

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Sir, I move: —

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What did they write—the Ministry of Home Affairs?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want to speak on this Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That I will do, but you said that you have received some letter from the Ministry about this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will consider it.

THE CONSTITUTION (TENTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1961

THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI A. K. SEN) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

I have no doubt that this Bill will be welcomed and supported unanimously by this House, as the other House has done, and I may make bold

342 RS—5,

to say that that will be only reflecting the unanimous view of the entire country. The remnants of Portuguese possessions in India are not only a source of irritation but, if I may say so, a constant reminder of the humiliation through which the entire colonial world has passed and from which fortunately most of the colonial world has emerged. This is the first nail in the coffin of Portuguese possessions in India and let us hope . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): When will the other nails come?

SHRI A. K. SEN: ... that the other nails will come sooner than the hon. Member may expect. The only thing is that they do not come simply because one wants them to come or says that they should come. So many things have to precede their coming.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Certainly they will come, but because . . .

SHRI A. K. SEN: There is no doubt in my mind and in the mind of our House that all the nails will come and will be fixed as firmly as this last nail on our soil deserves. It is not necessary to say anything further. It is a very short Bill. The Bill seeks to give effect to the unanimous request of the free people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli ever since they won their freedom from Portugal. They have run their territory very well, as will appear from the Financial Memorandum. Not only have they kept peace in that territory, but they have also saved nearly Rs. 30 lakhs in the course of the last few years during which they have been governing themselves. This will be a very good lesson for the Portuguese to learn because some of these colonial empires seem to think that there is no alternative for the colonial people other than the perpetration and the continuance of their own rule. I remember that even in this country the diehard Britishers used to think that this country would

£Shri A. K. Sen.] go to rack and ruin the moment British rule was withdrawn from this country.

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY (Maharashtra) : They say it is Portugal itself.

SHRI A. K. SEN: And they have now started this wonderful legal fiction by which they claim Darts of Indian soil as Portugal. On another occasion I had the privilege to say one thing and that is that even at the height of the British Empire and their power, they never had the audacity to call India England or Indians Englishmen. But the audacity of the Portuguese has outstripped that of the Britishers and has gone to the extent of claiming parts of India as Portugal and Indians as Portuguese. Well, these legal fictions will continue for some time, I suppose, but their hol-lowness will not only be exposed but completely destroyed very soon.

As I said, the rule by these free people of a small territory with very slender resources has proved how well colonial people can rule themselves. Not only have they ruled themselves well, but they have built up this fine reserve of Rs. 30 lakhs. Notwithstanding that, the urge to join the mother-country, the parent country, has prompted them to affirm their requests repeatedly that they should be joined to the rest of India, as the operative clause says, and to which they rightly belong. It is with a view to giving effect to that request that this Bill has been introduced and is going to be passed into law. It is well known that we have postponed passing this law so long because the whole matter was before the International Court of Justice.

The House will recall that Portugal, as soon as it was admitted into the United Nations in 1955, filed a claim and, again, before the International Court, *inter alia*, for a declaration of i

this alleged right of passage through Indian territory into these areas. As is well known, Dadra and Nagar Haveli were in olden times a Portuguese enclave surrounded by Indian territory, Indian territory in the sense of territory administered by India, because the other was also Indian territory. They claimed that with the setting up of the free Government and the ejection of Portuguese police and the few military personnel who were there, they were entitled to rush further police and military reinforcements through Indian territory with a view apparently to robbing again these people of their freedom. The Indian Government rightly denied that claim and the stand of India has now been more Or less affirmed by the International Court. Consistent with our behaviour in the international world and the rule of law, which we uphold not only within our own country but also outside, it was thought necessary that we should not take any leal step, as the present one, for the integration of these territories legally into India until the disposal of that matter before the International Court. That is why we have introduced this Bill after the disposal of the matter by the International Court.

As I was explaining, it is a very simple Bill. It seeks to amend the First Schedule to the Constitution by adding "Dadra and Nagar Have¹". So, article 1, as amended, after this Bill is passed, will read:—

"(3) The territory of India shall comprise—

- (a) the territories of the States;
- (b) the Union territories specified in the First Schedule;"

The First Schedule includes Dadra and Nagar Haveli. Then—

"(c) such other territories as may be acquired." As is known to hon. Members, India consists, according to our Constitution, of the territories of different States, then the Union territories as specified in the First

Schedule and then other territories which go outside the First Schedule but which are or have been acquired since the Constitution.

Apart from the fact that it is a legal expedient, I think psychologically and emotionally it is a great fact, namely, that the Constitution by an amendment incorporates by name these two territories which have been freed from Portuguese rule and recognizes them as formally belonging to this country. Therefore, Sir, it will be not only a matter to be hailed by this House but also by the entire people that these territories emerging from Portuguese colonialism have come to be named specifically in the Constitution as forming part of our country.

With these words I move the motion and commend it for the acceptance of the House.

The question was proposed,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, naturally we welcome this Bill, but I would not rush to be profuse in congratulating the Government as some other hon. Members opposite will no doubt be doing. Even so I would say that they have done a good thing.

The hon. Minister in his speech has given the reason why this measure could not be brought earlier. If you read the Statement of Objects and Reasons, you will find that as a result of the repeated requests by the people there, the Government is now bringing up this Bill, as if it was the only thing required here. Then he said that the matter was before the International Court of Justice, that we believe in the rule of law, that how fine we are having been brought up in the majesty of the British law so that we had to wait a little, for seven years, till the International Court of Justice in its wisdom disposed of this matter. I should have thought that such fantastic arguments would not have been

given by the Government that believes that it is part of our land under forceful colonial occupation by an aggressive imperialist power. Here again, it is demonstrated how the Government behaves hesitatingly in certain matters when it comes to deal with these imperialists or faces up to what the imperialists do not like. What jurisdiction the International Court of Justice had over this matter for the life of me I cannot understand. It is open to Portugal or for that matter anybody to go to the International Court of Justice and file any petition they like and appoint their lawyers to argue their case, and it is for the gentlemen of the International Court of Justice to sit somewhere there and decide these things if you like, but that does not alter the outstanding and fundamental fact that this territory is a part of India held by the sword by the Portuguese authorities. When the people themselves had liberated themselves from this colonial yoke, they were entitled to be taken into the bosom of the country and integrated in the Constitution. Seven years were lost—wasted. Not that the people were thrown absolutely to the mercies of certain forces outside, not at all, I am not suggesting that, but the Government delayed this matter. I can tell you, as everybody knows the liberation was also done by the people themselves. Not for a moment do I suggest that the Government or the Congress Party were not helping in this matter, but it was an act by the people themselves. We did not march our troops there. It is true, it is a fact that the people liberated themselves. After that we should have gone out to bring them in. We should have sent the Minister of External Affairs to go there and congratulate the people who had liberated themselves by the strength of their unity and patriotism and get them into the constitutional set-up of India. That was not done. Gentlemen of the Government waited for seven years, and today they have brought it. and it is good they have brought it. We are all supporting them. Here again, when I ask him that question as to when the other nails will

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] be coming, he says sooner than I thought. Surely he does not know the processes of my thought certainly in point of time. If I think that it should be liberated in the course of his year, would it be sooner than that? I would like to hear from him. Why is it not so? What is coming in the way? Today we have this Bill.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): May I seek one clarification from the hon. Member?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If I can clarify points to him.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: One clarification. We appreciate the noble sentiments of the hon. Members. For once he is patriotic. Could I know what are his sentiments about the Indian territories in the occupation of China?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is what I thought, Sir, that I would not be able to clarify. He might have asked me some other question. He could have asked me what I think of many other things on earth. Therefore, I would ask the honourable advocate of the Supreme Court to practise in this House relevancy a little because it might mean good to his profession elsewhere. Here let me deal with this interruption here. But I do expect from hon. Members like him relevant and intelligent interruptions, not third rate gutter political propaganda.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anyway why do you ask this question? Propaganda we will do in the elections and we shall do it outside. Now the question is why it was not done. In this Bill we are not in a position to say the same thing about Goa, Daman and Diu. How excellent it would have been if we had also included them, and why are we not in a position to do that? The Government should give some answer. The obvious

answer is that we do not do anything by force, or I do not know what will be the metaphysical or philosophical or quasi-philosophical answer to the question I put to him. But it is a fact. Then they say sooner than I think. But tell us when, do not keep us a' in a state of uncertainty over it, because here is the time to take the other part and make it a part of the Constitution and a part of administrative India as we understand it today.

Sir, we congratulate the people of Nagar Haveli and Dadra, and we also congratulate the people of Goa who are fighting today valiantly for liberation of that territory held by the Portuguese. We know how bravely they are fighting. The other day we read in the papers, that people were being deported to unknown penitentiaries or penal settlements or what ever they are, I do not know what they are called. Such things are going on. When will it be done? That should be stated now. Exactly seven years ago on the 15th August Indian patriots belonging to all parties, be longing to no particular political party, joined their hands together, marched shoulder to shoulder and enacted a drama or heroism and sacrifice. It is through that flaming patriotism that India announced that the country was determined to take Goa away from Portugal's bondage. As you know, since then the policy of the Government has been one of discouragement. Volunteers cannot cross that border. These gentlemen do not like to go there, not many of them would like to go, but if officially they do not like to go, unofficially people can go. And I would like to see a patriotic man like my hon. friend, Mr. Sinha, there. They would like to go there, march there. Why should it not be possible for five or six thousand Indians to march there and liberate those parts?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Nobody prevents you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is coming in the way? I may say that

there may be a controversy between us and the Government of India not on principle but on questions of practical politics, on questions of practical steps that are to be taken. There may be some dispute, some controversy, between us on the *one* hand and others on the other. I have deliberately avoided mentioning political parties because I know that what I am speaking today is the thought of many Congressmen also. Here I am not speaking for any particular party or for my party because this is a non-party issue in that way. It is a broad, national, patriotic issue, and I know that if these restrictions were to be withdrawn today, if it were possible for the people of India to take care of that particular part of our territory held by the Portuguese authorities, again we shall have the spectacle of Congressmen, Communists, the P.S.P. and others joining hands together, marching to the call of freedom and getting that territory back into our constitutional set-up. There would again be that kind of thing that we saw some seven years ago. The Government did nothing after that. Certain laws were passed; people were not allowed. How are the people to fight? You would not yourselves liberate them; if you take steps to liberate them, it would be a matter of a few minutes or a few hours, if you like. But at the same time others would not be allowed to take similar steps. What has happened? What comes in the way?

Now the question has to be viewed from different angles and I would ask the Prime Minister or the Law Minister to explain the position. Would it be a military adventure? Let us take it from that angle. I say, it would not be a military adventure at all. It is not like the case of Taiwan, for example, with a certain fleet there and where there would always be the risk of a major conflagration. Naturally, one has to think twice in such a set-up. Here it is a question of certain small, little territories, and the Portuguese authorities are situat-

ed in a particular way. Now, suppose the Government's case is that if they take, shall we say for argument's sake, military action, it would lead to a conflagration. I do not think the Government would say that it would lead to a military conflagration or that it involves any such risk of a war. Then what will they say? They may say that India's moral prestige will go down, because we preach Panchsheel and we have Buddha Jayanti and so on, and non-violence is talked about in Parliament by some hon. Members even when, incidentally, people are shot in the streets by the police—I take it in that way. They may say that the prestige of India will suffer. Argue it out. Is it really so? I do not quite understand that point. If it were a case of India's prestige going down in the world affairs in the event of our taking such an action against the authorities that are holding Goa in subjugation, in national humiliation, I would understand it from that angle if they say that its prestige would go down because we would like the prestige of India in the world arena to be upheld; we would even like the prestige of the Prime Minister to be upheld in the world arena. But we submit, Sir, that our prestige would not go down. Why do I say this? I say this because today the Portuguese are completely isolated in the world so much so that even some of their friends, some of them at least, are not in a position to openly support the attitude the Salazar regime has taken towards India. That shows the complete moral and political isolation of the Portuguese authorities and the Salazar Government in the eyes of the world today. When I say the world, I mean the Western countries leave alone the socialist ones, I do not say very much on them. That is the position.

Internally also, I am informed, the Salazar regime is isolated over this issue. As you know, Sir, the Communist Party is illegal in Lisbon. But

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] the Portuguese Communist Party is legal in Moscow. I met the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Portugal and had a discussion with him as to what were the views of the working people and the poorer sections of the people on the question of the liberation of Goa. Had the Salazar Government succeeded in bluffing the people to an extent that they would not understand if certain steps were to be taken in India would they be supporting the Salazar regime? I was told that a large section of the people, even if they have very conservative views in certain other matters, feel that this is unjust, especially when the French Empire and the British Empire are crumbling before them. They do not understand the position the Salazar regime has taken, especially when a country like India is involved. India's prestige is very high in the enlightened sections of the people in Portugal whose voice we do not hear because it is tightened as far as outside propaganda and publicity are concerned. But everybody knows that strikes do take place; everybody knows that actions do take place against the Salazar regime; everybody knows that one of the demands that are there in the militant working class movement is the demand that India's case is a strong case and that Salazar must give up his hold over Goa, Daman and Diu. Such is the position.

Then again you see in Africa. What is the position of Portugal, today supposed to be ironically the biggest empire. The bigger ones are going down in the geographical sense. Now the biggest empire, of course, is the United States of America, but it is not in the geographical concept in the old sense. You see, here in Africa, they are isolated. And in Angola, in what kind of a situation they have been placed? There was a general strike. The atrocities perpetrated by the Salazar regime aroused the wrath and anger of the people there. You know about

the Santa Maria incident. These are the indications—I do not say very progressive—but indications of a crumbling, cracking regime. Such is the position as far as the colonialism of the regime is concerned. Therefore, if you have the moral prestige in mind, I think there will be celebrations in all parts of the world wherever free men live. Even in the United States of America right-thinking men will celebrate the event of the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu. Everywhere the celebration will take place and we have reached such a position that they cannot but support it. Now, somebody might say. Suppose we take some action, then Salazar will move the United Nations and invoke a particular charter on the ground that Goa is their territory. Let us take up that proposition also. Today, unlike the previous time, there are 99 members of the United Nations Organization. The position of the Security Council, you know. Well, if there is a veto there, it will be in our favour. Take the General Assembly. Do you think that the Salazar Government can have any resolution passed in the United Nations General Assembly even on technical grounds? No. It will at once be confronted with, an overwhelming majority of votes against it. Therefore, it will be defeated even if it is supported by the Western Powers. So in the United Nations Organization it cannot take any steps. Then what remains? Nothing, nothing. Militarily it is weak, it cannot do anything. And we can kick them out much sooner than can kick a football in a playground as far as this regime is concerned, should this Government want to do so. Political isolation is complete. Internally, troubles are taking place in Portugal. Its colonial empire is collapsing between the fighting people of Angola and other places and in the United Nations Organization sympathies are fully with us. and the balance of

force is entirely in our 3 P.M. favour. Can you expect a better situation? I cannot think of a better situation un-

less somebody thought that the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu would come about like a bridal procession. Such things do not happen that way. Every objective condition points to the urgency and need to take action now and it also underlines how exceedingly favourable the situation is today. Now that is there but action is not being taken. I have said in this connection that we would like to see Goa, Daman and Diu liberated during the tenure of Jawaharlal Nehru's Prime Minister ship, and I think I share the sentiments of many Congressmen and many of our countrymen. It is because—well—there are biological processes. There fore, we said and many people feel, "Here, during the lifetime of Jawaharlal Nehru's leadership of the Government let the process of political liberation be completed." Is it a wrong desire? Is it an excessive demand? Is it an unreasonable wish of the people when Jawaharlal Nehru's glory is high? It is a legitimate sentiment. Why should it not be done now? I am not saying that this will not be done in the time of whoever may be succeeding him; it may be done unless he becomes something of a self-styled military dictator and goes to the West for supporting him and his regime, instead of remaining where he is. But the point is that here, today, it can be done, because his prestige also counts. Today we have a Prime Minister here who has world-wide prestige, and any action taken by this Government and spoken out by him from the forums of international organisations will have a larger and a more receptive audience than that which some smaller man occupying that place and speaking the same language might have. Such is the position. Therefore, the Congress Party should consider that from that world point of view and it is important that we take action now. But nothing is in sight now. We do not get a clear indication of the action in contemplation. Thoughts are the same. They probably feel exactly in the same way on questions of principle as any others feel, but on certain things it is time

that the Government of India spoke out. Well, we do not know what are those invisible chains that tie the Government of India so as not to take action now. We do not know what are the compelling reasons for which the Government of India do not act now. The Congress Party perhaps knows, but certainly on the opposition side we do not know. Thoughts have not been shared in this matter with us at all. What comes in the way? Now, Sir, you consider whether this comes in the way. It seems that we want to be good. It seems also that they feel that Great Britain or the United States or some Western power would misunderstand us or would take it amiss or would feel a little pinch about it. Well, we do not feel so. Otherwise what are the moral principles involved? Nothing. Even so, on this question the United Kingdom or the United States or any other country would be led to isolation if they took a stand against India. The Labour Party in England, for example, would be supporting it. They cannot say, "No". Why do I say this thing? When their navy was sent to Lisbon, Portugal in order to participate in certain military exercises or training exercises, voices of protest were raised in the Labour Party. They were raised even in sections of the Conservative Party and it came out in the British press that this should not have been done at that time. That only shows which way the wind is blowing. Therefore, in England, even among the Conservative Party, people would be hard put to supporting openly any stand that Salazar might take, or any stand against our country. As far as the United States of America is concerned, well, I am in no doubt that there will be such people there, also. People will be thrown into confusion there, those in higher circles. They would find it difficult. Although they are supplying arms to Ayub Khan, they claim themselves to be protectors of the so-called free world. If, suppose, steps are taken, I do not know how the Senators will be looking at each other before they open their mouths. Such

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] is our position. As far as other countries are concerned, yes, there is West Germany for Portugal. I find in the West German press that they are supporting Salazar. But West Germany is a militarised State and it has no international prestige today except that it has power in its hand built up and given to it by the United States of America, which has to be taken note of. Beyond that there is nothing. Then there is France. But what can France do? France cannot do anything in this matter because her hands are full with the Algerian problem; the Algerians are striking against her. Am I to understand that France will dare to raise her voice or protest in a manner which would lead to her complete isolation? I do not think so. So here is a golden opportunity for the Government of India to act. When they will act, we would like to know. Now, Sir, there is hesitation. There is some kind of hesitation arising out of wrong political considerations—I do not think they have any kind of moral principles about it—they are wrong political considerations; their assessments, certain wrong values of thoughts and so on are the only things that are standing in the way. Fifteen hundred million people have liberated themselves from the yoke of foreign imperialism since the end of the last great World War in the course of the last sixteen years or so. We had been amongst them counting for four hundred million people. Today everywhere it is collapsing—colonialism; today nobody talks about it. Even the colonialists themselves blush to talk about their colonialism. There was a time when they used to say, 'The sun never sets in the British Empire'. There was such a big talk even when we were in England and some *Conservative* people used to say, 'The sun never sets in the British Empire'. Of course we used to say in reply that God does not trust the British in the dark. That is how we used to say and that is how they used to say. But today how many

would be there to say, 'The sun never sets in the British Empire' The sun of imperialism and colonialism is no longer there. It has set. Let us wipe this out, this stigma that is on our nation. Militarily we know what they are. They had two ships there. We follow some papers and we enquire from our comrades when we go abroad how strong their military position is. We were told by them and I venture to give you the information—you may consult your sources of information—that Portuguese military strength is not what is made out. There is a lot of talk about their military build-up and to on—about their navy. As far as our information goes, they had only two ships covering their empire here, and these had to be moved from Goa, from the area round about there in the Arabian Sea, to face the situation in Africa. Therefore, the ship* also have gone, and along with them they have taken away a number of soldiers also. Yet they had been propagating that they had got a large number of people, and so on. They have, I agree, but the point is that it was not a number that - mattered. Everybody knows it. I think we can send our boy scouts with some sport guns and with some good rifles also, if need be. and we can liberate Goa. It may be a combination of sport guns and a few rifles, young chaps with some old people like us joining and getting back Goa. It is so simple as that, if I may say so.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (My-sore): What will China say then?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can tell you one thing. Now that is a relevant question. In a righteous cause what China will say or what others will say is not to be doubted. Of course, as far as China is concerned, China will support it. China will support you.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Being a young man, is it in order for the hon. Member to call himself old on the floor of the House?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can quite understand the hon. the Law Ministers discomfiture in this matter because we are of the same age. He would not like to be called old, I can understand. Anyway, Sir, let us say people of medium age. Now this is the position. Let me tell you what the position further is. As you know, I was a participant in the Moscow conference of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. And as far as the international communist movement is concerned, every party in all socialist countries is pledged to Goa liberation and it has been included in the appeal that was issued by the conference and the Communist Party all over the world had been called upon to rally round India and support the cause of the liberation of Goa, and it is published all over the world.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Did Mr. Bhupesh Gupta support us?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now the trouble is that I can deal with points but I cannot deal with obsessions. That is the position. Therefore, I say that you have got the support of all right-minded people. Do not get upset when you get support. Rarely you get such support. But since you get it, do not get upset. (*Interruption.*) Do not ask irrelevant questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must finish soon. I want to finish the Bill today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I also want to finish. I am finishing.

Now, Sir, this is the position. Therefore, from every angle the situation is opportune. First of all, I say that if they have any difficulty at the State level under the plea of usual excuses, well, I do not see why they should have such a hesitation. But suppose they have, let the Goan frontier be opened. Let it be open to Indians to cross that frontier and go to Goa as they like and let the people bear arms. The Congress Party at

one time said that people had the right to bear arms. That was a declaration of the Congress. I know they would not like it to be done but let us on the Goa frontier do that. The people should be free to bear arms. Let us carry out the old pledge.

Restriction on bearing arm should go.

Then, the question arises: Where do you get the arms from? That point I am prepared to discuss in a secret session of Parliament, the question where we get the arms from. I think if we sit together we can solve the problem once the other questions are settled. Therefore, that is not a problem. You can get over it. It is nothing. Therefore, it is no obstruction.

Now, Sir, come to another aspect of the problem, the question of a surplus of Rs. 30 lakhs that is coming today. But the people there have a fear. Will that surplus transform itself into a deficit? That is their fear because the Government of India is in the habit of transforming surpluses into deficits and deficits into foreign borrowings and so on. This is the thing. Therefore, the question of administration is very very important. Therefore, let the integration not mean to them that a certain kind of bureaucratic rule will be imposed upon them. This is absolutely essential. Self-governance to the people who are mostly tribal should be fully assured and they should feel that coming to India does not mean coming into certain clutches in the sense of a political set-up. Let the political set-up of India mean a further consolidation of their democracy, further extension of their democracy, better and better opportunities for their welfare and what is more, better chance for self-rule and also better attention to their cultural needs and so on. Therefore, it is very very important.

I say there is the tendency to get these things into the Union, to make them Union territories and then send

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] in a Chief Commissioner, shall we say from Bengal or Assam, to rule that part of the country. The result is that complete isolation takes place between the administration and the people and the people feel disgusted and so on. That should not happen at all. When we are bringing these territories back to a constitutional set-up we should at once make it look that the projection of India to them, Constitutionally speaking, is one of enlargement of democracy, one of giving them more facilities, more money, one of better respect to their cultural genius and aspirations. That is how it should be presented to them. Government should consider such measures because this is not the occasion for it and this particular Bill cannot provide for it. But what steps you take is very very important.

Now, Sir, I again pay my tributes to the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli who liberated themselves, who showed so much of courage in this matter. Those who have talked to these people who have taken part in the struggle know in what conditions they are fighting today, and I have no doubt in my mind that backed by the people of India this measure should be passed. But then even if you are of middle age or of medium age we would like to see it quickly done. This is very very important.

Sir, I share the sentiments that have been expressed by the hon. Law Minister in sponsoring this measure and we shall be, of course, wholeheartedly supporting it. But the time has come for the Government of India to consider the other aspect of the matter, namely, the liberation of Goa. In this connection I invite their attention to a resolution passed by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti where they have demanded that the restriction on volunteers crossing into Goa should be lifted. I think Government should make it possible immediately, during this very session, making an announcement to the effect that this restriction does not operate and people

are free to go to that part of India which is held by the Portuguese. Here again I only give you one information and one warning. The Portuguese are trying to consolidate certain things. They are trying to create a handful of profiteers and speculators by giving them certain leases and so on, so that it becomes a social base for keeping Goa under them and also a base for creating trouble when an attempt should be made to liberate Goa, Daman and Diu. That is to be kept always in mind because we should not give them any opportunity to consolidate their position or to create even a small political or social base of corruption in this manner in that part which may come in the way or which may demoralise the political life there. That is very very important.

Sir, I have said what I had to say about this measure. But I would still appeal here as we discuss this matter, as we did in the other House, let the national pledge, let the national resolve be expressed in a striking and an equally forceful term that we do stand for the liberation of Goa, not in the distant future but immediately. Everything that we do for seeking the liberation of Goa is sacred and solemn to our nation, to ourselves. There could be no moral higher than that. There could be no international law that we can contemplate, which would contradict this position taken by the Government of India and by the people of India. And there can be no better opportunity and better occasion for the Government of India and the people to act in unison than on this issue. This is all that I had to say.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to give this Constitutional Bill my wholehearted support. But before doing so I would like to point out that in my humble opinion it was not necessary for us to promote a Constitutional Bill for incorporating the Dadra and Nagar Haveli territories into the territory of India.

I would like, Sir, to invite your attention to the clauses of the Constitution on this point. The first is article 1(3) which says:

"(3) The territory of India shall comprise—

(a) the territories of the States;

(b) the Union territories specified in the First Schedule; and

(c) such other territories as may be acquired."

If we look at the First Schedule we will find all the territories given therein. But if we look at article 3(2) (c) we find that "such other territories as may be acquired" can also be added to these territories.

Article 240 says:

"(1) The President may make regulations for the peace, progress and good government of the Union territory of—

(a) the Andaman and Nicobar Islands;

(b) the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands."

We could promote an ordinary Bill empowering the President or the Union Government to make provision for the good governance of the territories incorporated by us. Additions can be under article 1(c). I do not think it is necessary for us to promote a constitutional Amendment Bill for this purpose. What the Supreme Court has said is that we may not cede our territories without a constitutional amendment. The Supreme Court has not held that we cannot incorporate some territories into our territories without a constitutional amendment.

Having made this point clear, may I say that it is of very great importance for us that Goa, Diu and Daman should become parts of India at an early date. I think the battle of Goa is being fought in Angola. I have

been reading what appears in the press in regard to the atrocities that this barbaric Government of Salazar has been committing in Angola. I have an article before me of the "Manchester Guardian" where it has severely criticised the British Government for sending some troops for manoeuvres in Goa. Then it says:

"Africans are being slaughtered indiscriminately except that an educated man is shot before an uneducated man. Villages are being fired and the fleeing inhabitants shot with machine guns. This is, of course, what the Portuguese in Angola openly said was going to happen, but it is horrifying that a nation with a supposedly civilising mission in Africa could put such plans into practice.

This bloodshed is not, after all, the work of local whites who have lost their faculties through fear of an African rebellion; it is the work of metropolitan troops (NATO troops) sent from Portugal for the purpose. Britain's acquiescence in what amounts to genocide by her ally is becoming a national disgrace. (The official party paper in Ghana has already demanded that Britain be exiled from the commonwealth on account of it.

Portugal is becoming a much greater liability to the West than Spain, which at least keeps her nastinesses to herself. But this" is not a question of cold war attitudes. It is a question of largescale murder. Britain should extricate herself from ties with Portugal until a civilised Government comes to power there."

Without going as far as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I would like to say that there are certain things that we can do to hasten the liberation of Goa. We need to give the Goans all the support that they need. Their battle is being fought by the people of Angola but they too need our support. The people of Angola and the people of Goa,

[Shri P. N. Saprū.]

both, need our support. What we can do is to advocate in the United Nations, an economic boycott of Portugal. We should sponsor a Resolution in the United Nations and I think we can get, provided of course we go about canvassing for our Resolution in the right way, ample support for a Resolution that Portugal should be completely boycotted. There should be an economic boycott by all the nations of Portugal.

The second thing that we can do, if Portugal does not behave even after the boycott, is to invite the U.N. to expel Portugal from her membership of the U.N. The time has come when a strong attitude should be taken by us towards this wretched country of Portugal. I do not call the people of Portugal wretched but I call the Government of Salazar wretched because I think the people everywhere are good. It is the Governments that are often bad. Therefore we should tell the Salazar Government that we are not prepared to tolerate any longer the continued subjection of Goa. For, we have ties which attach us to the people of Goa. They are flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. We have ties with the people of Nagar Haveli and Dadra. The International Court of Justice to which reference was made by Shri Gupta, has upheld our view that Nagar Haveli and Dadra have freed themselves from Portuguese rule and we should give the people of these territories a democratic Government, a Government which will enable them to feel that their culture is being preserved and that they are having a big say in their affairs, that is to say, some sort of autonomy should be given to them. Of course they are very small units and we cannot give them the status of a State like U.P. or Madras, if you call Madras now a big State. But we can give them some democratic institutions. That is a question which we shall have to consider when the Law Minister promotes a Bill for the administration of these territories. The more important question today is what we

should do so far as Portuguese imperialism is concerned. The Portuguese Government claims now to be the biggest empire in the world. The British used to claim to be the biggest empire in the world but they have liquidated their empire. So there is no difficulty so far as the British are concerned. They have a few parts yet which are not free but they too will get their freedom in course of time. The French used to look upon themselves as the second biggest empire in the world but they have difficulty in Algeria and they are finding it difficult to solve the problem of Algeria but the Algerian problem too will solve itself.

Now Portugal has not the resources of either Britain or of France and Portugal's record, from the first day that she started on her imperial career, has been a bad one. She has never worked as a civilised country in any part of the world which she has administered. Portugal failed to establish an empire in this country when there was a contest going on for empire-building in India, because though they had an able administrator in Albuquerque, the administrations at home were invariably stupid then. They are stupid now and they will continue to be stupid hereafter. It is for us to instill some commonsense into them and the way to instill common-sense into them is to show strength. They do not understand our ethical code. Our ethical principles prevent us from doing certain things. We could send some volunteers as were probably sent to Cuba. We can organise forces in our country and we could send those forces to Goa to free the people of Goa. But we are not going to do that sort of thing. There are, however, things which we can do, short of doing or taking those measures which we look upon as unethical. We can certainly promote resolutions in the United Nations. We can certainly promote opinion in the United Nations for a

boycott of Portugal and everything that Portugal stands for. I think if we were to organise forces for the declaration of an economic boycott of Portugal by the United Nations, we shall get a good amount of support in the United Nations itself. I think we shall get the support of the Afro-Asian group. We shall get the support of the Latin American group. I am not sure that even Brazil which is of Portuguese origin is satisfied with Salazar's Portugal. Therefore, the question whether more effective measures, more energetic measures, should not be taken to free the people of Goa from this tyranny of Portuguese rule, a tyranny which has been one of the worst tyrannies in the world, should be explored. We cannot just allow things to remain as they are. We have to tell the people of Portugal that there is a limit to our patience. We are a very patient people. We are a very forgiving people and we are a people who attach a very great deal of importance to ethical attitudes, and that is as it should be. But we think that our ideology, our ethical code, requires that we should take firmer action against the Portuguese Government than we have been doing so far.

So far as the Bill is concerned, of course, it has to be welcomed by everybody. I doubt whether it was necessary for us to promote a Bill of Constitutional character for this purpose. But that is after all a very minor matter. We want to be on the safe side. The Bill, I suppose, has been promoted as a Constitutional Bill, by way of extra precaution. And then we find that the population of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is not very large. I don't think they would like to be merged into Bombay. I don't know; it should be left to them to decide whether they would like to be merged with Bombay or Maharashtra, or whether they would like to have a separate existence of their own. I suppose the people of those territories or at least the educated people of those territories have been

used to the Portuguese language and I think we should provide facilities for the Portuguese language in those territories for the present and for some time to come. As a matter of fact, I have no prejudice against any particular language and we can, therefore, make concessions of that type. But we should take early steps to make known our strong feelings against the barbaric regime of Salazar, because the Salazar regime has been committing untold atrocities on the people living in Angola and in Goa. With these words, Sir, I give this Bill my strong support.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Bill has not come before the House a moment too soon, but we could not get over the legal difficulties in our way earlier. I am, however, very glad that we have this Bill before us now and the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli will soon form part of India. It is primarily the courage and burning desire of the people of those territories to be part of India that is responsible for this Bill. Secondly, it is the decision of the International Court of Justice that enables us to agree to the desire of the people of Nagar Haveli and Dadra to join us. It is because of our refusal to allow Portuguese troops to pass through Indian territory that the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli have been able to maintain their independence so far.

Sir, the Government of India has been blamed for not having taken strong steps to make Goa, Daman and Diu also part of India.

I notice, Sir, that the U.S.S.R. which is keen on altering the status of West Berlin is trying to do so by peaceful means. It wants to arrive at a settlement with the other Powers that are interested in the present status of Berlin. I wonder, therefore, how any person who has admiration for the U.S.S.R. can ask us today to use violent means in order to take possession of Goa, Daman and Diu.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): They have admiration for some other Power of the Communist Bloc.

PAUMT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: I do not know which other Power they have admiration for but here we have, before us, the example of Russia wh'ch is trying to negotiate with America and other Allied Powers in order to alter the present position of Berlin.

Sir, the character of Portuguese rule is well known. What is happening in Angola today is sufficient to boil the blood of any person who has any regard for human dignity. I do not know how many people have been killed in Angola but according to the newspapers, thousands of the indigenous people of Angola have so far been killed by the Portuguese Government. The fault of the people simply is that they want to rule over themselves. The people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli must be very happy today that they have for ever got rid of the tyranny of Portugal and will form part of a democratic country which will give them the fullest opportunity and of developing themselves socially, economically and administratively.

Sir, I should like to say again that I give my whole hearted support to the Bill.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh) ; There are very few occasions when we are so happy as today while lending our support to the Constitution (Tenth Amendments Bill. Sir it is a well-known fact that the objective with which this Bill has been brought on the floor of Parliament is to give power to the President to pass regulations for the functioning of the administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli in a fashion as would lead to its peace, progress and prosperity. This is the happy consummation of a long-drawn patriotic struggle that was launched by 50,000 people of

Dadra and Nagar Haveli for their liberation from the colonial yoke of the tyrant Portuguese. I have to use this word and I do not wish to be apologetic because when we cast our glance on the entire colonial history of the Portuguese not only in Asia and Africa but even in Latin America, we feel that the nation, if it has any conscience, must feel ashamed of its inglorious history which must impinge upon its conscience.

It is a matter of great joy that Indian history has become richer today by recording the valiant deeds of the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli though they constitute a very small area, about 180 square miles and with a population of 50,000 people. They were smarting under the heels of colonial domination for the last 175 years and now happily they have become free. We welcome them; we embrace them and we invite them to enjoy all the rights and privileges that normally accrue from the status of Indian citizenship.

Sir, there are a few points which have been raised just now and I would like to make my observations in regard to them. It is a fact that this struggle was launched in 1954. About seven years have elapsed since then the territory has been managed in a very good fashion and the Government of India had been assisting them in administering this territory, economically, administratively and also in other ways consistent with our governmental traditions. Sir, if I may be permitted to say, this was in one way our *de facto* recognition of the liberated enclaves of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and today we stand here to give *de jure* recognition to it.

Now, Sir, the other question that comes before us is about the delay in according this sort of recognition that we propose to do today. I very humbly submit that we, as a great nation, have to be always conscious of every

step that we take. Now, this question of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is not a question which is isolated from the general context. We feel that our step should be consistent with legal propriety too. The matter was pending before the International Court at the Hague and we were watching the situation. The only normal and proper procedure was to take action after the case had been disposed of by the Court. In 1960, the Hague Court gave its decision. It was not altogether in our favour. In certain matters, they did err if I may be permitted at this stage to say so. They did err because they acknowledged the sovereignty of Portugal over Dadra and Nagar Haveli, but when they did not allow the Portuguese forces to pass through Indian territory to Dadra and Nagar Haveli, they were perfectly correct, and probably this measure was to a large extent responsible for the retention of the freedom of these two liberated enclaves.

Sir, there is one thing that I must say about the Portuguese Government. They claim sovereignty over these two enclaves but it does not lie in their "mouth to speak in that language. What about, their own submission, their own conduct towards the directives of the United Nations? They were asked several times in the past to submit to the directives of the United Nations but they have always shown a sort of unabashed disregard for international obligation by disregarding and ignoring all these directives. Therefore, Sir, when it comes to the question of sovereignty, it should be remembered that it is not a one way traffic. They must look to their own conduct also. It is perfectly in line with our own thinking that we should go on with our process of integrating these two free enclaves and allowing them to be administered as part of Indian territory. The other day, while replying to a question, the Prime Minister rightly said that the course of action of the Government of India was not going

to be affected by this or that decision. This means that we have preferred to take that step which is normally accepted by the civilised standard of international behaviour.

The question was also raised about other territories including Goa, Daman and Diu. There could not have been a greater appreciation of the fact than the one displayed by the hon. Prime Minister when he spoke the other day on the floor of the Lok Sabha. He said that probably a similar Bill would be moved sooner than many people expected in Parliament. Probably it is the diplomatic propriety and so many other legal considerations which are standing in our way at present. What: was our position a few years back? We saw that on the floor of the United Nations Organisation Portugal was supported by a section of the Western nations but what happens today? After waiting for seven years the table has turned and when the question of anti colonialism was taken up on the floor of the United Nations Organisation not one single voice was raised against it. That is, every Power was in favour of the liquidation of colonialism.

I must confess, Sir, that this merger of Dadra and Nagar Haveli with the Indian Union is a gradual process of liquidation of colonialism in India and for that matter in Asia and all over the world. We sincerely hope that this process will be accelerated because the times are entirely different. The ideas that were once held by Rudyard Kipling about Empires do not hold good today. They are as rusty as the stuffed dodo. They have no place today. Colonialism is dead and the corpses are lying about. We have to dispose them of as quickly as possible. This is a specimen of the thing that we have taken up here on the floor of this House. With these words, Sir, I extend my warmest support to this Bill. There is not much scope to discuss and make observations on it because it is a purely constitutional measure and I am very

[Shri Satyacharan.] happy that the occasion has arisen, that the time has come when those compatriots of ours who were politically segregated have come into the lap of mother India.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister was right in anti-cipating that there would be unanimity for this Bill. There is not only unanimity for this Bill today, but if this measure had been brought years ago when those areas were freed from Portuguese control, there would have been unanimity in this House. If unanimity is the test to solve the problems then there would be unanimity also in regard to Goa and other enclaves. Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister and his Government are well aware of the mood of the country on this matter, if not from some time, but from many years ago, even from the days of the Congress struggle for freedom, the people of these enclaves in India have been clamouring and agitating for liberation. So if unanimity be the test in a measure to solve the vital problems then I think there is absolutely no doubt about the opinion of Parliament or of the Press or of the people in regard to the action that we should take to liberate the other territories which are under colonial rule. Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is stated that after repeated demands or requests made by the people of these areas this Bill has been prepared and introduced in Parliament but while introducing it the hon. Minister said something else. He said that because of the case pending before the Hague Court it was not possible to bring about the integration of these areas with the Indian Union. Sir, may I ask in all humility whether such a thing as the freedom of a particular area should be a matter of dispute before a court of law, a matter of civil dispute before the judges? If that is so, then China may take the dispute about the

border before the Hague Court. Other Powers also may do the same. I do not think that we can accept that position. Suppose the Hague Court had decided adversely against us, then what would have happened? Would we still then maintain that Dadra and Nagar Haveli would be part and parcel of India? If that is not so, why did you wait for so long, for seven years? Sir, I feel strongly that the freedom of a country or of any part of a country is not a matter to be decided by a court. There are certain things which are so vital and fundamental to a nation like national integrity, freedom and sovereignty about which it is the nation and its own people who should decide. Only when there are disputes, where doubts arise, these things may go before adjudication or courts of law. Sir, I am sorry to say that the Government of India has erred very badly in having waited for so long to translate the aspirations of these people to join us. Sir, the hon. Minister was very jubilant—naturally so—while introducing the Bill. We are all very happy and I think it is a matter of joy for all of us that these areas have come to us even though after a long time after much agitation and sacrifice but I want to take this occasion to ask the Prime Minister what he has done in regard to the promise he made a few months ago. I think about four months ago the Prime Minister was good enough to assure the House and also the people that very soon Goa also will be a part of India. So far as I am concerned I thought that a decision will be taken—at least some positive approach will be decided upon—before this independence day but nothing came out. I do not know what value we have to attach to the great words of the Prime Minister. After all, time is the most important thing in this matter. For integrating the already liberated areas we have taken seven years. How much time is required for the Government even to decide on a particular approach to liberate the other enclaves?

Is the Prime Minister trying to persuade the world in regard to this matter and is he depending upon the goodwill of "other nations? Though their goodwill is so important and valuable for any movement, I think the goodwill of other countries alone will not be adequate and will not solve the problem. If goodwill alone had mattered, I think much of the tension prevalent in the world today would not have been there. There would have been no conflict and the world have been peaceful. Unfortunately things have to be solved by other means. Problems have to be solved by other methods. One of the hon. friends who spoke before me suggested some of the measures that we should take to liberate the other parts of our territory under colonial rule. He mentioned economic boycott and removal of Portugal from the U.N. These are measures, I think, worthy of consideration in their larger perspective, but I want to know whether these things can lead to the liberation of Goa and other enclaves. That is the most important thing to decide. I feel that some more positive action on our part is necessary and *no* delay or hesitancy in this matter should be tolerated any longer. I wish that some sort of police action may be thought of. Otherwise, I do not see any other alternative way of getting these possessions. Either you have to allow the people to take these possessions by themselves by removing restrictions, or you have to take yourself some initiative in the matter. That means the Government of India should take some step in the matter to liberate these areas. Otherwise, I do not see any third alternative. I do not think that any third power in the world will come to help us in liberating these areas. You know what is happening in Angola. Many Members have referred to this problem. The entire population of Angola, who number more than what we have in Goa and other enclaves, have not been able to liberate them-

342 RS—6.

selves from the clutches of Portugal's colonial rule. Do you think that in such a situation the people in Goa, who are small in number and who have no other equipment except their courage and valour, would be able to liberate themselves from these clutches? I do not think it would be possible and it would not be reasonable on our part to expect them to do so. I feel that some positive approach, some positive action is necessary on the part of the Prime Minister and the Government. The hon. Minister said very rightly that Portugal's colonial rule is a sort of irrigation. Very true. Except verbal denunciation of Portuguese rule, oral condemnation of their atrocities, we have done nothing. And what we are doing today, though late, is just to recognise the result of the sacrifices made by these people in Dadra and Nagar Haveli. Even for the legal and constitutional recognition, we have taken seven long years and we have waited for excuses to delay this matter. I feel that the Government of India should be a little more fearless and forthright in its policies and it should be very candid in its approach. I feel that this paralysis of will on their part will not carry us forward. If the Prime Minister merely piously wishes for the liberation of Goans, I think it will not be done.

As regards the territory which is already liberated and which is going to be integrated, I do not like to say much, because other hon. Members have said enough. But on one point I feel strongly and that is the people of these territories who are coming to us should, as far as possible, feel at home with other Indians and for that purpose the Government of India should take all steps to assure them of their cultural freedom. All protection should be given to their cultural and linguistic activities and they should feel that they have come to India for the better.

It is right that the House has given its full consent and approval to this

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.] measure. I would have very much liked if this measure had contained other parts under colonial rule like Goa, Diu and Daman. I think it would have been a still happier event. Anyway, the debate in this House and the other House should produce at least some concrete effect on the mind of the Government. It should be able to influence them, persuade them, to take some positive action in this regard. Otherwise, the whole debate would be fruitless.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY
(Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a happy day for us, Members of this House, that we are considering this measure, which seeks to set the statutory seal of completion on the process of reunion with India of the territories of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, territories which had the misfortune to pass into the hands of a ruthless power which has become notorious for its atrocities in the civilised world of today. This measure is all the more welcome because it comes to us immediately after we have celebrated the anniversary of our independence. The people of these territories deserve our admiration and congratulations and thanks too. Their determination and courage is matchless. It is an object lesson to other people. Without external help, without the help of the Government of India, without the help of the people of India, these people have thrown off the yoke of Portugal. The whole country appreciates the courage, determination and sacrifice of the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. It is a matter of great joy to us and the country that we have been able to recover these territories without resorting to force. Hon. friends, while referring to Goa, have found fault with the Government of India for allowing this situation to prevail in other Portuguese enclaves. The way these territories have emancipated themselves, in my humble opinion, is a triumph of the policy that the Government of India have been following

in the matter of these enclaves. We have waited, it is true, maybe too long. But without sacrificing our principles, the principle of settling international disputes by peaceful negotiation, we have seen that these territories have come to us without our resorting to force. And the day is not far off, as the Prime Minister has expressed, when the other territories—Goa, Daman and Diu—will also come to us in the same way, without the Government of India taking any police action, as my hon. friend there has suggested. Sir, Portugal is not what it was four years ago. Portugal today is a discredited power in the world. Dr. Salazar's regime is discredited by almost every nation. Therefore, a discredited power with its brutal atrocities shocking the whole civilised world cannot last long. As the hon. Mr. Sapru just observed, the battle of Goa is perhaps being fought in Angola. The brutalities of the Portuguese administration there are piling up on the head of Portugal in such a large measure that Portugal cannot sustain. If it goes down under its weight, it goes down to posterity with a curse on its head. Let us hope that good sense at least will now prevail with the mounting public opinion of the world against the condemned Power, against the Portuguese atrocities, and that Portugal will realise that the day for imperialism has gone. If they do not recognise the principle of self-determination, as I said, they will be one of the two countries which will be cursed by posterity.

Sir, I have to extend my admiration and congratulations to the people of these areas who have managed their affairs, as the Law Minister has aptly said, with wisdom. There was unity and solidarity in their ranks, and they have managed their affairs with prudence, giving to the territories Rs. 30 lakhs of accumulated savings and in this year savings of about Rs. 7 lakhs. For any doubting Thomases that the Panchayati Raj may be a failure this is an object

lesson, Sir, where the people themselves have managed their affairs with such wisdom and such prudence. (Interruption) They will be allowed to function freely.

Hon. Members have stated that full democratic system of administration should be given to them. People who have deserved praise in such a large measure owing to the merit of their management are surely entitled to get full administration, and I hope our Government will accord them due democratic administration, and hon. Members need have no doubts on that point.

There is another point to which the hon. Mr. Sapru referred with regard to this measure. He was pleased to observe that this Constitution Amendment Bill was not necessary, and he has quoted article 1 for that purpose. As far as my limited knowledge of the Constitution goes, article 1 mentions the territories which comprise India. India may have acquired territories, but when we acquire certain territories, it is up to us to see that we amend the Schedule of the Constitution and that they find a place in the Constitution itself. Otherwise our legislative measures could not be extended to those territories. I suppose that is the reason why this constitutional measure was necessary.

There is only one more point to which I have to refer and refer with very sad feelings in my heart. While the whole world is condemning the Portuguese arbitrary powers and atrocities, a neighbour of ours, the Government of Pakistan, is giving its full support to the Portuguese administration in Goa. I wonder whether Pakistan which has become an independent country and which is enjoying full freedom should not extend the same sentiments to the people of a part of India who have had the misfortune to be enslaved by Portugal. It is to say the least an unfriendly act on the part of the Pakistan Government. Pakistan which always professes its wish for maintaining good re-

lations with India should see that it is not supporting a power which is discredited in the whole world for maintaining its brutal hold over the people of India in Goa. I hope Sir, that wisdom will dawn on them and that they will cease to persist in this unfriendly act.

Without saying anything more I welcome this measure and wish all prosperity and progress to the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradsh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to extend from this side of the House my humble support to this Bill which has received all round welcome from all parts of the House. It is a big day today not only in the history of India but also in the history of those territories which constitute what is called the Portuguese overseas empire. We have opened the big doors of liberation to our brethren across the frontier, if I may use the term, in Portuguese India.

In this connection I should like to refer to some statements made by my hon. friend, the Law Minister. He referred at length to the legal difficulties that we had at the Hague which prevented the Government of India from taking earlier action in the matter. I think those difficulties were formidable difficulties, but in view of the statements made on this side of the House as well as by my hon. friend, Mr. Sapru, that we should have a tougher Goa policy, I would like my hon. friend Mr. Sen, to go through the contribution made by Prof. Waldock at the International Court of Justice again. The Attorney General of India who defended our case all along denied that there was any question of annexation, and Prof. Waldock made a very notable contribution when he analysed international law and said that there was nothing in international law to prevent a country from giving support to forces which wanted to liberate another country. That is the official juristic opinion today which was submitted on behalf of the Government of India.

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

Sir, I think the time has come when we should state our views in respect of the other territories of the Portuguese empire, Daman, Diu and Goa, very clearly. As one who took some part in preparing literature for informing international opinion on this subject I might say that during the last few years there has been a weakening of the resistance movement in Goa because they were not sure of what India was going to do for them. In view of the stand that we have taken on the contribution made by Prof. Waldock, I should like to welcome an assurance from Government that this Government is interested in seeing that there is a revolt in the Portuguese empire in India and that we would give all assistance to people who help that revolt in the Portuguese empire in international law at all, and even if there is something wrong, I think we should consider ourselves fortunate to be regarded as being unfriendly to Portugal. I hope that as a result of the statements made from all sections of the House the Government of India would announce its policy regarding the liberation of other territories in the Portuguese empire.

The second point I would like to make is that while we have admitted these territories as a part of the Indian Union, we have not said a word about the nature of the administration that the people there are going to have. My hon. friend, Mr. Sapru, referred to the democratic association of the people in the Indian Union. Naturally we should like democratic institutions to grow in all parts of the country, but we should like to see in the first instance a Parliamentary Committee appointed to advise the Government in regard to the administration of these territories. I have gone in some detail into the report submitted on Dadra and Nagar Haveli by Government of India officers. I do not want to mention in this debate certain

utterances which were used by these officers which would not have been used by a public man. But the officer refers to the presence of an underlying current of linguistic controversy. I should like to have the permission of the House for reading what the Review Officer has said on the subject.

He says: —

"The linguistic controversy is, by and large, not acute in this area. However, since the period when some Gujarati schools were closed in the Southern villages, there has been a disquieting under-current of this feeling."

Sir, in view of all these political implications, we would not like the administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli to be left entirely in the hands of the officials. We know that a Minister is responsible for this ultimately but at this stage we should like to have some kind of popular association in the form of a Parliamentary Committee to advise the Government in this matter. The people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli consist largely of what one may call the *Adivasi* population. It has been found that out of about nine thousand households, 88 per cent, are *Adivasi* houses. They have got their very peculiar problems, and we have a fund of experience from this side of the House as well as the other about the way the *Adivasi* problem should be solved. Further, we should not make any mistake now in regard to the administration of these territories which will create problems later on. I might mention that one of the provisions which exist now is that any appeal from Dadra and Nagar Haveli can be heard only by two Goan judges of Bombay. If a Goan judge is not available, a Goan lawyer is to be appointed. These are all precedents which have got far-reaching implications, and I would like the Government seriously to consider the matter.

Sir, one final point I would like to make, and that is, the time has come for the Government of India to publish its blueprint for the administration of these territories in future. We have included in the Indian Union a part of what is called the Portuguese overseas empire. Now, the people of Goa, Daman and Diu are likely to ask what kind of status we are going to give them. In the last session of Parliament, in reply to a supplementary question, the Prime Minister made a statement on Goa which was very well received, it had a most salutary and reassuring effect on the Goans; all Goan associations welcomed the statement. Now, it is not only a Parliamentary statement that is wanted. In regard to their culture, they have developed their own forms of culture. There is the Portuguese language there; there are the missionary schools at work. There are twelve missionary schools. In Dadra and Nagar Haveli the Christian population is only about 585 but in spite of this fact, these schools are at work. Perhaps, the churches are being supported. All these matters should be carefully examined and in the blueprint which I would like personally to suggest that the Government should publish, we should tell them, "You can have all that you had and something more." If they received some support for all these schools, we should continue to give that support.

Further, Sir, there is one fear, as far as I could see, among the people of these areas and that is, they do not know whether there is going to be a separate union for them or whether they are going to be merged in the neighbouring territories, like Maharashtra. We should make it clear that we do not want to seek a merger of these areas with any of the linguistic groups that have been formed in the country and if they want to remain separate, they will remain as a Union-administered territory till they develop their own democratic institutions.

Further, there is the question of land reforms which has raised tick-

lish points in Dadra and Nagar Haveli. We would not like to force any pattern of land reforms on them. We should allow them to develop their own institutions till at least they feel that they are secure citizens of the Indian Union. I have no doubt whatsoever that the people of Dadra and Nagar Haveli are extremely enthusiastic in joining the Indian Union and the Revenue Officer has reported that the people are most anxious that the Indian laws should be applied. But let us have a blueprint before that. It is no point making statements alone in Parliament. Statements are valuable but we would like to tell them that this is what we are going to do for Dadra and Nagar Haveli and the other territories of the Portuguese Empire here. I think, Sir, a statement is called for and I hope that the inclusion of these territories in the Indian Union will be a signal for an active Indian movement to liberate the other parts of the Portuguese Empire.

श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव (उत्तर प्रदेश): उसभापति महोदय, आज का समय बड़े हर्ष का है कि पुर्तगाल अधीन भारत की भूमि दादरा और नगर हवेली, जहाँ के लोगों पर पुर्तगाल द्वारा अत्याचार किये जा रहे थे और जिन्होंने अपने बाहुबल से विजय प्राप्त करके अपने को मुक्त किया और स्वतंत्र होने की घोषणा की, आज भारत में पुनः सम्मिलित हो रहे हैं। हर्ष और आश्चर्य की एक बात यह भी है कि वे लोग जो चीन के दुराग्रह के एक तरह से समर्थक हैं, जो चीन के दुराग्रह का विरोध नहीं करना चाहते हैं, वे भी आज इस बिल का स्वागत कर रहे हैं। उनकी एक जवान नहीं है, वे दो जवान से बातें करते हैं। एक जवान से तो वे कहते हैं कि गोआ को भारत में मिलाने के लिये मिलिटरी एक्शन भारत सरकार को लेना चाहिये मगर दूसरी जवान से वे चीन का स्वागत करते हैं जो कि हमारे देश की भूमि पर इधर-उधर कब्जा करते जा रहा है।

मैं गवर्नमेंट को इस बिल के लिए अवश्य बधाई देता हूँ कि उसने बड़ी जल्दी इस बिल

[श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव]

को पेश किया। यहाँ पर जो यह कहा गया कि इस बिल को पेश करने में बहुत देर लग गई, गलत है। बहरहाल, वहाँ की वरिष्ठ पंचायत ने १२ जून, १९६१ को एक प्रस्ताव पास किया और उसके कुछ ही दिन बाद हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने प्रेस में एक स्टेटमेंट दिया कि हम पार्लियामेंट के अगले सेशन में इस तरह का बिल लाने वाले हैं। और ऐसा करने में उन्होंने जरा भी किसी प्रकार की देर नहीं की। मैं दादरा और नगर हवेली के लोगों को बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने जिस हिम्मत के साथ, जिस निभयता के साथ, जिस वीरता के साथ अपनी इस भूमि को स्वतंत्र किया, वह सराहनीय है। परन्तु आज भी हमारी भारत भूमि में पुर्तगाल के लोग अत्याचार कर रहे हैं और बराबर करते ही चले जा रहे हैं। वे वहाँ के लोगों के ऊपर जो भी अत्याचार कर रहे हैं वह उनके ऊपर ही नहीं, हम सब भारतीयों के ऊपर अत्याचार है। अगर वहाँ पर हमारे किसी इंडियन नेशनल की बेइज्जती होती है तो वह हमारी बेइज्जती है। अगर उन लोगों को जलाया जाता है, मारा जाता है, तो वह सब अत्याचार हमारे ऊपर होता है। कल की ही बात है, जो समाचार वहाँ से आये हैं उनसे यह मालूम होता है कि वहाँ एक व्यक्ति को जला दिया गया है। इस घटना के ऊपर हमारी माननीया डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहिबा, मिसेज अल्वा ने एक स्टेटमेंट दिया है कि जो साधन हम इन अत्याचारों को बन्द करने के लिये उपयोग में ला रहे हैं, अब हमको उनसे अधिक सख्त उपायों का अवलम्बन करना पड़ेगा। इसके लिये हमारी गवर्नमेंट बधाई की पात्र है। वह इस बात को जानती है कि हमारे देश में इस समय कितनी स्ट्रांग फीलिंग गोआ में पुर्तगाली राज के खिलाफ हो रही है। और जितना राक्षसी व्यवहार वहाँ हो रहा है, अत्याचार हो रहे हैं, वह हमें जनरल ओडायर की याद दिलाते हैं। जिस प्रकार के अत्याचार

सन् १९४२ में हम लोगों के ऊपर हुए थे, उससे बढ़ करके अत्याचार वहाँ हो रहे हैं। वहाँ के लोगों को सौलिटरी सेल में डाल दिया जाता है, खाने को नहीं दिया जाता है, मारा पीटा जाता है। हाल ही में वहाँ से इस प्रकार के अत्याचार करने और जलाने के जो समाचार आये हैं उससे स्थिति हम लोगों के लिये नाकाबिले बर्दाश्त होती जा रही है। अब वहाँ की स्थिति को ज्यादा बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते हैं। यदि पुर्तगाल वाले हमारी शान्तिमय उपायों की नीति को हमारी कमजोरी समझते हैं, तो वे गलती कर रहे हैं। हमने अपने देश से इतनी बड़ी साम्राज्यशाही को अहिंसात्मक और शान्तिमय नीति से निकाल दिया, जिस साम्राज्य के लिये यह कहावत बन गई थी कि उसके राज्य में सूर्य का अस्त नहीं होता है। ये थोड़े से दो कौड़ी के जो लोग हैं आज उनकी संसार में दो कौड़ी के बराबर इज्जत हो गयी है। पुर्तगाल का जो स्थान १५ और २० वर्ष पहले था वह आज संसार में नहीं है और अब उसको कोई भी इज्जत की दृष्टि से नहीं देखता है।

आज जो यह बिल आया है वह हमारी भारत सरकार की जो शान्तिमय नीति है उसकी विजय का चिन्ह है और विजय तो वहाँ के लोगों की भी है। लेकिन हमारी गवर्नमेंट की नीति की भी विजय है जिसके कारण आज दादरा और नगर हवेली स्वतंत्र हुए हैं और जैसा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अभी हाल में कहा कि वह दिन दूर नहीं जब हम दूसरा बिल भी पेश करेंगे जिसके द्वारा गोआ, दमन और दीव के लोग भी भारत में सम्मिलित हो जायेंगे। तो हम लोग उस दिन की बड़ी उत्सुकता और उतावली से प्रतीक्षा कर रहे हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश में गोआ को लिबरट कराने के लिये, गोआ को स्वतंत्र करने के लिये जो आन्दोलन उठा है, जो संस्थायें कायम हुई हैं, और जिनके प्रतिनिधि प्रधान मंत्री जी से मिल चुके हैं, वे लोग बराबर इस बात का उपाय कर रहे

हैं कि जो देशवासियों की इच्छा है वह जल्द से जल्द पूरी हो ।

मैं इससे अधिक और न कह कर के, केवल यह और कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन लोगों ने इतनी योग्यता और कार्यक्षमता के साथ काम किया कि थोड़े से समय में इन लोगों ने अपना जो शासन वहाँ चलाया, उसको अच्छी तरह से चलाते हुए, इन्होंने ३० लाख रुपये की बचत की है । इस बारे में कहा गया है कि जो बचत है उससे स्पेशल डेवलपमेंट स्कीम बनाई जायेंगी । हमारे भारतवर्ष में जैसा विकास का कार्यक्रम चल रहा है उसकी प्रशंसा संसार के कोने कोने में हो रही है और हमारी इस नीति की भी विजय है कि इन छोटे टुकड़ों की उन्नति का इसी प्रकार से हम बीड़ा उठाते हैं ।

एक बात मैं यह और कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक बड़ी आशाजनक बात है कि वर्तमान बजट में उनकी जितनी आमदनी और खर्च होगा उसमें से ७ लाख रुपये की बचत होगी और उसके लिये कहा गया है कि स्पेशल डेवलपमेंट स्कीम में वह खर्च किया जायगा । अच्छा होता अगर इस सदन को कुछ संकेत मिल जाता कि स्पेशल डेवलपमेंट स्कीम्स, जिन की चर्चा नोट में की गई है, वे उन लोगों ने बना रखी हैं या यह गवर्नमेंट बनायेगी या बना चुकी है। यदि इस सदन को इसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ मालूम हो सके तो बड़ी कृपा होगी ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ ।

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, it was not my privilege, Sir, to introduce this measure before this House. My colleague, the Law Minister, was good enough to undertake that responsibility. I was engaged in the other House, but I should like to be associated with the

consideration of this measure in this House even though this is rather a normal matter. There is no dispute about this measure and everyone who has spoken here has expressed his or her pleasure at it, and so there is nothing really for me to reply insofar as this measure is concerned. But some other matters, I am told, have been raised. For instance, why has this been delayed so long, for seven years? And the question of Goa, I am told, has been raised and in that connection an hon. Member referred to economic sanctions against Portugal. Now these may be important and interesting topics, but they really have no relation to this particular amendment of the Constitution. Now the answer to the question of seven years' delay is chiefly the fact that the Hague Court considered this for many many years, and I do not myself see how it would have been desirable for us, while they were considering it, to take this action. It might well have had repercussions in the minds of the Hague Court Judges as a result of which their final advice or judgment might not have been very much to our liking. That would have produced difficulties for us. The Hague Court does not function this way, I mean they cannot send arms to enforce their will. Nevertheless it is there; it expresses the will of the international community in the sense of settling problems by methods of law and order. It seems to me that for us to have ignored the Hague Court and to have started doing something here while it was considering it would have been a great discourtesy, and apart from the great discourtesy it might have involved us in all manner of complications in the United Nations or elsewhere. It is not always the best course to cut across the normal methods of doing things in our desire to have a speedy result. Sometimes an expected speedy result fails us and it takes us even more than the normal time to achieve the end in view. I have no doubt, therefore, that it was right for us to wait till the Hague Court had decided the issue and to wait for a little time, even after that,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] to observe the consequences of that decision.

Another point was raised, I understand, as for the future of this Bill. Some hon. Member expressed the hope that too many of the members of our very efficient services even should not go in and take charge of this area, and thought that it would be better for it to be left to the people there. Broadly I agree with that, and in fact that is what we have done for the last many years. We have helped them with advice and when they asked us to give them a good administrator, then only we found out someone who would help them, and sent him. Apart from that we have not interfered in their rather simple system of administration. They have done fairly well. So it is not our desire to interfere much or at all in fact except insofar as they require our advice or help.

Now I come to the principal question which has been raised here and in the other House—about Goa. I can very well understand the sense of almost frustration in regard to Goa, which many of us feel and which I myself am experiencing often enough. It may be so, but it is rather difficult to judge as to what might have happened if we had acted somewhat differently. Nevertheless, the more I think of it—and I am, for the moment, talking about the past—the more I am convinced that, on the whole, the policy we have adopted has been the right one. Of course, it is conceivable that almost immediately after or contemporaneously with our gaining Swaraj some step might have been taken for Goa. It was a possibility at that time, a possibility that might not have produced at that time the same results which would otherwise have later. But at that time the House will remember the problems we had to face. Immediately after independence partition came and along with it the upheavals in north India, in Pakistan, here on this side of the border, right up to Delhi and even beyond. It

was a very bad ordeal for all of us, and we were not thinking of any other thing. We could not. Well, we survived that ordeal, and then we thought it a reasonable presumption that it would be easy to solve the problem of the French possessions and the Portuguese possessions here by agreement. It never struck us that these countries would be, well, so difficult to deal with. The French ultimately—after a good deal of argument—did agree, and it was possible for the transfer to take place peacefully, although even now—as the House knows—the *de jure* transfer has not taken place, and always we are told that they are prepared to do so. But there are their difficulties—other difficulties—not in connection with this. It is true, of course, that during the last many years France has had to face any number of difficulties and crises, and it is unfortunate that we have had to suffer for that to some extent. Now we thought that we would be able to settle the question of Goa by argument. Even then we gave priority to the French possessions because we thought that it was more easy to deal with the French Government than the Portuguese Government—which it was indeed. But then we found that it was not only more difficult to deal with the Portuguese Government but also it was not possible to deal with them at all. As perhaps hon. Members may remember, the first response we got from them to an official note in regard to Goa was that they produced a papal bull of the 15th century on which they based their right not only to Goa but to large parts of the world. Though large parts of the world have slipped from them, Goa has remained and to that they propose to hold on the plea of the papal bull. It is very difficult to argue with persons of any country which bases its right in this way. Since then we, in the early days, opened diplomatic relations, sent a Minister to Lisbon in order to deal with this question. As this did not succeed, we withdrew the Minister, closed our Mission there and have had no diplomatic relations since then.

As for the other matter, the problem then became, either we should take steps, that is military steps, or, as some people think, to encourage popular steps against the Portuguese Government. By popular steps I am not referring to anything that might happen within Goa but that people from outside come and march in Now, anything that happens within Goa would have been, well, in the normal order of things. People in a country wish to change their Government, and they do it, but for others to go from outside created difficulties. The first difficulty was that it could be said, as it was said, that the people of Goa did not want any change at all and it had been imposed upon them by people coming from other parts. Secondly, people going from India, that is, unarmed people, would, as things were, inevitably be shot down. Now, if we allowed our people to go there to be shot down in large numbers, which the Portuguese would certainly have done without the least compunction, then we had to face a difficult choice. Either we put up with it and did nothing, which was a very painful choice, or we sent our Army behind them. Therefore, ultimately the question became of sending our Army and not merely leaving it to unarmed people to go there. And till we were ready to send our Army in this way, it was not right for us to create a situation which demanded the sending of our Army. This is the basic logic.

Now, as regards the sending of our Army there everyone knows, including Dr Salazar, that the Portuguese Army could not resist our Army for more than a few hours, maybe a day or two or whatever it may be. But it was not a military question. It was a political question with its consequences not only on our policy but in other ways too. That would have meant war with Portugal. Now, Portugal may be, in the military sense, a relatively easy country to deal with. Nevertheless, it is another country and for us, after all that we said repeatedly, again and again, not about

Goa I mean, but about our general policy, to start a war, however small the war may be, would have been fundamentally opposed to all that we had said, and the weight which we have in the councils of the world would have been much less. Also we might have got entangled in many ways. We must not isolate this from the other world problems. Nevertheless, Portugal has been actively or passively supported by some great powers, as we know, in the United Nations and elsewhere. Naturally, there has been a tendency for that support to be withdrawn. In fact, Portugal today has not got many friends left in the world. But there was this support and it was just possible that a difficult situation might have arisen. In the United Nations we might have been condemned as aggressors, technically speaking, and other problems would have faced us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How? They would have to pass some resolution there. It would go to the Security Council and the veto is there. Then they have to go to the United Nations General Assembly. Do you think they could have passed a resolution?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot say. Certainly they may have or they may not have done so. But that all depends. The point was that it was something that was opposed to all that we had been telling the world, the world which often has been at the brink of war. Even a little spark is a dangerous thing. And for us to light that spark was not in conformity with the whole trend of our policy, and it might even have involved us in considerable difficulties.

One minor matter I may remind the House about, not directly in this connection but still we have to remember all this. The House may know that for some odd reasons the Pakistan Government has been very friendly to Portugal. Probably the sole reason is that anybody who is against India, the Pakistan Government embraces and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] thinks that it can take advantage of that position. So, anyhow we thought it undesirable both on grounds of policy, basic or principal policy, and practical considerations to take military steps to drive out Portugal from Goa.

Also we felt, that whatever might be done from outside the initiative must come from the people of Goa, not from outside. So years have passed and it has been a painful experience to hear what has been happening in Goa, to put up with it without being able to do something about it. I do not know but, now looking back, we would have acted otherwise. It is always difficult to say. On the whole, I think, we acted rightly. I am not justifying it, but still that is my impression, and this policy that we pursued, a policy of very considerable patience, has created a considerable impression all over the world in our favour *vis-a-vis* Portugal. And now, not because of India or Goa so much but more so because of what is happening in Angola, Portugal is in bad odour almost the world over. It is a misfortune that even now some countries support it actively or passively. And I believe the fact that Portugal has been a member of the N.A.T.O. alliance has certainly given certain power to Portugal, certain strength to Portugal to function as it had done lately. The House may remember that even the United States of America, which previously rather sided with Portugal, and Mr. Dulles, the previous Secretary of State there, said something which was deeply resented in India, have voted against Portugal in the United Nations. I regret that the United Kingdom has not seen the light yet and still thinks of its oldest friend, oldest ally as well as N.A.T.O. ally. The fact of the matter is—and I think every country should realise it—that Portugal's association with N.A.T.O. brings disgrace to N.A.T.O. and not any strength, and the longer this continues and the N.A.T.O. powers, for reasons to which they attach value, keep Portugal there,

they weaken this alliance. I am not in favour of N.A.T.O. or Warsaw Pact or C.E.N.T.O. or S.E.A.T.O. I am not saying this from the point of principles but I am merely saying that as it is NATO today is weakened in the minds of vast numbers of people because of Portugal's association with it. That is the position in regard to Goa but I am prepared to say that in this changing world with what is happening now both outside India, in Africa, in Angola and what is happening in India and in Goa, this question cannot be considered as a closed one about what steps we should take in regard to Goa. We shall have to give a good deal of thought to it from time to time as to whether we should vary our previous policy and, if so, in what way. That is all I can say at present.

These were, so far as I know, all the subject matters raised but I have wanted to associate myself with this discussion here because, although this is a simple Bill—it is a Bill which no doubt will be passed unanimously and with acclaim here—nevertheless, it has importance and significance and, therefore, I wanted to be associated with this somewhat historic moment in our Parliament when this little piece of territory—its littleness does not count—is coming back to the arms of Mother India. Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—155; Noes—Nil

AYES—155

Abdul Rahim, Shri. Abid Ali, Shri. Agrawal, Shri J. P. Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin. Akhtar Husain, Shri.

Ali, Shri Mohammad.
 Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari.
 Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy,
 Shrimati. Anwar, Shri N. M. Arora,
 Shri Arjun. Banerjee, Shri Tara Shankar.
 Bansi Lai, Shri. Barlingay, Dr. W. S.
 Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar. Bedavati
 Buragohain, Shrimati. Bharathi,
 Shrimati K. Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bhargava, Shri M. P. Bisht, Shri J. S.
 Chakradhar, Shri A. Chaman Lall,
 Diwan. Chandravati Lakhnopal,
 Shrimati. Chaturvedi, Shri B. D.
 Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh. Chavda,
 Shri K. S. Chettiar, Shri T. S.
 Avinashilingam. Chinai, Shri Babubhai.
 Dave, Shri Rohit M. Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deogirikar, Shri T. R. Deokinandan
 Narayan, Shri. Desai, Shri Janardhan
 Rao. Desai, Shri Khandubhai K. Desai,
 Shri Suresh J. Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
 Dey, Shri S. K.
 Dharam Prakash, Dr.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurudev, Shri.
 Gwrupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
 Hagjer, Shri J. B.
 Hardiker, Dr. N. S.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 John, Shri M.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Jugal Kishore, Shri.
 Kabir, Shri Humayun.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb.
 Kapoor, Shri Jaspat Roy
 Kaushal, Shri J. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.

Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Krishna iumari, Shrimati.
 Kulkarni, Shri G. R.
 Kumbha Ram, Shri.
 Kunzru, Pandit Hriday Nath.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Latif, Shri Abdul.
 Lila Devi, Shrimati.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T. | Mahapatra, Shri
 Bhagirathi. I Malviya, Shri Ratanlal
 Kishorilal. I Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
 Mazhar Imam, Syed.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Menon, Shri K. Madhava.
 Misra, Shri Bibudhendra.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Modi, Shri J. K.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Naik, Shri Maheswar.
 Nair, Shri K. P. Madhavan.
 Nallamuthu Ramamurti, Shrimati T.
 Narasimham, Shri K. L.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Paliwal, Shri Tikaram.
 Pande, ' Shri T.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Fatal, Shri V. P.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Pushpalata Das, Shrimati.
 Raghu Vira, Prof. Dr.
 Raghubir Sinh, Dr.
 Rajabhoj, Shri P. N.
 Rao, Shri D. Ramanuja.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.

Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Sapru, Shri P. N.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savitry Devi Nigam, Shrimati.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Shanti Devi, Shrimati.
 Sharda Bhargava, Shrimati.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sharma, Shri Purna Chandra.
 Sher Khan, Shri.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shrimali, Dr. K. L.
 Singh, Raja Ajit Pratap.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budli.
 Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Singh, Giani Zail.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Tankhas, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Tumpalliwar, Shri M. D.
 Umair, Shah Mohammad.
 Venkataraman, Shri S.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Violet Alva, Shrimati.
 Wadia, Prof. A. R.
 Warkerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).

Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.

NOES—NIL

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting. MR. DEPUTY

CHAIRMAN: We shall take up the clause by clause consideration of the BiH.

The question is:

V "That clauses 2, 3, 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—156; Noes—Nil.

AYES—156

Abdul Rahim, Shri.
 Abid Ali, Shri.
 Agrawal, Shri J. P.
 Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
 Akhtar Husain, Shri.
 Ali, Shri Mohammad.
 Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari.
 Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati. Anwar, Shri N. M. Arora, Shri Arjun. Banerjee, Shri Tara Shankar. Bansi Lai, Shri. Barlingay, Dr. W. S. Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar. Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati. Bharathi, Shrimati K. Bhargava, Shri B. N. Bhargava, Shri M. P. Bisht, Shri J. S. Chakradhar, Shri A. Chaman Lall, Diwan. Chandravati Lakhanpal, Shrimati. Chaturvedi, Shri B. D. Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh. Chavda, Shri K. S. Chettiar, Shri T. S. Avinashilingam. Chinai, Shri Babubhai. Das, Shri N. K. Dave, Shri Rohit M. Deb, Shri S. C. Deogirikar, Shri T. R. Deokinandan Narayan, Shri. Desai, Shri Janardhan Rao. Desai, Shri Khandubhai K. Desai, Shri Suresh J. Deshmukh, Shri R. M. Dey, Shri S. K. Dharam Prakash, Dr. Doogar, Shri R. S. Dutt, Shri Krishan.

Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurudev, Shri.
 Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
 Hagjer, Shri J. B.
 Hardiker, Dr. N. S.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 John, Shri M.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Jugal Kishore, Shri
 Kabir, Shri Humayun.
 Kalkar, Kakasaheb.
 Kapoor, Shri Jaspat Roy.
 Kaushal, Shri J. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pi, Mohammed.
 Krishna Kumari, Shrimati.
 Kulkarni, Shri G. R.
 Kumbha Ram, Shri.
 Kunzru, Fandit Hriday Nath.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Latif, Shri Abdul.
 Lila Devi, Shrimati.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahapatra, Shri Bhagirathi.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
 Mazhar Imam, Syed.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Menon, Shri K. Madhava.
 Misra, Shri Bibudhendra.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Modi, Shri J. K.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Naik, Shri Maheswar.
 Nair, Shri K. P. Madhavan.
 Nallamuthu Ramamurti, Shrimati T.
 Narasimham, Shri K. L.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Paliwal, Shri Tikaram.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pa til, Shri V. P.

Pawar, Shri D. Y. Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Pushpalata Das, Shrimati. Raghu Vira,
 Prof. Dr. Raghubir Sinn, Dr. Rajabhoj,
 Shri P. N. Rao, Shri D. Ramanuja. Rao,
 Shri V. C. Kesava. Ray, Dr. Nihar
 Ranjan. Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala. Reddy,
 Shri N. Sri Rama. Reddy, Shri S.
 Channa. Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda. Sadiq Ali,
 Shri. Sahai, Shri Ram. "•it. Shri
 Ebrahim Sulaiman. Saksena, Shri H. P.
 Samuel, Shri M. H. Santhanam, Shri K.
 Sapru, Shri P. N. Sarwa'te, Shri V. V.
 Satvacharan, Shri. Savitry Devi Nigam,
 Shrimati. Savenkar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 S°eta Yudhvir, Shrimati. Sethi, Shri P.
 C. Shah, Shri K. K. Sbanta Vasisht.
 Kumari. Shanti Devi, Shrimati. Sharda
 Bhargava, Shrimati. Sharma, Shri
 Madho Ram. Sharma, Shri Puma
 Chandra.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shrimali, Dr. K. L.
 Singh, Raja Ajit Pratap.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Singh, Giani Zail.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Tumpalliwar, Shri M. D.

Umair, Shah Mohammad.
 Venkataraman, Shri S.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vijavargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Violet Alva, Shrimati. Wadia, Prof.
 A. R. Warkerkar, Shri B. V.
 (Mama). Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.

NOES—Nil

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

5 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would like to say a few words. I wish the Prime Minister was here when we spoke. Unfortunately he had some other business and even more unfortunately, some of the points that were made had not been communicated to him probably. It is difficult for anyone to do so, I agree.

Now, I would like to know from the Prime Minister—since he has spoken and I think he might also be provoked to speak again—one thing. First of all I am glad that the Prime Minister has said that the matter is not closed. How can it be closed? The question does not arise. If we say the matter is closed, it means accepting the present position of Goa. That is not enough. The question is, some indication should be given as to what would be done. He need not give the details of this thing, but something should be told because it is important for those people who are fighting within Goa. The Prime Minister himself said that it is important for the people to develop their struggle in Goa. I myself don't see why in this

case we should say it as if we are dealing with some other country here. After all, it is a part of India and part of our people are struggling and their comrades in arms and fellow-fighters should render them assistance. Here the analogy of one country trying to help another from outside and waiting for things to develop there, does not arise. That analogy is somewhat misapplied here, if I may say so. Even so, taking the Prime Minister's own argument, the steps of the Government of India should be such, even internally here—even if they did not take more drastic action—which would constantly inspire the people there within Goa who are fighting. Sir, the Prime Minister thinks that he has been, on the whole, right. Well, I do not wish to sit on judgment on the past at this stage of the discussion. Let us look forward to the future. Even if we do not sit on judgment on the past—because the past cannot be recaptured—the future can be gained. Therefore, Sir, I would like to know what is the position now. He said that he did not like the idea of people going without arms and getting shot down there. It is a right sentiment. I fully share that sentiment. How after all, can the Prime Minister of the country and the people of the country, watch our people crossing the frontiers to be mowed down by the Portuguese bullets? But is that all? Is there no alternative between crossing the frontier absolutely without any arms, to be shot down and massacred by the Portuguese authorities, and marching our troops formally? I think, Sir, that statesmanship should tell us and practical prudence should guide us in thinking that there are intermediary steps. Why can't these be taken? Why should not the country, the people, receive encouragement from the Government in such matters? Yes, we do not want and do not like our people to go there to be shot. But then is it not possible to see that people go there in a manner in which the Portuguese cannot shoot them with impunity? I suppose they will do a bit of shooting, but others also may do this thing. The question will arise.

how we get weapons and so on. As I said at the beginning, I would like this thing to be conveyed to the Prime Minister. There are ways of getting things done if you want to do things. There are shops. Let not the Prime Minister blame my buying a shot gun and so on. I can go and buy a shot gun. I am told our shot guns are very good. Why not this restriction on the buying of arms be lifted? It is right that we the citizens of India, if we can collect Rs. 150 or Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 should go to a Bombay shop and buy a few arms, or go to Calcutta or Madras and buy

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras):
The hon. Member is repeating himself.
He is simply repeating his own speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, how can I repeat Mr. Santhanam's speech? Such an experienced parliamentarian like Mr. Santhanam, does he not know this, even after such a long time spent in Parliament?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But you need not repeat yourself also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now if you ask Mr. Santhanam for another interruption, he will repeat his interruption again. Anyway, Sir, this is the position. I am repeating myself, it is true. But what can I do? Truth has to be repeated if it is not followed. That is another obvious thing. Therefore, this is important.

Sir, I drew attention to the Samiti Resolution. You will say again that I am repeating; but you will forgive me, because the Prime Minister was not here then and the Law Minister did not have the time to convey it to him, perhaps. The Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti passed that Resolution, saying that the ban on volunteers crossing be lifted and they have not made it a condition that if so lifted they will go there and get themselves killed. That is not at all in the Resolution. Therefore, the Government can still respond to this kind of thing by saying that there is no ban and then

the Prime Minister can advise: "Well, countrymen, do not go there and get yourself shot down by them." Then we may ask other questions, but that is a different matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not yet. Sir. So this is the point.

The third point is about this American's visit. I would, request the Prime Minister—I cannot advise the Prime Minister—I would request him not to put too much importance on it, because when a certain American gentleman made that statement here, a counter question was posed to him: Would they say publicly that Portugal should quit Goa? It is not enough to say things. We are not in need of platitudes. Would they say that the task of Portugal now is to quit Goa? Even under our Communist provocation—they are allergic to Communists—they do not say this thing, that Portugal should quit Goa. That exposes the Americans. They want to say good things when they come here, but when they cross to the other side and are in the same sub-continent, they say yet another thing, and yet another thing as they pass on from continent to continent. Therefore, let us not attach much importance to that. The question here is that they will not.

As far as Britain is concerned, I would like to know from the Prime Minister, when this encouragement was being given—it is a fact that they are part of NATO and that is an encouragement to the Salazar regime as everybody knows—when Great Britain sent troops and her Naval ships and so on, though a section of the British Press and the public opinion was opposed to it, I would like to know whether the Government of India launched any formal protest and did they point out that this was an extremely wrong thing to be done with regard to this matter, especially when we and they are part of the Commonwealth

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] and especially as it was being done when there was an outstanding issue like Goa there? Well, that also we do not know. As for NATO, the Prime Minister said that NATO would be weakened. Let NATO be weakened morally and otherwise. It is all for the good, for we cannot gain friends by saying that if Portugal leaves it will weaken NATO, as if we are interested in it. I know the Prime Minister is not interested; but people may understand it that way and words carry their own natural meaning. Other people may feel that Pandit Jawahar-lal Nehru is advising the NATO powers to maintain their moral position or to strengthen it. I am not at all suggesting that the Prime Minister has this in mind; but when he was speaking, I felt that he could be misinterpreted in certain other countries. There are certain interested people who might do so abroad. The sooner it becomes weaker the better, because Portugal is part of NATO and rest assured, as long as NATO remains, Portugal remains. There is no question of their separating. Whatever America may say, Britain will keep Portugal with them, because it is one of their mainstay, a power that they built up on the continent of Europe and which they used and used in other places also, to intimidate and terrorise people and, therefore, they will retain Portugal. Therefore, this kind of argument, however well-intentioned it may be—I may use it in a law court—but in the court of statesmanship and politics, I will not advance this argument. Therefore, this is another aspect of the matter. As far as the other things are concerned, I am very glad that the Prime Minister has said a good thing that imposition should not take place and that people should be given their right; but how; in what manner? In Nagaland you did something like that. Here there should be more legislative enactment to give them self-rule which—others have also asserted that—has to be given to maintain their culture and so on. It is very very important and tangible steps should be taken to give self-rule to

these people and to promote their culture and so on. This is all that I have to say.

I only hope that the Prime Minister will kindly inform us from time to time in what manner Goa is to be liberated. The country's desire is to see Goa liberated before Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is no more in the Prime Minister's office. Some day he will not be there as even you will not be here. Therefore, we would like to know. (Interruptions.) If these gentlemen remain it is better that he is there so far as we are concerned.

Now, the question is, people ask why it should be like that. The process of independence would not be complete as he himself put it. We entirely associate with the feeling of Congressmen and others that during his tenure of office it should be done and it is for him to give the lead, being the leader of the ruling party, the first party in the country and being the Head of the Government. I suggest that ways and means must be found, through the combined efforts of the State and of the people at the non-official level for bringing about a situation which makes the dream of the liberation of Goa into a living reality.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member who has just been speaking referred to various possible courses of action in regard to Goa. He said that there were other alternatives; one need not march an army; one need not send people to be shot down. Then he referred presumably to people going furtively and secretly with guns that they may obtain

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I did not say furtively and secretly.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: If they do not go furtively and secretly they will be shot down; it is obvious. Odd individuals do not go openly to face an army, even a Portuguese army.

A State army, however weak it may be, is infinitely stronger, from the point of view of arms, than a few odd individuals with shot guns in their hands which really means that people should go there secretly and organise, let us say, some kind of a guerilla warfare. Now, I am not touching on the morals of this question. But practically speaking I am opposed—maybe my upbringing is such—to any kind of sabotage activities and the like. I am entirely opposed to that, I have no moral objection to people with guns fighting for freedom but then I have to consider that from the practical point of view of how far it is likely to produce results. It is a conceivable thing if that had been done. But as things are, what happens is not that people do this. People go there in order to produce a situation which will compel the Government to send armies. Now, I am not prepared to be pressed into action until I think that the time is ready for that action. Therefore, I have objected to this kind of thing. I am asked, 'permit us to go there unarmed'. All that, if I may say so with all respect, is not quite straightforward because they do not expect to do anything except to force us to follow them with guns. And as I have just hinted a time may come when we may even decide to send our armies and when that time comes it will be an open effort of ours and not a secret or furtive one.

That is all I have to say, Sir, except to assure my hon. friend Mr. Gupta that I have no intention of passing away before Goa is liberated,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I said Prime Minister's tenure of office. I wish him long life even here but let it not be understood that I referred to Prime Minister's passing away. It is a forbidding thought, anyway.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—162; Noes—Nil.

AYES—162

Abdul Rahim, Shri.
 Abid Ali, Shri.
 Agrawal, Shri J. P.
 Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
 Akhtar Husain, Shri.
 Ali, Shri Mohammad.
 Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari.
 Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy,
 Shrimati. Anwar, Shri N. M. A. rora, Shri
 Arjun. Banerjee, Shri Tara Shankar. Bansi
 Lai, Shri. Barlingay, Dr. W. S. Basu, Shri
 Santosh Kumar. Bedavati Buragohain,
 Shrimati. Bharathi, Shrimati K. Bhargava,
 Shri B. N. Bhargava, Shri M. P. Bisht, Shri J.
 S. Chakradhar, Shri A. Chaman Lall, Diwan.
 Chandravati Lakhnapal, Shrimati.
 Chaturvedi, Shri B. D. Chauhan, Shri Nawab
 Singh. Chavda, Shri K. S. Chettiar, Shri T.
 S. Avinashilingam. Chinai, Shri Babubhai.
 Das, Shri N. K. Dave, Shri Rohit M.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deogirikar, Shri T. R.
 Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
 Desai, Shri Janardhan Rao.
 Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
 Dey, Shri S. K.
 Dharam Prakash, Dr.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gurudev, Shri.
 Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.

Hagjer, Shri J. B.
 Hardiker, Dr. N. S.
 John Shri M.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Jugal Kishore, Shri.
 Kabir, Shri Humayun.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb.
 Kapoor, Shri Jaspat Roy.
 Kaushal, Shri J. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Krishna Kumari, Shrimati.
 Kulkarni, Shri G. R.
 Kumbha Ram, Shri.
 Kunzru, Pandit Hriday Nath.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Latif, Shri Abdul.
 Lila Devi, Shrimati.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahapatra, Shri Bhagirathi.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chetry, Shrimati.
 Mazhar Imam, Syed.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Menon, Shri K. Madhava.
 Mirza, Shri D. H.
 Misra, Shri Bibudhendra.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri S. D.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Modi, Shri J. K.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Naik, Shri Maheswar.
 Nair, Shri K. P. Madhavan.
 Nallamuthu Ramamurti, Shrimati T.
 Narasimham, Shri K. L.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Paliwal, Shri Tikaram.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing
 Patil, Shri V. P.
 Pawar, Shri, D. Y.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Pushpalata Das, Shrimati.
 Raghu Viro, Prof. Dr.
 Raghubir Sinh, Dr.
 Rajabhoj, Shri P. N.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.

Rao, Shri D. Ramanuja. Rao, Shri V. C.
 Kesava. Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan. Reddi,
 Dr. B. Gopala. Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa. Reddy, Shri M.
 Govinda. Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri. Sahai, Shri Ram. Sait,
 Shri Bbrahim Sulaiman. Saksena, Shri H.
 P. Samuel, Shri M. H. Santhanam, Shri K.
 Sapru, Shri P. N. Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri. Savi'try Devi Nigarn,
 Shrimati. Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta, Yudhvir, Shrimati. Sethi, Shri P.
 C. Shah, Shri K. K. Shakoor, Shri
 Moulana Abdul. ; Shanta Vasisht,
 Kumari. Shanti Devi, Shrimati. Sharda
 Bhargava, Shrimati. Sharma, Shri L. Lalit
 Madhob. Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sharma, Shri Purna Chandra. Sher Khan,
 Shri. Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shrimali, Dr. K. L. Singh, Raja Ajit
 Pratap. Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh. Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Shri Mohan. Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Singh, Giani Zail. Sinha, Shri
 Awadeshwar Prasad. Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B. Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha, Dinkar, Prof. R. D. Subbo Rao, Dr.
 A. Tajumul Husain, Shri. Tankha, Pandit
 S. S. N. Tavyebulla, Maulana M.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V. Tumpalliwar, Shri
 M. D. Umair, Shah Mohammad.
 Venkataraman. Shri S. Venkateswararao.
 Shri N. Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Violet Alva. Shrimati. Wadia, Prof. A.
 R. Warerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).

403 Constitution (Tenth { 16 AUG. 1961] Amendment) Bill, 1961 404

Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
Vashoda Reddy, Shrimati.

NOES—Nil.

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at nineteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 17th August 1961.