

मिलता है और दूसरे को नहीं मिलता और बेनामी इत्यादि लेनदेन होता है, ये सारी बातें दूर हो जायेंगी। बेनामी कर्ज का जहां तक सवाल है, एपेक्स बैंक या सेन्ट्रल बैंक सोसायटी को रिजर्व बैंक से कर्जा देता है। यह जो कानून में हम अधिकार ले रहे हैं, उससे इस बुराई को दूर करने में हम सफलीभूत हो सकेंगे।

दूसरी बात आप लोन के बारे में कही ऐसे किसान जिनके पास जमीन न हो या दूसरों की जमीन जोतते हों या जो सिक्क्यूरिटी नहीं दे सकें, उनके लिये रिजर्व बैंक ने एक आप लोन की स्कीम बनाई है, वह करीब-करीब तैयार हो गई है, उसे लागू किया जायेगा। तो इन सारे नियंत्रणों से कोओपरेटिव बैंक इस विधेयक में निहित अधिकार से आप लोन के जरिये और दूसरे तरीके से किसानों को कर्जा देगा। आज एक शंका उठाई गई और कुछ डर हुआ कि शायद इस कानून के बनने से कोओपरेटिव बैंकिंग को धक्का लगेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि धक्का लगने के बजाय उसको प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा; क्योंकि रिजर्व बैंक के नियंत्रण के अधीन इसका दायरा इतना अधिक बढ़ेगा कि उसमें सुधार ही दिखाई देंगे। इससे कोओपरेटिव बैंकिंग का विस्तार होगा और अगले वर्षों में हम चाहते हैं कि कोओपरेटिव बैंकों के जरिये हम किसानों को अधिक से अधिक कर्जा दे सकें और खेती की पैदावार अगर खर्च की कमी से रुकने का अंदेशा हो तो हम कर्जा देकर उस कमी को दूर करेंगे। यह प्रोग्राम है। तो यह डर हुआ कि उससे कोओपरेटिव को शायद धक्का पहुंचे और कोओपरेटिव की बैंकिंग में और क्रेडिट में, कर्ज में, कमी हो। तो यह कमी की बजाय बढ़ोतरी होगी। इसलिए मेरा विश्वास है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें डर की कोई गुंजायश नहीं है।

फिर एक बात यह कही गई कि रेट आफ इन्टरेस्ट बहुत ज्यादा है। पहले

शायद दो परसेन्ट रिजर्व बैंक देता है स्टेट कोओपरेटिव बैंक को और वे 5 परसेन्ट ज्यादा चार्ज करते हैं।

شری عہد الغلی : نو پرسنٹ تک

چلا جاتا ہے -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : नौ परसेंट तक चला जाता है।]

श्री बी० आर० भगत : अभी आपने देखा होगा कि सारा इन्टरेस्ट स्ट्रक्चर जो है, सूद की दर का स्ट्रक्चर, वह बदल गया है। डिपोजिट्स पर हम ज्यादा देते हैं और बैंक रेट बढ़ गया है। इन कारणों से आप देखेंगे कि रिजर्व बैंक जिस रेट से स्टेट कोओपरेटिव बैंक को देता है वह 2 परसेन्ट नहीं है, अब 4 परसेन्ट है और स्टेट कोओपरेटिव बैंक आधा परसेन्ट अपने खर्च का मार्जिन रखता है—सेन्ट्रल बैंक 2 परसेन्ट और प्राइमरी क्रेडिट सोसाइटी ढाई परसेन्ट। यह पूरा मार्जिन 5 परसेन्ट होता है। इस प्रकार 4 परसेन्ट में उनको मिलता है तो 9 परसेन्ट लेते हैं। अब आप 9 परसेन्ट को देखें और बाजार की दर को देखें तो बाजार में 12 परसेन्ट पर, 18 परसेन्ट पर, आजकल लोगों को सूद मिलता है। तो उस हिसाब से इस रेट पर भी कोओपरेटिव के जरिये सूद मिलना, यह महंगा नहीं कहा जा सकता।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं विधेयक को पेश करता हूँ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 and the Banking Companies Act, 1949, for the purpose of regulating the banking business of certain co-operative societies and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

†[] Hindi transliteration.

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

Clauses 2 to 14 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE GOA, DAMAN AND DIU (EXTENSION OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE AND THE ARBITRATION ACT) BILL, 1965

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW (SHRI JAGANATH RAO): Madam, I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, and the Arbitration Act, 1940, to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu and for certain other matters be taken into consideration."

As explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the Bill is a further step in the process of integration of the legal system of the Union Territory with the general pattern of the legal system in the rest of India. A number of Indian laws including the Indian Penal Code, the Indian Evidence Act and the Code of Criminal Procedure have already been extended to that Union Territory. The Code of Civil Procedure was, however, not extended as it was necessary to reorganise the subordinate civil courts before extending that Code. The Government of Goa, Daman and Diu have already undertaken legislation to reorganise the civil

courts in the territory on the pattern obtaining under the Bombay Civil Courts Act and requested that Parliamentary legislation be undertaken to extend the Code of Civil Procedure, having regard to some of its provisions having inter-State operation. Under the Portuguese law, civil procedure and arbitration are interconnected and, as such, it is proposed to extend the Arbitration Act along with the Civil Procedure Code.

These Acts will be enforced with effect from the date the reorganised civil courts come into existence in the Union Territory.

The Bill is on the lines of similar legislation for extension of laws and contains certain consequential amendments to the Goa, Daman and Diu (Judicial Commissioners' Court) Regulation, 1963.

The question was proposed.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Bill. It is a small Bill and it seeks to apply certain provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure and the Arbitration Act to Goa, Daman and Diu. There should be no quarrel why this Bill should not be introduced and passed by this House. But I doubt the wisdom of the Government in bringing this Bill forward at this juncture. Madam, as you are aware, the question of Goa's merger with the neighbouring territories is pending for a long time. When Goa was liberated there was a great demand that it should be merged with the neighbouring State of Maharashtra and Diu with the State of Gujarat. There was a lot of controversy over this question and the ruling party was also divided. Unfortunately, the other political parties are also divided on this issue and many of the reasonable persons also have taken a sectarian view of this matter. After Goa was liberated, there was an election in that territory and a regular legislature was formed there. In that election, there was the

specific issue whether Goa should be merged with the neighbouring State or whether it should be merged with the other State which claimed that Goa should go along with it—I mean, Mysore.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Who raised this issue during the elections?

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: I do not know, somebody must have raised it. Then there was a third alternative also, whether Goa should remain independent. There was a clear verdict. Political parties were formed on this particular issue. There was the Maharashtra Gomantak Party which was successful and they got a majority also in the Legislature and they formed their government also in Goa. Later on, the Legislature of Goa passed a Resolution saying that the territory should be merged immediately. Now, this question has been hanging for a long time, and internally there is very much discontent over the indecision on the part of the Central Government. Now, I do not know why the Government is hesitant about taking a very drastic or a final decision in regard to Goa. They have been committing this mistake with regard to other territories also, they are suffering from this indecision. I do not want to raise this controversy at the moment when our frontiers are threatened and when our Army has gone to liberate our country and to meet the aggression, and at this juncture, I do not want to raise this controversy whether Goa should be immediately merged with Maharashtra or not. But, as I said, it would have been better if the Government had thought about it before this legislation. This gives an impression that the Government indirectly wants to keep Goa as a separate entity and slowly and slowly they apply certain provisions to this territory, and ultimately by this hesitancy or by this method they may perpetuate the territory of Goa. I am sure that the

people of Goa will not tolerate this and it is not the time to raise the voice against this move. But once they have given their verdict clearly on the issue of merger, there should not be any difficulty in at least declaring for the present that ultimately Goa will be merged into the neighbouring territory. But unfortunately the Government is creating a wrong impression by applying the Central laws to the territory.

In Kashmir also it was so; for a time there were two Prime Ministers in one country, there were two flags and there were two Constitutions and all that. Now, the Government fortunately have learnt a lesson and slowly and slowly they are remedying their past mistakes. I do not know whether the same thing would happen in the case of Goa also. Goa is an important territory. It is a naval base. Strategically also it is very important and the Government should not give any cause for the spread of this discontent or for this impression that Government wants to keep such a tiny State of Goa as a separate unit. There were so many States before the Constitution came into being; there were very many small States. Afterwards the States' reorganisation came. It was thought that the whole country should be reorganised on a linguistic basis. And the small units which were here and there should be merged into one big compact unit. Therefore, States' reorganisation came about and linguistic States were carved out. Many people doubt the wisdom of creating States on linguistic basis. But as far we are concerned, we are in favour of linguistic States from the very beginning because we believe in democracy. And in order to function well in a democracy it is absolutely necessary that the people should participate in the administration of the State. They can do so only through their mother-tongue. Therefore, these States were carved out. Unfortunately, there were some wranglings between States and States. Even now there are some major questions. There

[Shri R. S. Khandekar.]

are many important disputes with regard to the borders of the States. But if there is enough wisdom and reasonableness and if there is mutual confidence between the people, I think these disputes can be easily solved. So, when small areas were merged into big States, there is no justification absolutely why a small place, a place smaller even than a district, should remain independent and the Government should waste so much expenditure over a legislature, Lt.-Governor's paraphernalia and all that.

The question will arise: What should be the test? The test in a democracy is always the people's will and the people there have unhesitatingly given their verdict in favour of Maharashtra. But the Government have disregarded that verdict and instead are trying to perpetuate a small State like Goa. Therefore, I wish the Government had deferred this Bill for some time. And when the Government comes to the conclusion—I hope the Government will not commit this mistake, but if they come to this conclusion that Goa should remain a separate State—then all these Central laws can be applied at that particular moment. Nothing is lost if till then the old arrangement continues in the present State of Goa, Daman and Diu. Therefore, Madam, at this particular hour, when there is absolute need of unity, I wish there should be no discordant voice. When our Army is marching forward and a glorious decision has been taken, I think, for the first time in the last seventeen or eighteen years, a wise decision . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): There are many wise decisions. This is one of them.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: . . . when when it has come out of its hesitancy and broken practically with the past policies—we welcome that decision—in order to show our solidarity and unity, the Government at this moment should not bring forward such a legislation which will create bitterness in the

country. I do not say that the question of merger should be decided now. Goa decision can wait. If the country remains intact, we can decide the question later on. This is not the time. It can be decided when normal conditions prevail. That will be the time when such a legislation can be brought forward.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am also of the opinion that this is hardly the time for the Government to bring in such a piecemeal bit of legislation in regard to judicial decisions in Goa. All legal and constitutional legislation in regard to Goa should wait for the final decision about the future of Goa. As Mr. Khandekar has pointed out, at a time when we are locked up in a struggle with Pakistan, it is hardly the time to bring forward such a piece of legislation. It all seems to emanate from the idea which is a sort of obsession with the Government in power that in order to keep a legislature going it must be fed, as factories are fed, with legislative proposals from time to time. I wish Government would consider that our Parliament is not only a legislature but a parliament, and 'Parliament' comes from a French word which means talking. I wish our Parliament and our Legislatures were more of talking shops than legislative factories. More time should be given for the discussion of public affairs than for the consideration of legislative proposals. Most of them, I am afraid, are half-baked.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Are we having less time now?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: With regard to this particular piece of legislation, it goes against one of the guarantees given by the late Prime Minister before and after the incorporation of Goa into Indian territory. Before its incorporation, more than once Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru gave an assurance to the people of Goa that if at any time Goa should decide to join India, its culture, its language, its legal

system would be kept intact, and after the incorporation of Goa into Indian territory, specially in regard to laws and customs, the late Prime Minister gave a definite guarantee that these laws and customs should continue till such time as the people of Goa would want to change them.

Madam, the introduction of the Indian civil procedure system into Goa is particularly inappropriate because this civil procedure system which they have derived, as it is from the English system, is totally opposed to the legal and judicial system of Goa which it has derived from Portugal. Those who are acquainted with the history of law know very well that most of the continental legal systems are derived from the Roman system of law and procedure. Whereas we have derived our legal and judicial system from the British, it is totally different from the system obtaining in Goa; it is based on the Roman law prevalent in England. It is not only different, it is radically a different system. They have been used to a Portuguese legal system where a Judge finds a much larger place in the examination of witnesses, in the testing of evidence, in appreciating the evidence and examining the witness than a place prevalent in the English system. So I think this piece of legislation is trying to introduce a radical change in the legal and judicial system of Goa.

It is not by this kind of piecemeal legislation that we are going to make the people of Goa friendly towards India. The time for changing the whole legal system of Goa will come when a final decision is taken as to the future of Goa. Madam, the change in the legal system, which is embodied in this civil procedure introduced by us, must be provided by general and legal education through which the people of Goa would be prepared to receive this truly radical and new system. Therefore, I hope and trust that on account of the circumstances in which this piecemeal legislation is going to be introduced, on account of the radical difference between the

system which has prevailed in Goa up till now and the system which we are going to introduce and especially in view of the solemn guarantee given by the late Prime Minister that no change would take place in the laws and customs of the people in Goa unless and until the people of Goa themselves ask for a change, the Government will stop short and withdraw this utterly unnecessary piecemeal legislation which may even hurt the feelings of the people of Goa and make them hostile to any further incorporation of the life and activities and the legal system of Goa with that of India.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): I oppose this Bill. This looks a very innocuous Bill and the Deputy Minister introduced it in a very gentle way, but actually it is a very controversial one.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): You want it to be merged with Kerala?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: When Mysore can claim merger of Goa, I can also claim.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Landscape is the same.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I will come to that. As pointed out by the previous speaker, there is a lot of difference between the legal system existing in India and the system that was there in Goa. So introducing this piece of legislation will not help. Secondly, this Bill is meant or is understood to be meant to delay the merger of Goa with Maharashtra. That is the way in which it would be understood. I could very well understand the Minister bringing a Bill like this one year ago but now the main question before the people of Goa and before the people outside Goa is merger. Even the ruling party, with all their differences, had to come to some decision recently about the future of Goa. The High Command of the Congress have decided to have

1965

[SHRI M. N. Govindan Nair.]

another election on this issue. When we have to settle the question of the merger of Goa in the immediate future, why should you unnecessarily drag the whole country into a controversy on this now? You cannot postpone the merger of Goa for long. I agree that when the fight is going on our borders, during that period we may not take up the question of merger of Goa; but immediately that situation is over, this is a question which cannot be postponed. Under the circumstances, it is not necessary now to move this legislation.

Coming to the question of merger of Goa, it is a controversial issue.

SHRI JAGANATH RAO: Why raise it?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: According to some people there is one view that it should merge with Maharashtra. There is another view that Goa should remain as a separate State for some time more and there is a more fantastic view that it should merge with Mysore.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Very fantastic.

AN HON. MEMBER: It does not exist at all.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I hope the Deputy Chairman will not get offended with me.

SHRI JAGANATH RAO: Why not with Kerala?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The majority view in Goa is that it should merge with Maharashtra.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Question.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: There is no question about it. Yes, they have already given their verdict during the last elections when the Maharashtrawadi Gomantak Party got the majority. So, as far as the people of Goa are concerned, the majority is

for merger with Maharashtra. Then there was a section of people—and a considerable section I agree—who wanted Goa to remain as a separate State. They also now feel that by remaining separate they will not be able to achieve what they once thought they could.

SHRI A. D. MANI: May I ask how this Bill would prejudice the issue of merger or non-merger? Suppose this Bill is passed, do you think it will stand in the way of the merger?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is not the point. Immediately after this emergency when you have to bring in a Bill for the merger of Goa with some other part of the country, why should you bring it now? That is my point?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I understand the point.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: With regard to the other section which stood for a separate Goa, they were under the impression that if Goa remained a separate State that group would be able to get a majority, but the last election belied that hope also. Now they know that even if it remained a separate State, this Gomantak Party will be in majority always. So there is a toning down of their fight against the merger with Maharashtra.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I do not think it is correct.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Thirdly, those who are demanding a separate State also know that a State with five lakhs of people cannot remain as a separate State for long. India cannot afford to have that luxury of having a small State with five lakhs of people as a separate entity. They also know that but what they are worried about is that the Maharashtrians do not woo them. That is their complaint. A good section of the people there feel that they cannot continue like this for long and

they have to merge with some neighbouring State and their choice is definitely Maharashtra—there is no doubt about it—but the Maharashtrians outside, instead of wooing them . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: Why woo them? It is an arranged marriage.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It is not. They feel: 'If they try to rape us, how can we stand it?' That is how they look at it. There is the Maharashtra Assembly passing a Resolution and then the Maharashtra people are saying that they will lead a march to Goa. They have to give up this aggressive attitude. I have been to Goa and I have talked to all sections of the people there. And this is what you find. Even those people who want to merge with Maharashtra, you see their attitude. They are hesitant. So, if my friend, Mr. Deokinandan Narayan and his friends be more tactful and try to win them over instead of adopting aggressive ways, I think . . .

3 P.M.

SHRI A. D. MANI: You want him to woo.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Yes, and I find . . .

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Marriage by capture.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: And I found a small section which wants to remain separate. And what was their argument? "When we have a legislature at our gates, and when we have Ministers so nearby . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is all beside the point; you talk on the legal system.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: This is very important.

SHRI A. D. MANI: This is the crux of the point, the crux of the Bill is the merger issue.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: The crux of the Bill is the merger issue and the Minister wants to evade the issue of merger by bringing in such things which are intended to perpetuate the present condition. This is my point. So there is only a very small section there and they say, "When we have a Legislative Assembly at our doors, why should we ask for merger and reduce the number of our M.L.As. and all that?" So there is only one small section but that is not a strong section.

Then I was much surprised to find the move of the Mysore people—here is my friend. I went round Goa for nearly a week and I did not find one man who knows Canarese. There may be some college professors, or somebody else, but otherwise there was nobody that way, and there is nobody who wants its merger with Mysore. And in Mysore also, who wants the merger of Goa except your Ministers?

SHRI A. D. MANI: And Members of Parliament.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I do not know; I hope he will be more competent to explain it. I do not know how the Congress was persuaded to listen to its Mysore friends to hold the A.I.C.C. session in Mysore, at Bangalore, and while the Congress was in session at Bangalore, they also organised a demonstration to show that the people in Bangalore or Mysore are for having merger of Goa with Mysore.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: The Kasaragode people want it.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I think it was all pre-arranged, and I can tell you that a demonstration which was taken out by some workers to ventilate their demands in the matter of food or something, that also, very cleverly the Government side put it as a demonstration for the merger of Goa with Mysore. So that is a very fantastic claim to make and that should be discarded. Not only that;

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.]
 the ruling party should not allow such things to happen. They have to tell their friends in Mysore that they should not create unnecessary problems. When the people in Goa do not want to have any merger with Mysore, and when the majority of the people in Mysore do not want it, only the ruling party and the leaders of the ruling party in Mysore State take up the responsibility of organising an agitation there and create confusion in the country. Now that should be put a stop to. In Goa there are two sections of people. Some people, a minority section wants that it should remain a separate State, but a vast majority want its merger with Maharashtra. So this is the position there. In the circumstances such piecemeal legislation is no good. I think you should withdraw it for the time being. As long as Goa remains a separate State, let them have the present legal system, and immediately after this emergency bring in another Bill whereby you ask for the merger of Goa, Daman and Diu with the neighbouring States. So, I think, that should be the attitude.

In this connection, I would also say that it is not only with regard to Goa. There is also Pondicherry. Why do you want it as a separate State? I cannot understand. How long are you going to allow such small bits of territory to remain as a separate State?

SHRI A. D. MANI: They do not want communism there.

Then my friend was referring to culture and all that, that it was a separate culture, and all that. What is the separate culture in Goa?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Based on Portuguese culture.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Apart from the fact that it was based on Portuguese culture, actually there is very little difference. Of the five lakh Goans, more than one and a half lakhs live in Bombay, and one very

good thing I found about Goa is that—because of the impact of the West—they have got modern ideas. They are very, very efficient and clever, and all that. Why not the whole of India benefit by their talents? Why do you want to restrict them to a small State? They should be part of a bigger State, and that should not be delayed. So also with regard to Pondicherry. Why do you want a separate State of Pondicherry? What is the French culture? There is Mahe, a much smaller bit. For such small things how many years you want to integrate them? You finish with such small things as quickly as possible, so that there may not be any trouble brewing as a result of the delay. For example, if you had taken a decision on the question of the merger of Goa immediately after the last elections, when the verdict of the people was given, Mysore would not have come later with its claim on Goa, and all that. Now this delay has given them and some other people room to raise unnecessary issues and create confusion in the minds of the people. So I think Government should withdraw this Bill and promise this House and the country that immediately, in the near future, after this emergency is over a decision will be taken with regard to the future of Goa.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, in the context of the current political and national issues, the Bill is non-controversial, and the time taken for introducing the Bill is also understandable, because certain preliminaries were to be arranged and prerequisites to be fulfilled. It is true that the original system as obtaining in Goa was different from our system here. We follow the British pattern while the continental pattern was followed in Goa. But that is no reason why our system should not be introduced now. Now that would be a step ahead in the direction not only of legal integration but also of national integration. To that extent it is also welcome. But I should like to say, as has been already suggested, that this is a piecemeal legislation,

and in view of the present political and national situation, it would have been better had this Bill not been introduced at all. True, we are facing great problems, particularly on our frontiers, and therefore we would observe a sort of moratorium so far as our domestic problems are concerned. This is all right but at the same time, now that this particular Bill is being introduced, I must say that this is yet another indication of the Government's policy of vacillation and procrastination regarding the future of Goa.

I may say that the Goa problem has been handled in a very tragic way. Perhaps that is the mildest word that I can use. And it has been allowed to drift in such a fashion as to allow vested interests. As a matter of fact, make Goa the cockpit for conflicting vested interests. As a matter of fact, it was in the interest of the nation that Goa, Daman and Diu should have been merged with the adjacent State or States. I am using the words State or States, because Goa, Daman and Diu are not contiguous areas. But the question of their merger should have been finally settled. Therefore, I say that instead of introducing such piecemeal measures, the Government of India should come forward at the proper time, immediately after this national emergency is over, with a measure to merge Goa, Daman and Diu with the adjacent State or States, and then it should become unnecessary or superfluous to introduce such a Bill as is being introduced now.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam, I am surprised at the opposition to this innocuous and routine measure. The discussion has raised many wider issues, the issue of merger, the issue of the assurance of the late Prime Minister about retention of the special culture of the Goan people. But let us be clear that this is a procedural law and not a substantive law. While it may be said of substantive laws that they form a part, and a valuable part of the culture of the people, procedural laws have nothing to do with the culture of the people. This is procedural

law, as I have already said, and also of routine type. It only extends the Civil Procedure Code to the territory of Goa, and as is normal in such cases when extensions are made, certain saving clauses in regard to orders, directions and circulars that have been issued in the past are made. This Bill makes provision for all that. Moreover, when there is the extension of a law to a new territory, powers of adaptation are conferred on the executive. When we promulgated our Constitution, the President of India was given wide powers to adapt past laws which had been promulgated in the British times, to the new Constitution, to the new set-up of things. These broadly are the three things that this simple measures seeks to do.

And so, I am rather surprised to find that an attempt is being made to put forth the argument as if this measure is an attempt to side-track the issue of merger. There is nothing like that here. It is possible that merger would be the proper solution and good solution. But someone has remarked, the best is always the enemy of the good. There are some hon. friends who want that this Bill should be withdrawn and I think they can be placed in that class. They want that this good thing should be deferred because better thing has not come.

One hon. Member said that the late Prime Minister gave certain assurances to the people of Goa, and one of them was that the special culture, laws and customs of Goa shall be respected till the people of Goa desire otherwise. Well, while making this statement, our late Prime Minister also said that it shall be the endeavour of this country and of this Parliament to slowly integrate the territories that are now known as the territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, in every respect with the other parts of the country.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Yes, but slowly.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: This Bill is really an honest but mild endeavour, in my opinion, in that direction. As I have already stated, while consi-

1965

dering those assurances, let us not forget that this is only procedural law and procedural laws are not substantive laws which latter really form part of the culture and civilisation of a people.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: But even procedural law is part and parcel of the legal system of the country. How can you separate procedural law from that?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: The late Prime Minister gave no assurance that the whole legal apparatus of Goa shall be retained as it was, when Goa became part of India. Otherwise his other assurances which in my opinion is the major assurance to this country and Parliament, namely, that Goa shall be slowly integrated with the rest of the country, has no meaning.

Madam, some hon. Members have said that it should be part of Maharashtra State. There are others who may urge that it should go to the State of Mysore. But I can assure this House and all those hon. Members that this legislation is neutral and would operate neutrally between the claims of Maharashtra and the claims of Mysore. This legislation is not going to tip the balance in favour of Maharashtra or in favour of Mysore. I can therefore see no possible objection to this legislation on this score.

There are others who have said that since Goa rightly belongs to Maharashtra, why not wait until the merger of Goa with Maharashtra? But then it has been made clear in the objects of this Bill that the Maharashtra Gomantak Party which is in power in Goa, are contemplating to put a legislation on the statute book, which would pattern the civil courts of Goa on the same lines as the civil courts of Bombay. When they have made that endeavour, that would be nullified if the Civil Procedure Code is not in the meantime extended to that territory, because, as has been rightly pointed out by one of the hon. Members who opposed the Bill earlier, the legal system is an integral whole. You cannot have one system of courts and another system of procedural law.

Therefore, when the Maharashtra Gomantak Party itself is planning to reframe the whole structure of the Goa civil courts, it is very necessary not only proper, but it becomes very necessary also—that this Code should be extended to Goa.

Madam, a wider issue has been raised. But that wider issue as I have already stated, is not affected by this legislation. If I may repeat again, this legislation is neutral between the claims of Maharashtra and the claims of Mysore. Therefore, I find no point in any of the arguments advanced by hon. Members opposite. If it is to go Maharashtra ultimately as it is bound to, in my opinion, then that State will have this legislation to rely on because before integration or merger, the particular system of courts, the particular system of procedure that obtains in Maharashtra would be prevalent in Goa.

I do not want to address this House on the wider issue of merger, whether Goa should merge today or ten years after. This is a matter for the executive to consider and I think they are applying their mind to this problem. Let me remind this House that some wise man has remarked that it is always proper in public affairs to hasten slowly, and by bringing forth this measure Government are really hastening slowly and I am sure that when the appropriate time comes this legislation will help rather than hinder the integration of Goa with Maharashtra to whom it rightfully belongs.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, I had no intention to participate in this debate but some controversial issues have been raised. Some Members have advocated that Goa should be merged here and now with Maharashtra. There is difference of opinion about the question of the future of Goa. As Prof. Ruthnaswamy has rightly pointed out, the late Prime Minister had given a solemn undertaking that Goa's future would be deferred for a period of ten years. There was no mortal hurry for the

Congress Parliamentary Board to reverse that decision, to give a go-bye to that solemn undertaking given by the late Prime Minister to the people of Goa and to ask the Chief Minister of Goa whether he would be prepared to resign and seek a fresh mandate from the people with regard to the future of Goa. It was quite unnecessary and the Congress Parliamentary Board should not have raised this question at all but should have abided by the undertaking given by the late Prime Minister.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: But if the majority of the people want it?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, it is not for me or for anybody else to impose our decision on the people of Goa. The people of Goa should really and fairly take the decision. Goa's merger with Maharashtra might have been one of the items in the election manifesto of the Gomantak Party but that was not a straight issue that was put before the people of Goa, whether Goa should merge with Maharashtra or whether Goa should merge with some other neighbouring State or whether Goa should remain as a Union Territory. The late Prime Minister had given the undertaking that for ten years Goa would remain as a Union Territory and so the people of Goa did not take it seriously, this question of Goa's merger with Maharashtra. It is possible that some of the supporters of the Gomantak Party might have voted for the merger of Goa with Maharashtra, especially when it was in the election manifesto but then to say just because they got a narrow-majority in the Assembly the entire people of Goa are for merger with Maharashtra is not a correct proposition. If you analyse the votes polled by the Maharashtra Gomantak Party and the votes polled against this Party, it would be clear that the majority of the people of Goa did not vote for Goa's merger with Maharashtra. They got only sixteen seats out of thirty while the United Goan Party got twelve seats, Congress one and independent one. These people

are not for merger of Goa with Maharashtra and so it is quite evident, if you take the voting figures, that the majority of the people of Goa did not exercise their vote in favour of merger of Goa with Maharashtra. They have got a narrow majority and after forming the Government they have passed a resolution urging the merger of Goa with Maharashtra, but this is not sufficient to say that the overwhelming majority of the people of Goa are for the merger of Goa with Maharashtra. Even the very position of the Ministry now is threatened because three members, M.L.As., belonging to this Party have already resigned from this Party and today or tomorrow the President might be obliged to proclaim President's Rule in Goa.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Maharashtra): Not on this issue.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: They have resigned, whether on this issue or not, but I am sure that even on this issue there are differences. The Speaker of the Goa Assembly was not for holding elections to decide the future of Goa; on the other hand, he wanted a plebiscite to be held to decide the future of Goa. The ruling party there is cracking and there is no unity or unanimity of opinion with regard to the future of Goa. Madam Deputy Chairman, there are four issues open before the people of Goa. There is a considerable section which wants that Goa should be merged with Maharashtra. There is another section in Goa which wants that it should be merged with Mysore.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: No.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: There is a very powerful section which wants that Goa should continue as a Union Territory for the present, for ten years. Later on, they might decide which way Goa should go, and there is another section inside Goa and outside, which wants that a separate State of Konkan—speaking the Konkaning—should be carved out and that Goa should be merged with that State. These four issues are before the people of Goa. It is a very con-

1965

troversial issue and so this is not the proper moment or opportune time . . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: A separate State with areas taken out of Maharashtra and Mysore.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, but most of the people who speak Konkani, the majority of them, live in Mysore State and the President of the Konkani Sabha in South Canara stated recently that Goa should be merged with Mysore. There are many people who still feel that a separate Konkani State should be carved out. I, therefore, plead that this is a very controversial issue where emotions are roused, excitement is created and sentiments are involved and this issue should be solved with the willing consent of the people of Goa. I have no objection to the wishes of the people being taken into consideration either by way of elections or by the adoption of some other method but then this is not the opportune time for us to divert our attention to controversial issues where Indians living in one part of the country would fight against those who live in the other part of the country when we are faced with our enemy on the frontiers. So for another ten years the question of Goa's future should not be decided and it should be left to the people of Goa to decide their own future.

May I add, Madam Deputy Chairman, in some countries there are free international ports? And Goa is a very good port and it has very good scenic beauty. It should be developed as a tourist paradise and if Goa is allowed to be a free international port, our tourist traffic will increase and the income of the people of Goa will also be increased to the extent to which you provide facilities for others to come into Goa.

Another vital factor that should be taken into consideration today is there is no prohibition in Goa. If Goa is merged with Maharashtra or Mysore . . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is a valid point.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:

. . . the prohibition laws that exist in both the States will be extended to Goa and Goa's future will not be as bright as it is today, because that is the main source of income for them. If it is converted into a free international port, many tourists will go there both from inside India and outside and it will enrich the coffers of Goa, and the Goan people will therefore feel that they will have better opportunities in life if Goa remains as a Union Territory. And added to that if the Central Government is generous in giving grants and other loans to the people of Goa so that their cultural and economic level is always kept high, they will not have any feeling of displeasure at having become a part and parcel of India.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Madam, he is misleading the House by saying . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chordia.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: I do not want to speak on this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. Pandit Tankha.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Bill and I support it strongly. I have been unable to appreciate the arguments put forward by the Opposition while opposing this Bill. Whether Goa, Daman and Diu shall merge with Maharashtra or with Mysore is immaterial for the consideration of this Bill. That argument is wholly outside the purview of the points to be taken up for consideration of this Bill. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is mentioned:

"The legal system of the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu is some what different from the general pattern of the Indian legal system. In order that laws in force in the rest of India may uniformly apply to Goa, Daman and Diu, two Regulations, namely the . . . were promulgated

by the President providing for the extension to that Union territory of a number of Indian laws including the Indian Penal Code, the Indian Evidence Act and the Code of Criminal Procedure."

So by the President's Regulations, the enactments mentioned, which are applicable to the rest of India, also apply to that territory. But when doing so the President could not extend the Civil Procedure Code because the system of courts existing in that territory was somewhat different from that of the courts existing in India. That was why the Civil Procedure Code could not be applied through those Regulations and it is only because of this that this Bill is now being brought forward. While extending the Civil Procedure Code, it is also desired that the Arbitration Act should also be extended to that territory. Therefore, Madam, I do not see any reason why this Bill should be opposed. Whether the territory of Goa, Daman and Diu is merged with one State of India or the other is wholly beside the point.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMACHANDRA SATHE) in the Chair.]

In any case, wherever the territory may be merged it will continue to be a part of India and therefore the laws which apply to India should also apply to this territory. Therefore, I would strongly support this Bill on this ground.

As regards the question of merger of Goa, Daman and Diu with one particular State or the other, Madam Vice-Chairman, I had the privilege of visiting Goa at the end of May last. A large number of Members of Parliament were invited by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to visit some State undertaking in Bombay, Baroda and other places. While we were on tour visiting the undertakings in Bombay, we were extended an invitation by the proprietor of the Jayanthi Shipping Company to visit one of their largest freighters which was at

that time in Goa. We accepted that invitation and many of us visited Goa for two days. Goa, Madam, is a beautiful place, a very beautiful country and a rich country at the same time. But what I was sorry to see was that the country so rich in minerals had not been developed to the extent to which it should have been. There one saw the same poverty among the people, as you find in many other parts of our country; small hamlets with poor people who could hardly afford their daily needs. But educationally, I am glad to see it was more advanced than many other parts of the country. Now, Madam, during that visit of ours a reception was held in our honour by the proprietor of the Jayanthi Shipping Company and in that reception members of both the parties of Goa, the ruling party as well as the congress-minded people, met us. The question of merger being the most important for them was uppermost in their minds and they naturally had talks with us on this subject. Some of the Ministers of the Government though not the Chief Minister himself, were present at the reception and we had the privilege of meeting them all. It is not true that it is the unanimous wish of the people of Goa that they should merge with one part of the country or the other. Opinion is divided and it is difficult to say which party predominates. While one party claims to be in a majority and they go by the fact that they have won the last elections to the State Legislature—I refer to the Gomantak Party—the other party says that it is not a fact that the elections were fought on that issue and to treat that verdict as a verdict for merger with this party or that group would be a wrong thing.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: What is the name of the ruling party?

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Goman-tak Party.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: It is Maharashtrawadi Gomantak Party. The name itself says that.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: There is nothing in the name.

اب شری شہر خان - (میسور) :

مجاہدتی اس کے پہچان نہیں ہے

† [श्री शेरखां (मैसूर) : अब मेजारिटी
 इसके पीछे नहीं है ।]

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: They claimed that they were in a majority but the leaders of the other group who were also present there said, no. They said that along with the Christian population of Goa, they were in favour of Goa retaining either its old identity or at least retaining that identity for the time being as was mentioned by the late Prime Minister and in the light of the assurance which was given to them. They say if there is any doubt at all on this point, a specific plebiscite should be held on this very point as to whether Goa wants to merge with Maharashtra or not. As far as we are concerned, no Party put forward before us a case for its merger with Mysore. That may have been in their minds, but, in any case, nobody presented that point of view to us. While talking to them I expressed my personal view that it would be better to wait for some years and let the feelings of the people subside for the time being and then in a calmer atmosphere they may decide for themselves as to whether they want merger with Maharashtra or with Mysore or they want any other form of government. As far as the Congress-minded Parties were concerned, they accepted this view-point that it would certainly be better, instead of a decision being taken now regarding merger, if the matter was kept pending for some time.

I might also mention that at that time fear was expressed by some of the gentlemen that there was a danger that Mysoreans might bring in some of their men into the State and by allowing them to come and live

there they would thereby try to gain a majority for those who are for the State's merger with Mysore. However, we could not and did not get a very clear picture regarding the number of people who were in favour of its merger with Maharashtra. We were told that as far as the Christian population was concerned, it was not in favour of its merger with Maharashtra at all. Maharashtrians living there certainly, desire to join with Maharashtra. I am inclined to think that it would have been much better if we had not put this issue before the territory of Goa, Daman and Diu at this juncture but had allowed things to continue as they are at present. Let the Territory be administered by the Centre, if not for ten years, at least for another four, five or six years, until it is possible for us to know the real wishes of the people. Regarding the merger of Goa with any other State, I am of the view that it would be much better if the opinion is obtained after the next elections. After the next elections have been held in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, we should obtain the opinion of the people there as to which State they wish to merge with.

My friend, Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy, has put forward a point of view—which perhaps may be the view of some of them—that if it is integrated with Maharashtra, the prohibition laws will apply to Goa and Goa being a non-prohibition State for so long would lose its revenue.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Merge it with U. P. which is a non-prohibition State.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Either you carry U.P. to Goa or bring Goa to U.P. I think that the latest decision, which the Indian National Congress has taken on this issue, namely, to place this question of merger with one State or the other before the people there is, to say the least, rather a hurried decision. I would like it to reconsider its point of view and to let things remain as they are at present for some more years to come and

thereafter leave it to the people themselves to decide as to the State with which they wish to merge. That would be the best course to do. The latest decision in Congress circles, I believe, is that they are holding some other conference at a later date to decide this issue. I should think that it would be a wiser decision for them to postpone things for the time being and to let the territory continue as a Centrally administered territory. The territory itself will benefit largely if it remains under the Centre for the time being, of course. The Centre has more funds to develop that territory, to improve its communications and afford facilities for other things. If it is merged with one State or the other, immediately there will naturally be the question of financial liability on that State and as financial difficulties are facing all States, it will not at all be able to advance the interests of the territory to the extent that the Centre can help it. I would, therefore, urge that the Centre should retain it as a Centrally administered territory and not think of its merger with any State for the present.

As I have submitted, as far as this Bill goes, whether, in course of time, the territory accedes to one State or other, it is wholly immaterial. So far as this Bill goes, it merely seeks the extension of the Code of Civil Procedure and the Arbitration Act to these Union Territories. I think, it is an indisputable point and even those who favour its merger with one State or the other cannot disagree on this. Whether it goes to Mysore or Maharashtra or to any other State, the laws of India will apply to that territory in any case. Therefore, this point is quite immaterial and I see no reason why this Bill should have been opposed by any of the Parties.

With these words, Madam, I strongly support the Bill.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया जी, इस विधेयक पर बोलने का मेरा कोई इरादा नहीं था, किन्तु कुछ मेरे भाइयों

ने मरजर का सवाल खड़ा कर दिया और बीच में महाराष्ट्र का भी सवाल ले आया। इस कारण से मैंने सोचा कि मैं भी कुछ कहूँ। जहाँ तक इस विधेयक का सम्बन्ध है, वह तो साफ है कि जब से गोआ का हिन्दुस्तान में मरजर हो गया उसी वक्त से हिन्दुस्तान के जो कानून हैं वे वहाँ लगाने चाहिए थे। और प्रेसीडेंट के रेगुलेशन के अनुसार कुछ कानून वहाँ दाखिल भी हो गए। अब यह सिविल प्रोसीजर कोड जो सारे हिन्दुस्तान में मौजूद है और वहाँ अब तक नहीं लगाया गया और अब लगाया जाता है तो मैं नहीं समझता कि उस में क्या गलत हो रहा है या क्या विफोर टाइम या आफ्टर टाइम हो रहा है या उस में क्या कान्ट्रोवर्सियल बात हो सकती है।

यह विधेयक तो बिल्कुल साफ है और इस पर सर्वसम्मत राय होनी चाहिए थी। मैं नहीं समझता इस का विरोध क्यों किया गया। फिर मरजर के बारे में पंडित जवाहर लाल जी का नाम लिया गया, परन्तु मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक्त पंडित जवाहरलाल जी ने इस बात को कहा, उस वक्त यह साफ कहा था कि जो कुछ गोवा के विषय में किया जायगा वह वहाँ की जनता की राय के मुआफिक किया जायगा। और जब वहाँ की जनता बार बार इस बात को कहती है कि हमें महाराष्ट्र में मिल जाना है, उस के लिए वहाँ की मेजरिटी कोशिश करती है, प्रस्ताव पास करती है, रात-दिन प्रयत्न करती है और अपनी राय को व्यक्त करती है तो जो कुछ पंडित जी की इच्छा थी वह तो जाहिर हो जाती है। फिर दूसरी कोई बात वहाँ रहती नहीं। और आप जानते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र में भर्ज होने के लिए वहाँ की, गोआ की, असेम्बली ने बहुमत से प्रस्ताव किया। मैं इस बात में नहीं जाता कि वहाँ का एलेक्शन किस इश्यू पर लड़ा गया था परन्तु यह बात तो आप को माननी होगी कि वहाँ की असेम्बली ने बहुमत से प्रस्ताव किया कि हमें महाराष्ट्र में मिलना है। उस के बाद महाराष्ट्र असेम्बली

ने उस का स्वागत किया और कहा कि हा, गोआ को महाराष्ट्र में ही आना चाहिए। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस में कौन सी दो राये हो सकती है। फिर काट्रोवर्सी खड़ी हुई, मैसूर वाले कुछ कहने लगे, परन्तु मैं अपने मैसूर के भाई से एक बात साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक मैं ने यह नहीं सुना किसी मैसूर के भाई से या मिनिस्टर से कि मैसूर वाले यह चाहते हैं कि गोआ मैसूर में मिल जाय। यह किसी ने नहीं कहा और न मेरे भाई श्री मुल्क गोबिन्द रेड्डी ने आज कहा, उन्हो ने तो मैसूर का नाम तक नहीं लिया। उन्होने कहा Maharashtra or any other region.

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR (Nominated): The Mysore Legislature has passed a resolution

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण मैं यहा की बात कह रहा हूँ, जो भाई मुझ से पहले बोले उन की।
I am coming to it.

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR: You say that nobody said Therefore I said that

SHRI A. D. MANI: Why raise this matter now?

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण और जो प्रस्ताव मैसूर प्रसेम्बली ने पास किया है वह भी इतना साफ नहीं है कि वह कहते हों कि मैसूर मैं ही यह मिलाया जाय, जितना कि महाराष्ट्र का साफ है।

तीसरी बात कोकणी भाषा की यहा कही गई। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोकणी भाषा मराठी की डाइलेक्ट है और यह विद्वानों ने साबित कर दिया है कि कोकणी भेराठी की डाइलेक्ट है। यह कहना कि मैसूर में कुछ कोकणी बोलने वाले हैं तो मैं भी कह सकता हूँ कि मैसूर में जितने हैं उस से ज्यादा महाराष्ट्र में कोकणी बोलने वाले हैं। तो यह

कोई आर्गुमेंट नहीं हो सकता। आर्गुमेंट यह है कि मराठी की डाइलेक्ट कोकणी है।

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR: That is not a fact that there are more Konkani people in Maharashtra Kindly note it.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण मैं फिर आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सवाल गिनती का नहीं है। मैं ने पहले यह कहा कि Konkani is a dialect of Marathi.

श्री ए० डी० मणि : किस ने कहा ऐसा।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण विद्वानों ने।

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR: You added that there are more Konkani people in Maharashtra.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण न गिनती आप ने की है और न मैं ने की है परन्तु यह बात आप भी मानेंगे कि कोकणी भाषा बोलने वाले महाराष्ट्र में कम नहीं है।

श्री रंगनाथ बिवाकर महाराष्ट्र में है लेकिन ज्यादा नहीं हैं, कम सख्या में है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण मैं कह रहा हूँ कि गिनती आप भी नहीं करने गए थे और न मैंने की है।

श्री रंगनाथ बिवाकर नहीं मैं ने किया है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण . मेरे कहने का मतलब है कि कोकणी भाषा मराठी की डाइलेक्ट है यह विद्वानों ने साबित कर दिया है और इस में कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती।

पंडित श्याम सुन्दर नारायण तन्खा : यहा तो कोई विद्वान है नहीं।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : यहा हो या न हों, यह तो आप जानते होंगे।

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa): Madam, on a point of order. The issue is not the merger question here. The issue is about application of some Central laws to that State.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): One Member has already said so.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Those who preceded me talked nothing but merger. If they had not talked about merger, I would not have indulged in that question.

तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब वह बात रही नहीं। जिस पार्टी से मैं आता हूँ उस पार्टी में गोवा का क्वेश्चन विचाराधीन हो गया है और आप जानते हैं कि अब तक क्या हुआ है। यह बात अभी न तय हुई हो लेकिन एक बात तय हो गई कि यह इलेक्शन के जरिए यानी वहाँ की जनता की राय के अनुसार होने वाली है। यानी जो बात पंडित जवाहर लाल जी ने कही थी वहाँ के लोगों के मत के अनुसार, इच्छा के अनुसार, यह बात तय की जानी चाहिए उसी बात को कांग्रेस ने अब दुहराया है और कांग्रेस यह तय कर चुकी है, हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर इस बात को कह चुके हैं कि गोआ के मर्जर का क्वेश्चन गोआ की जनता की राय के अनुसार तय किया जायगा। इस में अब दो राय नहीं हो सकती। वह कब हो, कैसे हो, यह निर्णय उन के अधीन है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि वह फोरन हो या कब हो। यह तय करने का काम उन का है। परन्तु यह बात निश्चित है . . .

SHRI R. R. DIWAKAR: Will you give the same freedom to Vidarbha?

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: That we shall see. You come there. You tell the Vidarbha people and see if anybody supports you there.

अब यहां यह कहा गया कि गोआ असेम्बली में जो मैजोरिटी है वह नहीं रही। यह बात भी गलत है। जिन तीन सदस्यों ने इस्तीफा दिया है वह इस इश्यू पर नहीं दिया है।

श्री ए० डी० मणि : कौन से इश्यू पर दिया है ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : श्रीर लोकस बातों पर दिया है। इन तीन भाइयों ने जाहिर किया है कि जहां तक मर्जर का सवाल है हम और भाइयों के साथ हैं। इसलिए यह सवाल खड़ा करना कि तीन भाई उस में से कम हो गए बिल्कुल गलत है, यह मिसलीब करने वाली बात है। वह तीन भाई उतने ही जोर से कहते हैं जितना कि पहले कहते थे, इस बारे में जिन के साथ थे उन्हीं के साथ हैं और वहां की मैजोरिटी आज भी मर्जर के, महाराष्ट्र के साथ मर्जर के, पक्ष में है।

आप यह भी जानते हैं कि गोवा के करीब तीन लाख आदमी, गोआनीज, आज बम्बई में हैं। यानी ज्यादा से ज्यादा सम्बन्ध अगर गोआ का है तो वह बम्बई से है, महाराष्ट्र से है।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : बम्बई को गोआ में मिला दीजिए।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : गोवा का आर्थिक जीवन बम्बई में रहने वाले तीन लाख गोआनीज के हाथ में है।

श्री रंगनाथ दिवाकर : उन तीन लाख का वोट लिया जायगा।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : वह लिया जाय या नहीं लिया जाय, उस की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि किसी कांस्टीट्यूशन में ऐसा नहीं लिखा—आप बतला दीजिए अगर किसी कांस्टीट्यूशन में हो—कि जहां का वोट लेना हो, जहां का निर्णय करना हो वहां का निर्णय बाहर वालों के मत से हो ऐसा अपने कांस्टीट्यूशन में हो तो मुझ पता नहीं। लेकिन किसी कांस्टीट्यूशन में आज तक यह नहीं है। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि गोआ का जो आर्थिक सम्बन्ध है वह अधिकतर महाराष्ट्र से है और दूसरे किसी