a separate State. It has also been hinted at that it may not be a viable State. Now it has happened so often that even a small number of people have formed States both in India as well as abroad. Look at the question of Haryana. Look at Nagaland. The people, though they are very small in number, they are clamouring for new States and they are getting new States. So what is the point in saying that because the Goan people are only ten lakhs in number, therefore, they cannot form a separate State? Well, if they form a separate State, I think, their wishes for self-development, for economic consolidation, will be better realised than if they are relegated to the status of being a Union Territory. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, I am saying that you give this choice also to the people of Goa whether they should form a new State. I think the hon. Minister will consider it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want to speak on your amendment?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: My amendment is a very simple amendment, only two words to be added in

sub-clause 3(a), to add the words “or Mysore” after the word “Maharashtra” in line 3 of that sub-clause. With this small amendment it reads like this:

“The wishes of the electors of Goa as to whether Goa should merge in the State of Maharashtra or Mysore or should continue to be Union territory;”.

This is a very simple amendment. I claim it on this—which I have not mentioned before—that the Konkani-speaking people in Mysore State are about six to seven lakhs and the population of Goa is about ten lakhs or so. Therefore, the affinity, on the basis of language, of Goa to Mysore is much greater than the affinity, naturally on the basis of language that should prevail between Goa and Maharashtra. Therefore, it is a very simple amendment and I request my friend to accept it.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Madam Deputy Chairman, only such alternatives have been provided in this Bill which were thrown up during the elections in Goa in 1963, and questions which did not agitate the mind of the people, which were not thrown up in that manner during the elections, it was thought it would not be proper to include them in the option which was to be offered to the people of Goa, and because of this we have only offered such option which actually came before the people of Goa during the elections in 1963. In view of this we are unable to accept either of these amendments.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you pressing your amendment, Mr. Chatterjee?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am putting amendment No. 2 to vote. The question is:

2. “That at page 3, line 4, after the words ‘Union territory’ the words “or should form a new State” be inserted.”

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Noes have it.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: We want to record it.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: We want a Division.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why don't you stand up? This will also go on record.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The names will not go on record. That is the difficulty. But in case of a Division through that instrument, the names also go on record.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is very essential that the names should be recorded; it is essential here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think a Division of that kind is necessary. It is obvious that Noes have it. I shall take a count of the votes if you please stand up. It is in the discretion of the Chair, and if I find that there is any difference between this count of votes and the voice vote earlier taken, if I have any doubt, then a Division can be taken.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If you take a count, will the names also be recorded?

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, एक हमारा पाइण्ट ग्राफ आर्डर है। जब चेयर यह कह दे कि Obviously Ayes or Noes have it. इसके बाद भी कोई डिवीजन हो सकता है ?

उपसभापति : उसी के लिए मैं कह रही हूँ कि खड़े हो जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : इसके तीन प्रासेस चलते हैं

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want those who are in favour of this amendment to please stand up.

श्री राजनारायण : यह गलत है। आप एक मर्तबा कह दें . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: But please have the names recorded. We are prepared to co-operate with you in saving time, but the names must be recorded. We are willing to co-operate with you in saving time, but the names must be recorded.

(The House divided.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—11; Noes—42.

AYES—11

Antani, Dr. B. N.
Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
Ghosh, Shri Niren
Gurupada Swamy Shri M. S.
Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati
Misra, Shri Lokanath
Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
Patel, Shri Sundar Mani
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda
Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.

NOES—42

Abdul Shakoor, Moulana
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
Anandan, Shri T. V.
Anis Kidwai, Shrimati
Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati
Asthana, Shri L. D.
Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh
Chaman Lall, Diwan
Dass, Shri Mahabir
Dharia, Shri M. M.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Gilbert, Shri A. C.
Indira Gandhi, Shrimati
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali
Khaitan, Shri R. P.
Krishan Kant, Shri
Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas

[The Deputy Chairman.]

Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.

Mary Naidu, Miss

Mir, Shri G. M.

Muhammad Ishaque, Shri

Pande, Shri C. D.

Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.

Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati

Purkayastha, Shri M.

Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shri-
mati

Savnekar, Shri B. S.

Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati

Shakuntala Paranjpye, Shrimati

Shukla, Shri M. P.

Siddhantalankar, Prof. Satyavrata

Supakar, Shri S.

Swamy, Shri N. R. M.

Tapase, Shri G. D.

Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad

Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.

Varma, Shri C. L.

Varma, Shri Niranjana

Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And so amendment No. 3 is barred. The next amendment is No. 11 standing in the name of Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy. Are you pressing it?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Madam, I want to say a few words on my amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already spoken and after the Minister had given his reply I do not think you can say anything at this stage.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Then, Madam, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has he the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, let us have a division.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

11. "That at page 3, line 3, after the word 'Maharashtra' the words 'or Mysore' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That means, Madam, that Shri Sri Rama Reddy cannot withdraw his amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have declared that the Noes have it. So the amendment is lost. I do not know what is this confusion that Mr. Lokanath Misra has.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, the point is, the hon. Member wanted the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment and several of us said, "No, it cannot be withdrawn".

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, this is not the position. Since you insisted that it should not be withdrawn, I put the amendment to vote and it has been lost.

The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill

Clause 4—Persons entitled to vote at opinion poll

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, I beg to move:

6. "That at page 3, lines 9-10, the words 'and no other person' be deleted."

7. "That at page 3, after line 11, the following Proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that all those persons who are Goanese but whose

names are not included in the electoral roll of an assembly constituency for the time being in force in Goa by reason only of their not being ordinarily resident in Goa, shall be entitled to vote'."

8. "That at page 3, line 13, the words 'and no other person' be deleted."

9. "That at page 3, after line 15, the following Proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that all those persons whose native place is Daman or Diu but whose names are not included in the electoral rolls of the Daman assembly constituency or the Diu assembly constituency by reason only of their not being ordinarily resident in Daman or Diu, shall be entitled to vote'."

(The amendments also stood in the name of Shri Lokanath Misra).

The questions were put and the motions were *negatived*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 5 and 6 were added to the Bill.

Clause 7—Opinion Poll Commissioner

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, I beg to move:

4. "That at page 4, line 2, for the words 'an officer of Government' the words 'an officer of the Central Government, not being an officer on deputation with the Administration of Goa, Daman and Diu' be substituted."

(The amendment also stood in the name of Shri Loknath Misra).

Madam, I do not want to detain the House long and I shall briefly explain that my amendment refers to the question of officers of Government, of the Central Government, who will be in charge of the poll. It is well known that in this country situated as we are, there is a large illiterate population and so the officers who are in charge of the polls play a very important role. Therefore, for the sake of fair and free elections we demand that the officers who are there in this poll, who are in charge of the polling arrangements, should be neither from Maharashtra nor from any of the neighbouring States. Let there be people who are neutral so that we get a proper idea. Madam, the whole purpose of moving all these amendments is to get a proper idea, to get the democratic vote of the people and to fulfil the assurances that were given to the people of Goa, repeated by different people, by the Prime Minister and the President of India, again and again. I am sorry, Madam, the Government has not thought it fit yet to retrace their steps. Of course, we know all about the assurances that the Congress gave the people before independence. So many assurances were given to the people, even by the Prime Minister. The Seventeenth Amendment of the Constitution is an example in point. The people were assured, particularly the peasants and agriculturists, that their lands would remain, that no one would touch them. But as soon as the Congress got power one of the first acts of theirs was to deprive the poor agriculturists of their land. Similarly in this . . .

4 P. M.

SHRI G. M. MIR: It is the rich agriculturists who have been deprived.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You call a man who has got 30 acres as a zamindar? What is the ceiling in Gujarat? Come and have a look. It is most atrocious that you call a man who has got 20 to 30 acres . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): What is the ceiling in the Punjab?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You are zamindars; the Punjabi people are zamindars.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: The ceiling there is 30 standard acres. You are utterly ignorant of the situation. You are completely ignorant.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, I protest against this sort of interruptions.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I think my hon. friend is utterly ignorant of the situation.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You are utterly ignorant of what assurances your leader gave. Read the Resolution of the Karachi Congress, the Resolution that was moved by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Here assurances were given to the people of Goa and the same Congress Party is repudiating those assurances given to the people of Goa. They are doing it because Maharashtra is bullying the Government and this Government has succumbed to this bullying. Of course the present Home Minister comes from Maharashtra. This Government is being bullied . . .

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: Madam, I protest against this.

SHRIDAHYABHAI V. PATEL: . . . because Maharashtra wants this to be done. And is this an honest way of voting. How is it being taken? How many people on the opposite side spoke for the Bill and how many spoke against it? Is this honest voting? People on the opposite side who spoke against the Bill are being coerced to vote for this Bill. Therefore the whole process is a fraud . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Madam, I protest against the statement of my friend. Nobody is being coerced. I

have not been coerced; nobody on this side has been coerced.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: We protest against the scandalous remarks of Mr. Dahyabhai Patel

(Interruptions.)

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Poisonous? I think all the poison comes from Shiva sena; from nobody else. They are looting petty and small shopkeepers; that is poison.

And look at the manner in which the Home Minister took up the Bill in that House and he persists in misleading this House. He said openly at six o'clock that the Bill would not be taken up and in one hour he took it up. Then he comes here and says that the Bill had a full discussion there. My friend, Mr. Dandekar who had so many amendments in his name did not get an opportunity to move them because he misled the House and the Opposition members left. There was actually no quorum in the House at that time and here the Deputy Home Minister gets up and misleads the House. The whole thing is a fraud.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are given an opportunity to put things right here.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is a deception that is practised against the people.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: He cannot question the proceedings of the other House.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Is it fair, Madam.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Look at the noisy interruptions. Unless he sits down I will not.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: On a point of order, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is it?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Is it fair for an hon. Member of this House to say that there was no quorum in the other House and they carried on their proceedings without a quorum? No House can carry on without a quorum; it is the basic principle. And to say like that is condemning the Lok Sabha. It is not fair on the part of Mr. Dahyabhai Patel to say that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, I thought that the motto of our Government was 'Satyameva jayathe' but under this regime of 'Satyameva jayathe' *sathyam* is being suppressed by loud voices. This is an example of what is being done by the Congress; this is an example of what you are doing to the poor people of Goa. You want to suppress their voice. It is wrong for you to do that. In a democracy the voice of the people, whether you like it or not, should be allowed to be expressed. They should have the liberty to express their views, whether you like those views or not. Under the wrong advice that the Shiva sena is giving the voice of the people is being suppressed. You will never be able to suppress the voice of the people. It has been tried everywhere. You may carry the day by your whip but the voice of the people can never be suppressed. Remember that there are people who cherish their liberty and the liberty of the country and by this sort of voting and by these tactics their voice can never be suppressed.

The question was proposed.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You also want to speak? All right. No reflection on the other place.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: But reflection on the Home Minister.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: And no provincialism also.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, if an example could be taken from the ideal gesture of the Ministry in Goa, it should have been taken by the Home Ministry first. I endorse whatever has been said by my leader regarding the Maharashtrians being kept in charge of the poll in Goa during the opinion poll. There would be definite difficulty, there would be definite prejudice in getting a free and fair opinion.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: They gave a demonstration here just now.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It would be unfair if officers from the particular State which is mentioned in the Bill and in favour of which opinion is to be expressed in the poll were to be there. Therefore I would very much want an assurance from the hon. Deputy Home Minister that there would be no Maharashtrians conducting this opinion poll.

Secondly, I had raised an objection on the day on which the statement was made by the other Deputy Home Minister regarding the Lieut. Governor. That is a relevant point in this regard. The top man who is in charge of the administration who is only a civil servant must go. If the popular Ministry showed a good gesture by resigning why should not a civil servant be removed if there is any suspicion in the country, if there is any doubt in the mind of anybody, that he might prejudice the poll in favour of a particular State? He is a Maharashtrian; whatever might be said in his favour by the Deputy Minister he is a Maharashtrian and therefore I very much take exception to a Maharashtrian heading the administration while the poll is being taken in favour of Maharashtra. Therefore, Madam, I would like to

[Shri Lokanath Misra.]

have a categorical assurance from the Deputy Home Minister, before this particular amendment is put to vote, that he would see that the Lieut. Governor who is now in charge of the Goa Administration would be transferred before the poll is taken. If that is not done there would be still a doubt, a suspicion, in the country and it would be very difficult for the Government to dispel it from the minds of those who suspect that it would not be a free and fair opinion poll but a prejudiced one.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Madam, this is a very simple amendment moved by Mr. Dahyabhai and Mr. Lokanath. We all want that a fair and free exercise of vote is given to the people of Goa, there should be impartiality and that the people of Goa should have unfettered freedom to exercise their vote. There should be no coercion, no intimidation. Mr. Dahyabhai was quoting an example of how in an election in Gujarat one polling officer was marking the ballot paper for the candidate—obviously for the Congress candidate—even though the illiterate voter wanted the mark to be put in favour of the Opposition candidate. So it is likely, if an interested party is there as the officer, that he will take advantage of the situation. We have seen so many instances. They will abdicate their authority, their sense of justice, fair-mindedness and they will become parochial and try to interfere particularly when they deal with illiterate voters who go to the polling booth by asking them to vote for a particular candidate in the case of elections and in this case for a particular idea. In order to see there is no reflection on the officers and since we want to have an impartial poll, it is better to avoid any officer of any neighbouring State, either Maharashtra or Mysore, working in the conduct of the poll. Therefore this is a sound amendment that has been moved and there should be no difficulty for the Government to accept this.

SHRIMATI SHAKUNTALA PARANJPYE: Madam, objection has been taken to the Lieut. Governor, Mr. Damle, being in charge of the Administration. Let me tell my friends, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel and Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy that this Lieut. Governor is not a Maharashtrian. He is a U.P.-ite and . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I am very sorry that such things have been said here in the House. First of all, out of 10,000 Officers, Government servants, who are serving in the Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, only about 280 Officers are from Maharashtra. (Interruption.) Secondly, the opinion poll that is going to be conducted is not going to be conducted by the Lieut. Governor. It is going to be conducted by the Chief Election Commissioner of India and by the persons appointed by him. (Interruptions.) I do not yield to such intrusions on my time.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is a relevant point.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: The other thing is that the particular Officer, whose name has been mentioned in this regard, is known for his integrity and sense of freedom. He is not going to be involved in any of this thing and we are sure of that. So, hon. Members need not have any fear about this. One thing I want to make clear. There is no coercion and there is no bullying of any kind. We have not been accustomed . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is there.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: . . . to say bullying or coercion, nor do we submit to such things. And if Mr. Dahyabhai Patel says that the

masses of India are ignorant, are illiterate and are guided by the officers, it may be the opinion of his Party about the Indian people.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is a matter of record.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: I will not say that. My Party and the Government believe in the collective wisdom of our people, who are as good as any other people in any other part of the world. We do not call our people illiterate and ignorant. They are as good as any people in the world and I am quite sure they will express their opinion in the proper way. I emphatically oppose this amendment. I am not able to accept it at all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

4. "That at page 4, line 2, for the words 'an officer of Government' the words 'an officer of the Central Government, not being an officer on deputation with the Administration of Goa, Daman and Diu' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clause 8—Assistant opinion poll commissioners

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, I move:

5. "That at page 4, lines 5-6, for the words 'an officer of Government' the words 'an officer of the Central Government, not being an officer on deputation with the Administration of Goa, Daman and Diu' be substituted."

(The amendment also stood in the name of Shri Lokanath Misra.)

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Madam, I move:

12. "That at page 4, lines 3-4, after the words 'one or more persons' the words 'who shall not be Goanese, Maharashtrian or Mysorean' be inserted."

The questions were proposed.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am moving my amendment and it is for me to withdraw it later if I feel so.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: That is coercion, in spite of the Home Minister's denial, and we see the example in the House. They are thoroughly demoralised.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am putting your amendment to vote.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at page 4, lines 5-6, for the words 'an officer of Government' the words 'an officer of the Central Government, not being an officer on deputation with the Administration of Goa, Daman and Diu' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you withdrawing your amendment, Mr. Sri Rama Reddy?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I would like to say a few words.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: We do not want to hear him. We want to know whether he is withdrawing it.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Why do you advocate on my behalf? While I congratulate the Bandodkar Government on having resigned and made it possible to conduct a free and fair

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

election or opinion poll in Goa, I would like to impress upon the Government the need to extend this fairness and freedom on a wider scale. Let it breath through all the ranks that are conducting these elections. So, I would like this small amendment to be accepted.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Do you want Mysoreans to conduct the election?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: No. I say here one who shall not be Goanese, Maharashtrian or Mysorean. This is a very simple amendment. I trust the Deputy Minister will not find it very difficult to accept. The freedom of the election will be complete and it is nothing more and nothing less.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: We do not accept the very premise of this amendment. So, it is not possible to accept this amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you withdraw your amendment?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I withdraw it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has he the permission of the House to withdraw it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then, I shall put the amendment to vote

The question is:

12. "That at page 4, lines 3-4, after the words 'one or more persons' the words 'who shall not be Goanese, Maharashtrian or Mysorean' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The questions is:

"That clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was negatived.

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 9 to 20 were added to the Bill.

Clause 21—Special procedure for voting by certain classes of persons.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL

Madam, I move:

10. "That at page 7, after line 37 the following be inserted, namely:—

"(c) all persons mentioned in provisos to clauses (a) and (b) of section 4, to give their votes by postal ballot, and not in any other manner, at an opinion poll, subject to the fulfilment of such requirements as may be specified in those rules."

This amendment relates to giving permission to the people of Goa who are now residing in Bombay and other places for their occupation. They are the real people who come from Goa and they must be given an opportunity to vote. The amendment reads:—

"All persons mentioned in provisos to clauses (a) and (b) of section 4, to give their votes by postal ballot, and not in any other manner, . . .

SHRI K. K. SHAH: How can they be voters in two places. They are voters in Bombay.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Look at the intolerance of the Congress Members. Even when I am reading the text of my amendment, this gentleman, the General Secretary and what not of the Congress, always gets up and interrupts me. What is the meaning of it? I am reading my amendment. They will not allow Members of the House to read the amendment. I request that all people who come originally from Goa should be consulted and it is very easy to do it, because the Portuguese Government, when they were in Goa, they had compiled a register and a voters' list. Their names are available in the register and the printed list and those people who have got their

names should be entitled to vote and not say they have not been residents. Some of them may have gone to Bombay or may be to Delhi for the purpose of occupation. They should be given sufficient notice. They were the original residents of Goa and the printed list of those names, the voters' list prepared by the Portuguese regime, is available. In addition to this, all those who declare themselves and who are from Goa may be given an opportunity, but not those who have just migrated for business and who are not Goans. It is very easy to decide who are Goans and who are not. It is a very simple amendment, and if Government are honest in their intentions—of course I am doubting them from the beginning—they should accept that.

The question was proposed.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: May I know whether the amendment proposed by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel will cover Miss Reita Faria who is presently not here?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Govindan Nair.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Madam, I support this amendment because you should know that, Goa being a very small place, many of the inhabitants there had to go in search of jobs to the neighbouring States, especially in the City of Bombay and other places. Like Malayalees wherever you go you find the Goans also. So we know that a good chunk of Goans, because that part is backward, had to go to other places for making a living. You should not deny them the right to express their views on this question of the future of Goa. So I do not think that the Government should reject that.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: It is surprising. My friend ought to know that under the Constitution the right to vote is given to a man who has been for six

months a resident of that place prior to the voters' lists being prepared every year. How can a person be a voter at two places? I fail to understand that. These are all people who are voters in Bombay.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am surprised at the ignorance of my friend who has been a resident of Bombay. He knows that the Goans were not on the registered voters' lists of Bombay because they were not considered voters.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is what he meant, I think, I do not know what is the position. Mr. Shukla.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Madam, I would say that because we are honest, we cannot accept Mr. Dahyabhai Patel's amendment. I have already dealt with this point in great detail. I have said that anybody, whether he is a Bengali or a Maharashtrian or a Madhya Pradesh man or a U.P. man, who lives in Goa and who is ordinarily a resident in Goa, shall have the right to participate in this opinion poll. There is no race as Goan race so that once he has stayed in Goa even 20 years back, if his name was found in the register prepared by the Portuguese, he should now be allowed to vote, if he has been out of Goa for 20 years or 25 years. We do not accept that kind of thing. I have already gone into great detail as to what facilities we have given to those people whose names might be left out from the opinion poll inadvertently. They can still get their name registered provided they are ordinarily resident in Goa. Even the time-limit for residence etc. is not applicable. Anybody who can prove to the voters' registration officer there that he is ordinarily resident in Goa can get his name registered there without any difficulty. I do not see any reason to accept this amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

10. "That at page 7, after line 37, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(c) all persons mentioned in provisions to clauses (a) and (b) of section 4, to give their votes by postal ballot, and not in any other manner, at an opinion poll, subject to the fulfilment of such requirements as may be specified in those rules'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 21 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 21 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 22 to 35 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, यह विधेयक क्यों आया और क्यों इसका विरोध हुआ, यह सब समझने के लिये मैं निवेदन करूंगा और मैं चाहूंगा दिल से कि यह युवक उपमंत्री श्री शुक्ल अपने दिमाग की पृष्ठ भूमि को बतावें, जिससे कि भविष्य में कम से कम उनके जैसे नवयुवकों से ऐसी गलती न हो। एक ऐतिहासिक तथ्य में जाना पड़ेगा और सरकारी पक्ष के जिन लोगों ने काफी उत्साह दिखाया है, उनसे भी मैं निवेदन करूंगा और जिन लोगों ने उत्साह नहीं दिखाया है, उनसे भी मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इस देश को हम लोग ले किधर जा रहे हैं, इसको जरा

ईमानदारी से वे समझें। क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि सरकारी पक्ष से जितने वक्ता बोले हैं, उनमें अधिकांश भाव में इस विधेयक के विरोधी रहे हैं और क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि महाराष्ट्र के रहने वाले जो इस विधेयक के पक्ष में बोले हैं, उनके अन्दर प्रान्तीयता की गन्ध नहीं है? यह प्रयत्न है, साफ है। तो चाहे यह विधेयक पास हो और चाहे यह विधेयक फेल हो, मगर इस सदन में आज जो वातावरण दर्शाया गया है, वह वातावरण हमारी राष्ट्रीय एकता को भंग करने वाला है, वह वातावरण हमारे राष्ट्र के सम्मान को धूमिल करने वाला है। इसलिये मैं कहता चाहूंगा कि सरकार कम से कम अब तो सचेत हो जाये ताकि भविष्य में ऐसी गलती न हो।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ अपने मित्र धारिया साहब से। मैं उनकी बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ, कद्र करता हूँ और जब वे धीरज से इस सदन में बैठते हैं, तो मैं उनका और ज्यादा सम्मान करने लगता हूँ। अगर बटवारा ही या जनमत लेना ही या वोटमत लेना ही किसी समस्या के समाधान के लिए आवश्यक माना जाय, तो जब मुल्क का बटवारा 15 अगस्त, 1947 को कबूल किया गया था, तो क्या राष्ट्र की जनता की सम्मति ली गई थी? मैं आज भी दृढ़ता के साथ इस मत का हूँ कि उस समय भी मुल्क के बटवारे पर वोट लिया गया होता, तो मुसलमानों का बहुमत भी बटवारे के निश्चित विपक्ष में होता, जो आज सब जगह परिलक्षित होता है। मैं यह सत्य भी आज सरकारी पक्ष के लोगों को और इस युवक डिप्टी मिनिस्टर को बताना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि अभी इनके जीवन का अधिकांश बाकी है कि जहाँ के लोगों ने मुल्क के बटवारे के लिये आवाज बुलन्द की थी, वहाँ पाकिस्तान नहीं बना। पाकिस्तान बना वहाँ जहाँ के लोगों ने मुल्क के बटवारे का हमेशा विरोध किया था। इस तथ्य को भी डिप्टी मिनिस्टर समझ लें, तो अच्छा हो।

एक तथ्य मैं और प्रकाश में लाना चाहूंगा। आन्ध्र पंजाब ये सब भी उसी दिमाग की खराबी की उपज, है जिस दिमाग की खराबी से आज इस विधेयक को यहां पर प्रस्तुत किया गया है। 18 जून आज भी गोआ में स्वतन्त्रता दिवस के रूप में मनाया जाता है। 18 जन, 1946 वही तिथि है, जिस तिथि को डा० राममनोहर लोहिया ने गोआ को स्वतन्त्र करने के लिये गोआ आन्दोलन का सृजन किया था, जब उनकी गिरफ्तारी हुई थी। पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू प्रधान मंत्री थे और वे डा० लोहिया की गिरफ्तारी पर चुप साधे हुये थे। उस समय गांधी जी जीवित थे श्री के० के० शाह को याद होगा कि गांधी जी ने कहा था कि डा० लोहिया साधारण पुरुष नहीं हैं और डा० लोहिया की गिरफ्तारी भारत की स्वतन्त्र आत्मा की गिरफ्तारी है और अगर भारत की सरकार इसके विरोध में आवाज नहीं उठाती है, तो मैं अकेले कदम उठाऊंगा। गांधी जी ने जब यह कहा तब डा० लोहिया का वहां से निष्कासन हुआ। मैं अफसोस के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि एक मीटिंग हो रही थी और उस मीटिंग में भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री नेहरू जी ने पूछा था कि इस 18 तारीख का सिग्निफिकेंस क्या है? 18 तारीख राष्ट्रीय दिवस के रूप में क्यों मनाया जाता है? जानकार लोगों ने कहा यह दिन वह है जिस दिन डा० लोहिया गिरफ्तार हुये थे। धीरे धीरे इस इतिहास को वहां से हटाने का षडयंत्र हो रहा है। क्यों? यह कहां ले जायगा मुल्क को, यह युवक मंत्री समझें। जिस दिन गोआ आजाद हुआ, मैडम माननीया—माफ कीजियेगा, मैडम मैं कहता नहीं—उस दिन का वहां का जो चित्र अखबारों में आया, उसमें डा० लोहिया जिन्दाबाद का नारा, गांधी जिदाबाद का नारा था, तो बाद में यहां के सम्बन्धित विभाग ने कहा कि डा० लोहिया जिन्दाबाद का नारा निकाल दिया जाय। यह क्या हो रहा है? इस दिमाग से यह मुल्क चलाया जायगा, तो इस

विधेयक को संचालित करने वाले युवक डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब सोचें कि वे कहां बैठे हैं। किस धरती पर बैठे हैं। वह धरती बहुत ही किमलन वाली है।

यहां पर भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री जवाहरलाल जी का एक प्राचीन वाक्य गोआ के संबंध में श्री राम रेड्डी ने कोट किया। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूं, कि उनको तनिक भी चिन्ता या अफसोस नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर उनको वाक्य ही याद करना है, तो 8 अगस्त, 1942 रात में जो बम्बई में इजलास हुआ था ए० आई० सी० सी० का उसी याद करें :

“The State must necessarily belong to producing masses, workers in the field and the factory.”

जब अंग्रेज राज विनष्ट हो जाएगा, तो राज-सत्ता किसके हाथ में आएगी? उस प्रस्ताव में लिखा हुआ है कि खेतों में काम करने वाले किसानों और कल-कारखानों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों के हाथ में आएगी।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : इमनिश तो हम लोग आए हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : क्या खेतों में काम करने वाला यही श्यामधर मिश्र है? क्या खेतों में काम करने वाला यह हमारा मित्र शुक्ल है? क्या खेतों में काम करने वाली श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी है? (Interruptions) श्रीराम रेड्डी जी इतना बड़ा वाक्य जब इस कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस ने भुला दिया तो श्री नेहरू के उस छोटे वाक्य को भी इन्होंने भुला दिया, तो आपको ज्यादा चिन्तित नहीं होना चाहिए।

माननीया, आज मैं अपने देश की स्थिति बताना चाहता हूं। आज हमें आवश्यकता थी भूखों को अन्न देने की, आज हमें आवश्यकता थी नंगों को कपड़ा देने की, आज हमें आवश्यकता थी बिना घर वालों को घर देने की, आज हमें आवश्यकता थी बिना शिक्षा वालों को शिक्षा

[श्री राजनारायण]

देने की, मगर इस विधेयक को लाकर जनता के ध्यान को हटाया जा रहा है। माननीय शीलभद्र याजी शायद इस बात को न समझें। आज जनता के मन को जनता के ध्यान को इस मौके पर ऐसे विधेयक को लाकर हटाया जा रहा है। कोशिश यह है कि जनता का संघर्ष जो रोटी का है, कपड़े का है, जो मकान का है, जो शिक्षा का है, जो दवा का है, वह धूमिल हो, ध्यान दूसरी ओर जाय। कारण क्या है, हमें कोई भी बताए ? एक बात मैं माननीया आपसे सुझाव के रूप में कहना चाहता हूँ। माफ़ करेंगे श्यामधर जी मिश्र और उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान के कोई हों।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But you are speaking on the Third Reading.

श्री राजनारायण : इसीलिए कह रहा हूँ। समझ लीजिए कि हम फर्स्ट रीडिंग पर बोल रहे हैं। जितना समय दिया है उसी के अन्दर (Interruptions) हमको मत टोकिए, हम खत्म कर देंगे। (Interruption) आप लोग 20-20, 25-25 मिनट ले चुके हैं, मुझको भी कहने दीजिए।

लाघ, कृषि, सामदायिक विकास और सहकारिता मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री एस० डी० मिश्र) : मैं तो नहीं बोल रहा हूँ। मेरे बैठने से ही इतने प्रोवोक हो गए।

श्री राजनारायण : जो मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान, बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी प्रान्तों के सदस्य हैं, उनसे विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन है। आज इस मुल्क में जितनी भी गड़बड़ हुई, वह गड़बड़ एक लालच के कारण हुई कि हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी प्रान्त को एक प्रधान मंत्री मिल जाय। अगर भविष्य में इस गड़बड़ी को बचाना है, तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो इन प्रान्तों के यहां पर संसद् सदस्य हों, वे अपने दिल में प्रतिज्ञा कर लें कि भविष्य में उत्तर प्रदेश या बिहार या मध्य प्रदेश या राजस्थान या पंजाब या

ऐसी जगहों से किसी को प्रधान मंत्री नहीं बनवायेंगे।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इस विधेयक से इसका क्या सम्बन्ध है ?

श्री राजनारायण : सम्बन्ध है। एक लाइम जूस होना है। प्रधान मंत्री का पद लाइम जूस है और उसी लाइम जूस के लान्च में आज इस देश को अनर्थ के गर्त में ले जाया जा रहा है। कारण है... (Interruptions)

(Time bell rings)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you should finish. It is time.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया देखा जाय कारण क्या है ? इसी सदन में राम रेड्डी ने कहा, नेहरू जी के वक्तव्य को पढ़कर सुना दिया। लालबहादुर शास्त्री जब वर मंत्री थे, उनके बयान को देखा जाय। आज इंदिरा गांधी अपने पूज्य पिता के, जो प्रधान मंत्री थे बताए हुए सिद्धान्तों को ठोकर मार कर दूसरी स्थिति पर गई। कारण यही है कि जो लाइम जूस है, जोकि प्रधान मंत्री का पद है, वह कहीं निकल न जाय। इसीलिये सारी को सारी कोशिश की जा रही है।

दूसरा कारण देखा जाय। हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी प्रान्तों की स्थिति क्या है ? चाहे शिक्षा को ले लिया जाय, चाहे आर्थिक स्थिति को ले लिया जाय। शिक्षा में एक हजार में जहां 4 ग्रेजुएट हैं, 3 ग्रेजुएट हैं। . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you must wind up. You have taken much time.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में आमदनी भी ढाई सौ से नीचे है। कृषि मंत्री बैठे हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश को 11 हजार नलकूप दिए गए जबकि मद्रास को एक लाख पैंतीस हजार।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश):
यह किस बिल पर बोल रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : इसी गोवा विधेयक पर,
जिस दिमाग से यह विधेयक आया है।

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You
have been given enough time.

श्री राजनारायण : हमको दो मिनट
दीजिए (Interruptions) आप लोगों की छाती
कों फट रही है, हमारे बोलने से ?

श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल : चोराहे पर
जाकर बोलिए इस तरह से, यहां सदन में
नहीं।

उपसभापति : आप 30 मिनट बोल
चुके हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : चिन्ता न करें, मैं
जल्दी समाप्त कर दूंगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You
are not relevant. All right. I will give
you only two minutes.

श्री राजनारायण : हम दो मिनट ही
बोलेगें, लेकिन बीच में कोई बोले तो वह समय
दिजियेगा।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि बेचारा जो अशोध
अनभिज्ञ युवक डिपुटी मिनिस्टर है, हम उससे
कहना चाहते हैं—उत्तर प्रदेश से उनका
भी सम्बन्ध है पैतृक . . .

उपसभापति : मगर यह गोआ बिल है।

श्री राजनारायण : इसलिए मैं कह
रहा हूं कि गोवा चाहे महाराष्ट्र में जाय, गोवा
चाहे मैसूर में जाय, गोवा चाहे यूनियन टैरीटरी
रहे—इस प्रश्न पर जितनी चर्चा नहीं होनी
चाहिए, उससे ज्यादा चर्चा हो गई। गोवा
पर जब तक विदेशी नियंत्रण था तब
तक हमने छाती खोल कर उसके मुकाबले

में लड़ाई की, मगर अनावश्यक ढंग से जिस
प्रान्ततीयता, जिस जातीयता, जिस सम्प्रदायवाद
को फैला-फैला रहे हैं, उससे देश की एकता
भंग हो रही है, टूट रही है। इसलिए मैं सभी
लोगों से कहना चाहूंगा कि गोवा कहां रहे,
कहां जाय, इस पर ज्यादा दिमाग न खपाओ ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That
will do. Yes, Mr. Shah.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Madam, I want
to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a
couple of minutes.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: My friend has
said that these Maharashtrians who
have spoken have no heart and that
they are guided by provincialism. I
take exception to this. On the con-
trary . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Don't take it.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: . . . my
friend must realise that during the
last election, even though the Maha-
rashtrians had secured a clear major-
ity, even then the Maharashtrians
have agreed to a poll being taken to
decide whether to merge with Maha-
rashtra or to remain as a Union ter-
ritory. Mysore is not stepping in. The
votes would have been divided. One
portion would have been for Mysore;
one would have been for remaining
as a Union territory and one would
have been for merger with Maha-
ashtra. But clearly the majority
would have been for merger with
Maharashtra. Mysoreans would be oblig-
ed to opt for Union territory. Even such
a handicap has been accepted by the
Maharashtrians. Does that not show
the sense of fairplay and justice of the
Maharashtrians? What more does my
friend want?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Madam De-
puty Chairman, we support the prin-
ciple of taking the opinion of the
people when their future is going to
be determined. As far as this principle
goes, our Party has no difference of
opinion on this point. But the point
arises that it has been a restrictive

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

choice and no just amendments have been accepted by the Minister. The amendments were tabled whether they could vote for Mysore or for a separate State to be carved out, the Minister said that this issue was not thrown out during the last election. How can he know that it was not thrown out? That was not the issue before the people. A section of the people agitated for that. So he has taken note of that point only. But there is definitely a section which might think otherwise. This has not been taken into account. I am of opinion that perhaps the majority of the people of Goa will vote for Maharashtra and it should be merged with Maharashtra. In that sense I have no quarrel. But I think it would have been fair if options had been open to them. This point of restricted referendum or plebiscite creates suspicions and leaves many questions unanswered of the people of the country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Another thing is this. This principle the Congress Government do not apply everywhere in India. It is only because of the compulsions within the ruling party and the reverses they suffered during the last election that they have chosen to bring forward this Bill. The principle is good, but may I ask what is the position of Saraikaila and Kharaswan that have been absorbed in Bihar in spite of Oriya being spoken there. There was a great movement in Orissa. Did you take an opinion poll there?

(Interruption by Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee)

Similarly, about Kashmir. You should have applied the same principle to the Kashmiri people. I should like to know whether in settlement of the Kashmir question the wishes of the people of Kashmir in some form or the other were taken into account. They should have been taken into account.

SHRI G. M. MIR: The Kashmir question has been settled according to the wishes of the people and this question has been decided in three general elections.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Wait, Mr. Mir. Fake elections or a military raj do not reflect the wishes of the people of the country. Anyway, I do not suggest that Kashmir should go out of India. But I do suggest that in determining the future of Kashmir the wishes of the people of Kashmir and its leaders should be consulted in some form or the other and a solution to the problem found. Those elections were all fake elections. It was all done under the military raj. That is no election.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should wind up, Mr. Ghosh. I will not give you more time. You cannot go on like this.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: They are interrupting, Madam. Then, there is the question of the Assamese hills people. They want a separate State. Do you take a referendum there? You are blocking their way. (Interruption by Shri G. M. Mir). Thereby you create a sore trouble spot there. You do not hold a referendum there because it does not suit somehow or other your interests. In this way you are keeping many sore points in the body politic of India which do not speak well for the future of the country. So because of particular exigencies and because of particular compulsions from within the Congress Party you have brought forward this Bill but not in a comprehensive way. I agree that poll should be taken. Referendum should be taken and they will vote for Maharashtra as far as my knowledge goes because they want merger with Maharashtra.

Then there is the question of Pondicherry, Mahe and Karaikal. They should be merged with Madras. You are not taking a poll there. You are leaving that question unanswered.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ghosh, you should wind up. Mr. Ruthnaswamy.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: . . . The same principle should apply to these territories.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, all this excitement and misunderstanding and the difficulties in which the Government are placed today could have been avoided if that solemn assurance of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru had been kept in mind and the Government had waited for the people of Goa themselves to agitate and the initiative in asking for an alteration in their status.

Madam, I would take up the few points made out by the Deputy Minister. He tried to make out that an opinion poll is the same as an election. He said that only the people resident in Goa at the present moment should be taken in the voters' list. He does not seem to realise the difference between an election and a plebiscite or a referendum. A plebiscite is taken among the people for the definite and decisive expression on a single point. A number of plebiscites were held soon after the first World War and the people, who were really the people concerned about their future status in the regions, wherever they had been, were consulted. There is a vital difference between an election and a plebiscite and therefore it is quite appropriate for the Members of the Opposition to ask for the inclusion of the people of Goa wherever they may be to be consulted on this opinion poll because the assurance given by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru and his successors was given to the people of Goa at that time, when Goa was separated from Portugal, that they would be consulted. They were assured that they would be consulted. In that struggle against the Portuguese a large number of Goans in Bombay took part. There is the great name of Prof. Soares associated with it—retired teacher—who

took a prominent part in the agitation, and he was allowed by the Government of India to go to Portugal to interview Dr. Salazar in order to convert him—no doubt he failed. But the people outside Goa were taken into confidence by the Government of India when it suited them. Therefore, I think it is very necessary that in fairness and justice the people of Goa, to whom the pledge was given by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, should be consulted.

I agree there will be difficulties. But all those difficulties can be overcome. At the end of the last World War the votes of large numbers of British soldiers, scattered all over the world as far as Malaya and the Far East, were taken. I think if the Government were really sincere about trying to get the real opinion of the people of Goa, to whom the assurance was given, they would include those people also. It is time for great statesmanship and not for mere legal hairsplitting and horse-trading in which the Deputy Minister has indulged.

There is a saying by Burke that a great empire and little minds go all together. By empire he meant not any territory or empire but rule. A great rule and little minds go ill together. Therefore, I make this appeal to the Government that even at this last moment they should take into consideration the opinion of all the people of Goa.

The Deputy Minister made much of the argument that the people of Goa are not a race. No one said that they were a race. The people of Goa are like the people of Maharashtra, like the people of Gujarat. They are an organic entity and it is to that entity that at the time of the liberation of Goa that this great solemn pledge was given by the Government of India and its leaders. It is this pledge that I want the Government of India to honour at this at this great movement in the history of Goa.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : उपसभापति महोदया, गोवा के अलग अस्तित्व के प्रश्न पर जोर डालकर गोवा के भविष्य को तय करने का सवाल जोड़ा गया है। यह कहा गया है कि चूंकि गोवा पुर्तगाली शासन में कहीं डेढ़ सौ साल और कहीं 450 साल तक रहा, इसलिये उसने अपना पृथक अस्तित्व बना लिया है, वह पृथक अस्तित्व कायम रहना चाहिये और पृथक अस्तित्व को नुकसान पहुंचाने वाला कोई काम नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं माननीय सदस्यों से, कि हिन्दुस्तान का कौन सा एक अस्तित्व रहा है? कुछ टुकड़े अंग्रेजों के शासन काल में थे, लेकिन जितना अंग्रेजी शासन में यह हिन्दुस्तान नहीं था, उस से ज्यादा बड़े हिस्से छोटे-छोटे राज्यों में विभक्त थे। राजशाही का सिस्टम आप गर्वनमेंट हम आज के समय उचित नहीं समझते लेकिन राजा को समाप्त करते ही क्या उस इलाके के लोगों के रहने की विशेषता स्वयमेव समाप्त हो गई? आपने किस से पूछकर उनको मिलाया और सरदार पटेल ने जब सारी रियासतों का एकीकरण करके हिन्दुस्तान का वर्तमान नक्शा देने की कोशिश की उस समय किसके साथ कौन सी आइडेंटिटी आपने मिलाई। हमने यहां पर एक को-आपरेटिव आइडेंटिटी का निर्माण किया है और अगर यहां पर 500 से अधिक आइडेंटिटीज शामिल होकर एक देश का गठन हुआ, तो गोवा का किसी भी आइडेंटिटी के आधार पर तर्क देना, यह देश की सारी राष्ट्रीय कल्पना के विपरीत है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है। क्या गोवा के इस प्रश्न को अलग कोई अस्तित्व में रखकर आप गोवा को सालाजारशाही के अस्तित्व में कायम रखना चाहते हैं, महज इसलिये कि सालाजार के शासन में अथवा उसके कुछ पूर्वजों के शासन में गोवा कुछ दिनों रह गया? मेरा निवेदन है कि आप इस पृथक आइडेंटिटी के आधार पर गोवा के प्रश्न को या इसी प्रकार देश के किसी भी सवाल को सुलझाने की कोशिश मत करिये। अगर भाषा का ही डिसीजन है, तो

ओपीनियन 'पोल' यह कौन सा उसका इलाज है। फिर तो एक्सपर्ट्स आप लिंगुइस्टिक्स को यह काम सौंप दीजिये, जो यह देखें कि कोंकणी कन्नड़ की शाखा या मराठी की शाखा हैं। भाषा शास्त्रियों का कन्वन्शन बुलाकर आप उनके लिये यह प्रश्न छोड़ दीजिये। आज 'कामन मैन' इस सवाल पर कौन सा निर्णय देगा? ओपीनियन पोल उसका कोई इलाज नहीं रखता।

आज लोगों ने मोहन रानाडे का उल्लेख किया। मैं निवेदन करूं कि मोहन रानाडे ने उनके कहने के अनुसार, चाहे हिंसा का मार्ग अपना कर गोवा के स्वराज्य के लिये काम किया है, लेकिन कांग्रेस के बंधुओं को यह सोचना चाहिये कि कांग्रेस के अंदर भी स्वराज्य की प्राप्ति के लिये काम करने वालों में दोनों प्रकार के लोग रहे लेकिन कांग्रेस ने उनमें इस प्रकार का कोई विभेद नहीं किया है। मेरा विचार है और मुझे आशा है कि सरकार मोहन रानाडे के प्रश्न पर क्योंकि उन्होंने कौन सी पद्धति से गोवा की स्वतंत्रता के हेतु आंदोलन में भाग लिया या उन इलाकों की मुक्ति के लिये किस प्रकार के काम कराये इस विषय को लेकर उनकी मुक्ति के प्रश्न पर जिस प्रकार के आरोप लगाने का प्रयत्न किया गया है, किसी भी प्रकार से उस कंसिडरेशन को सामने लाने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन जो लोग गोवा के लिये एक पृथक राज्य की मांग करते हैं वे अपने तर्क में मोहन रानाडे के नाम का प्रयोग करते हैं मैं समझता हूं यह मोहन रानाडे के प्रति, उस जल में बैठे वीर के प्रति, एक बहुत बड़ा अन्याय है। मेरा यह निश्चित दावा है कि केवल मोहन रानाडे ही नहीं, गोवा के जितने लोगों ने गोवा की मुक्ति संग्राम में भाग लिया और सक्रिय रहे, कभी भी उन्होंने इस भारत की सरकार से यह आश्वासन मांगने की कोशिश नहीं की कि आप हमारे भविष्य के बारे में क्या फैसला करेंगे, हम आजाद होने की कोशिश कर

रहे हैं, आप हमारी आजादी के लिये दबा दीजिये। उस समय क्या उन्होंने किसी तरह के शर्त रखने की कोशिश की कि हमारी संस्कृति की रक्षा करियेगा, हमें एक अलग रियासत बनाइयेगा, हमारे भविष्य को दस साल तक नहीं तय करने की कोशिश करियेगा? मुझे आदर है पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के प्रति लेकिन मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि दस साल के बाद की बात या किसी भी प्रकार की बात जो उन्होंने कही है नेशनल इन्स्टीट्यूट के बारे में वह आऊट आफ दी वे जाकर कही है। देश के स्वाधीनता संग्राम में, विदेशी दासता से मुक्ति पाने के अभियान में, सब लोग एक राष्ट्रीयता के सिद्धान्त पर जगह जगह लड़ें। तो उसमें यदि हम प्रमुखतः एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कारणों से राज्यों का गठन करें यह अलग कारण है लेकिन आज जो गोवा को अलग बनाने की बात कर रहे हैं, मुझे दुःख है कि तर्क दिये जाते हैं आर्थिक। परन्तु छोटे छोटे राज्यों का गठन करते समय जितने भी आर्थिक तर्क दिये गये, दुर्भाग्यवश आर्थिक उन्नति का दर्शन नहीं दिखायी देता। उसमें पृथक्वादी मनोवृत्ति का प्रधान्य दिखायी देता है। तर्क देते हैं नैचुरल रिसोर्सेज और इकनामिक एडवान्स-मेंट का लेकिन उसकी जड़ में काम करती है वहां की पृथक्वादी और सेपेरेटिव मनोवृत्तियां मैं उन भाइयों से निवेदन करूंगा डाग इन दी मैंगर पालिसी को चरितार्थ न करें। गोवा के भविष्य को तय करते समय ऐसा तर्क न करें, जिसके कारण उन पृथक्वादी मनोवृत्ति को किसी तरह से बल प्रदान हो। गोवा के स्वतंत्र होते ही वह प्रश्न नेशनल इन्स्टीट्यूट का हो जाना चाहिये। सरकार ने अभी तक तय नहीं किया है, पता नहीं क्यों? अभी पक्के आधार पर दिये गये निर्णय वह लागू नहीं कर सकी। वह ओपीनियन पोल के प्रश्न को ही आधार बनाये है, मुश्किल यह है कि उसको भी आधार बनाना नहीं चाहते कि एक कटे-गारिकल कमिटमेंट दे सरकार और उसके बाद फिर इस मामले में राजनैतिक दांवपेंच लागू करने की कोशिश नहीं करे।

श्री राजनारायण : माननीय, मेरा एक सवाल है।

उपसभापति : नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं इन्हीं से एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं। अगर वे जवाब देना चाहते हैं . . .

उपसभापति : आप चुप रहें।

श्री राजनारायण : आप ऐसी बात क्यों करती हैं * * * *
हम चाहते हैं हमारे सवाल का जवाब वह दें।

At this stage can I not ask a question from the Minister?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called the Minister.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I am not disturbing. I think others are disturbing. Why are you always saying this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not used the word. After everyone has spoken, I have called the Minister. Please take your seat, Mr. Shukla.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Not many questions have been raised during this time. There are one or two other points which have been raised. I shall reply to them. Mr. Niren Ghosh, in his characteristic manner, has raised and tried to link this question of Goa, Daman and Diu with the question of Kashmir. I personally feel that it is a very unprecedented way of looking at it. This is a question of internal adjustment that we are trying to achieve by ascertaining the wishes of the people of Goa, Daman and Diu. It has nothing to do with the question of Kashmir. We have always made it clear that this is an internal matter. In an internal matter we can always ascertain the wishes of the people for local adjustments but if

****Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri V. C. Shukla.]

Members of the Communist Party—Left—want to bring in their party's point of view on Kashmir on a matter like this, I must say that it is very unfortunate and absolutely uncalled for and this matter has nothing to do with what we may do or may not do with Kashmir. The question of Kashmir has absolutely no relevance to this particular matter.

Some other points were raised by Prof. Ruthnaswamy and other Members. I have already dealt at length with those points. Actually the whole question about who should vote and who should not vote depends upon whom we take as the people of Goa. Who are the people of Goa? Whether those who are normally resident in Goa are Goans or those who are not normally residents of Goa but bearing some Goanese names and who might have been there some 20 years back are Goans? Clearly the logic is on the side of people who have made Goa their home. Whether they originated from other parts of India or not is not the concern here. The whole question is clearly before us and we want to be very fair to those people who live in Goa, and those people are going to determine the future status of this Union Territory. There is no other thing. Although Mr. Rajnarain spoke for a great length of time, I do not think he made any point which is worth replying.

5 P.M.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:
He made the most important point.

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा सवाल यह है कि क्या सरकार के पास इस समय कोई ऐसा भी प्रस्ताव है कि भाषा के आधार पर बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश, राजस्थान और मध्य प्रदेश, इन चार स्टेटों को एक में इन्टिग्रेट कर दिया जाय ?

श्री बी० सी० शुक्ल : जी नहीं, हम ऐसे किसी प्रस्ताव पर विचार नहीं कर रहे हैं ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We now go to the Produce Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1966.

THE PRODUCE CESS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): It is already 5 O'Clock.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): This may be taken up tomorrow:

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We must finish the work as far as possible within the time allocated. We are sitting late every day, after 5 O'Clock, and I do not think that the House should disperse now.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अब तो पांच बज गया, क्या इसके बाद भी हाउस चलेगा ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION (SHRI S. D. MISRA): You have called me, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Mishra.

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : उपसभापति जी, मैं श्री सुब्रमण्यम् जी की ओर से यह प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि "उपज उपकर अधिनियम, 1966 में संशोधन करने वाले विधेयक पर, जिस रूप में वह लोक सभा द्वारा पारित किया गया है, उस पर विचार किया जाय ।"