

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 7]

AYES

[14.56 hrs.

Alvares, Shri
Aney, Dr. M.S.
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Bheel, Shri P. H.
Dandekar, Shri N.
Kachhavaiya, Shri Hukam Chand

Kapur Singh, Shri
Krishnapal Singh, Shri
Mahida, Shri
Masani, Shri M. R.
Mukherjee, Shri H. N.
Nambiar, Shri

Nath Pai, Shri
Ranga, Shri
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Singha, Shri Y. N.
Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi

NOES

Aiva, Shri A. S.
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
Barua, Shri R.
Basappa, Shri
Baswant, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chandrabhan Singh, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala
Chavan, Shri Y.B.
Chavda, Shrimati Johraben
Dafle, Shri
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
Dighe, Shri
Dorai, Shri Kasinatha
Dubey, Shri R. G.
Elayaperumal, Shri
Harvani, Shri Ansar
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Iqbal Singh, Shri
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Kamble, Shri
Kanakasabei, Shri

Kedaria Shri C. M.
Keishing, Shri Rishang
Khadilkar, Shri
Kindar Lal, Shri
Koujalgi, Shri H. V.
Lalit Sen, Shri
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Mahishi, Shrimati Sarojini
Malaichami, Shri
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
Mantri, Shri
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri Bibudhendra
More, Shri K. L.
More, Shri S. S.
Mukne, Shri
Murli Manohar, Shri
Muthiah, Shri
Nigam, Shrimati Savitri
Pande, Shri K. N.
Patel, Shri P. R.
Patil, Shri D.S.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri T. A.

Patnaik, Shri B. C.
Pratap Singh, Shri
Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri Jaganatha
Raut, Shri Bhola
Roy, Shri Biswanath
Saigal, Shri A. S.
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Sheo Nersin, Shri
Siddananiappa, Shri
Siddiah, Shri
Singh, Shri K. K.
Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Sonavane, Shri
Surya Prasad, Shri
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Tiwari, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary, Shri R.S.
Vaishya, Shri M. B.
Verma, Shri K.K.
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Yadava, Shri B. P.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the Division is:

Ayes: 17; Noes: 78

The Resolution was negatived.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I have wrongly voted for 'Noes' instead of for 'Ayes'. My vote also may be added to 'Ayes'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That statement will be recorded. It does not affect the merits of the case.

14.56 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: NATIONAL
INTEGRATION

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of Mem-
1603 (A) LSD—7.

bers of Parliament be appointed to chalk out a scheme for complete national integration and with that end in view recommend to Government to take necessary steps, particularly in regard to the merger of the Union Territories of Goa and Nagar Haveli in Maharashtra, Pondicherry in Madras and Daman and Diu in Gujarat, before the next General Elections."

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): May I say a word?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not now. Let me first place the resolution before the House.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament be appointed to chalk out a scheme for complete national integration and with that end in view recommend to Government to take necessary steps, particularly in regard to the merger of the Union Territories of Goa and Nagar Haveli in Maharashtra, Pondicherry in Madras and Daman and Diu in Gujarat, before the next General Elections."

Now, the hon. Home Minister.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): I have an identical motion. May I move it?

Shri Shinkre: Before the Home Minister says anything, may I say one word? This is for his own consideration.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: After the Home Minister, I shall call the hon. Member, if necessary.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): May I know whether when the resolution is before the House, the Home Minister can reply to it, without its having been discussed? Is that proper?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hathi): I am not replying.

Shri P. R. Patel: Is that according to the rules?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not replying.

Shri P. R. Patel: It may be a statement that he may be making. Even then, can he make a statement on this without the resolution having been discussed before that?

Shri Hathi: This is a rather important and delicate matter. Although the resolution mentions about the appointment of a committee, in fact, it

deals with the question of merger of certain Union Territories with different States. These are delicate and important matters which require careful consideration by all the States concerned.

In view of this, I beg to move:

"That the debate on the resolution be adjourned."

Shri Alvares: I have an identical motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the hon. Member opposing this motion of the Home Minister?

Shri Shinkre: I want to say a word about the motion of my hon. friend Shri Alvares.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the hon. Member opposing the motion of the Home Minister?

Shri P. R. Patel: The motion moved by the hon. Minister is for the adjournment of the discussion. I have nothing to say against it and I can understand it. But the way in which it is done does harm to the other parts of the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the hon. Member opposing the adjournment of the debate?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I do not quite understand the reasons why the hon. Minister has chosen to ask for an adjournment. This is a motion of which notice was given in proper time by the Member over there. He has read it out and placed it before the House and has suggested certain reasons for it, namely the desirability of implementing our ideas about national integration and so on and so forth. The Home Minister suggests that many delicate questions are involved and, therefore, discussion of this should be postponed. I cannot quite understand it. If a matter is acceptable on principle and

if in the execution of that principle certain delays are involved . . .

15 hrs.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not going into the merits now.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: No, Sir. I am opposing the idea that the Minister has put forward that the matter be adjourned. I would seek a clarification from you after a while perhaps.

It is open to the House, I believe, at this particular point of time to reiterate its espousal of certain principles in regard to national integration. It is open to this House also to be told by the Home Minister what exactly are the delicate and difficult problems involved in implementation of the principle of national integration. There is no question as far as I am concerned, and in the mind of almost every other member of this House that the principle of linguistic states is a principle which is part of our entire political and social set-up. It may be that in a particular area to apply that principle might require some little time on account of some very special requirement of the region. That is a different matter. What I wish from Government today is in answer to a resolution of this sort a reiteration of the acceptance of the principle of national integration, and I would like Government to tell us something more about the difficulties of the situation. If, for instance, over the question of Goa's getting into Maharashtra or of Pondicherry's merger into Madras or of Daman and Diu becoming incorporated in Gujarat, there are certain difficulties, they should not be discussed in a hush hush atmosphere in the private meetings of Maharashtrians or of Kanarese Members or God knows who else. I do not understand that kind of thing. I want Parliament to take cognisance of these matters openly because, after all we are strong enough to face whatever difficulties are there. If we are facing difficulties in relation to China, Pakistan and so many other things, these

footling little difficulties inside of our own country can be discussed openly and in a courageous manner.

That is why I oppose the idea of adjournment. I wish there is a free and frank discussion of these issues involved. I take it Members of Parliament are responsible enough not to speak in a manner which would add to whatever fire might be smouldering in Belgaum or elsewhere. We could certainly try to order our conduct according to canons of parliamentary propriety, but there is reason why we should stop discussion of this matter merely because some pourparlers are going on behind the scenes—I saw some symptoms of it in the Central Hall of Parliament, but I am not going to refer to what has happened in the precincts of Parliament inside this House.

Therefore, I believe that opportunity should be given to this House. When the Member concerned has moved his resolution, I expect him to give the reasons and then this House should discuss the matter. The Home Minister later on might tell us what Government's view is. But I would expect that Government reiterates its acceptance of the principle of linguistic integration of all our States into the Indian Union, and Government should give some indication of the difficulties which are causing delay in the implementation of this policy.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): The Government has not committed itself to the principle that the linguistic principle is the only criterion for the reorganisation of States.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I want to oppose the adjournment. This is merely a non-official resolution. The general practice, as we have seen during these 8 years, in connection with resolutions is for the mover to withdraw if he is a member of the ruling party and if it is not acceptable to Government. That is one thing. Secondly, this resolution has the aspect of national integration in view.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

merger of certain Union Territories with various States. Some Members will express their views on these matters. I know there is some dispute between two States. But after all, we have every right, whether Members come from north, south, east or west or any part of the country, to express our views. Moreover, if it is adjourned today, will it not come up on the next day in the same session? Then again adjournment will be moved . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will see.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The statement made by a Cabinet Minister that for ten years Goa would continue to be under the Centre has created all these things. The Defence Minister has also been criticised by others.

Therefore, I feel that a discussion should be allowed. We know our responsibilities fully well. We are equally concerned with these matters and we shall not generate heat which will change the complexion of the discussion. I plead that discussion should be allowed now.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :

उपाध्यक्ष जी, कुछ समय से भारत सरकार की यह आदत हो गई है कि राष्ट्रीय महत्व के इस प्रकार के प्रश्नों को टालते रहना, टालते रहना और फिर उन को उलझा देना और जब अन्त में इस प्रकार से जब समस्या बिल्कुल विगड़ जाये, तो अपनी विवशता प्रकट कर देना। बिल्कुल यही स्थिति काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में है। हम ने कहा था कि वहाँ पर जनमत कराया जायेगा। हमारे पहले प्रधान मंत्री के अनुसार वहाँ पर तीन बार जनमत हो चुका, वहाँ पर संविधान ममा ठीक निर्णय कर चुकी, लेकिन इस के बावजूद भारत सरकार संविधान में धारा 370 को रखे हुए है। वहीं गलती भारत सरकार गोआ के सम्बन्ध में कर रही है। 1961 में गोआ स्वतन्त्र हुआ। दो

वर्ष तक हम इस योग्य नहीं हो पाये कि वहाँ पर निर्वाचन करा सकें। अन्त में वहाँ पर निर्वाचन हुए और गोआ के शासन की बागडोर उन लोगों के हाथ में आई, जो एक दो या दस बीस बरसों से नहीं, बल्कि शताब्दियों से गोआ की स्वतन्त्रता के लिये और गोआ का भारत में मिलाने के लिए लड़ रहे थे। जब वहाँ के लोगों ने अपना यह निर्णय दिया कि गोआ जैसे छोटे प्रदेश की अलग रहने की कोई अपेक्षा नहीं है इसलिये उस को महाराष्ट्र के साथ मिला दिया जाये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not go into the merits.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि भारत सरकार इस प्रस्ताव को स्थगित करने का यह प्रस्ताव ला कर अपने दायित्व से हटना चाहती है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस से देश के सामने जो समस्याएँ हैं, वे विगड़ेंगी और सरकार के सम्बन्ध में लोगों के मनो में तरह तरह की विपरीत प्रतिक्रियाएँ होंगी। सरकार इस समय वही भूल कर रही है, जो कि काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में की गई है।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव के स्थगन से पहले मंत्री महोदय इस सदन को यह आश्वासन दें कि अगले शुकवार को जब यह प्रस्ताव आयेगा, उस समय सरकार इस स्थिति में होगी कि वह गोआ के सम्बन्ध में अपना स्पष्ट मन बता सकें, अन्यथा इस प्रश्न को स्थगित न किया जाये और इस पर चर्चा की जाये।

श्री बड़े (खारगीन) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, गोआ के सम्बन्ध में एक स्टेटमेंट श्री पाटिल ने दिया और एक स्टेटमेंट श्री चह्माण ने दिया।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not go into the merits.

श्री बड़े : मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव को स्थगित क्यों नहीं करना चाहिये। अगर आप मेरी हिन्दी को नहीं समझ सकते हैं तो मैं अंग्रेजी में बोलता हूँ।

उन दोनों स्टेटमेंट्स की वजह से एक लूफान सा पैदा हो गया और महाराष्ट्र तथा अन्य स्थानों के पेपर्स में इस विषय में लेख तथा वक्तव्य प्रकाशित किये गये। इस प्रकार सारे देश में एक तनावपूर्ण वातावरण पैदा हो गया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव को स्थगित कराने से पहले शासन की तरफ से स्टेटमेंट दिया जाये कि वह इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करेगा और गोम्रा की जनता की भावनाओं का आदर करेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस से शासन की स्थिति अच्छी होगी। नहीं तो, जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य, श्री शास्त्री, ने कहा है, कि काश्मीर और नागालैंड के अतिरिक्त गोम्रा की समस्या भी पैदा हो जायेगी। यह समझ में नहीं आता कि शासन इतनी समस्याओं को अपने गले में डाल कर कैसे बैठने वाला है। शासन खुद ही अपने लिए दर्द पैदा करता है और फिर दबा के लिये सटपटाता है।

श्री अ० [सि०] सहगल (जंजगीर) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आप की मार्फत माननीय मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस विषय पर बहस होने दें। बहस होने के बाद वह इस प्रस्ताव के मूवर से यह प्रस्ताव विदङ्ग करा सकते हैं। लेकिन कम से कम यहाँ पर इस विषय में बहस होने देने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये, ऐसी मेरी राय है। आखिर हम इस बात का फसला करने जा रहे हैं—अगर आज नहीं करेंगे, तो कुछ बरसों के बाद करेंगे। हम सब समस्याओं को जो टरकाते जाते हैं, उस से हमारी व्यवस्था खराब होती है। इस लिये मैं आप की मार्फत उन से निवेदन करूँगा कि वह इस प्रस्ताव पर बहस होने दें।

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): Could I say a few words?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it necessary?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: You have allowed many others. We might put forward a different view.

This is a resolution moved by my hon. friend, Shri Sonavane. The hon. Minister of State of Home Affairs has suggested an adjournment of the discussion. There is no attempt to shut out discussion; there is no attempt to deny any opportunity to any side or to any Member to have his say on this resolution. This is only a formal question of postponing the discussion to another date. It is not unusual in this House that discussion on resolutions and bills is adjourned. The House accepted adjournment of discussion even on the important Bill of Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. So, it is not an unusual proposal that the Home Minister has made. So, let us accept the proposal as something usual and routine. It is nothing more than a routine matter. Opportunities still remain, and the discussion is still open. There is no hush-hush policy anywhere. Nobody has said that the discussion on the resolution be shut out. Therefore, the proposal of the Home Minister may be accepted as a routine matter.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda): As it is a very ticklish and a very delicate question, a discussion in this House is bound to open the floodgates of controversy, and therefore there is no harm in accepting the proposal moved by the hon. Home Minister. This is not avoiding the question, but making an effort to solve the whole problem in a very amicable way, which may not cause any heartburn or controversy. So, I would appeal to the House not to be guided by emotions, but to accept this proposal coolly.

Shri P. R. Patel: I do not understand why this adjournment is sought.

[Shri P. R. Patel]

After all, Parliament has taken decisions on many delicate questions, and we, Members of Parliament, understand our responsibilities. We know how far to speak, and how far not to speak. In this case, I am afraid that justice will not be done to other parts of the country. I wish that this matter is discussed in the House, so that we may know the facts of the case, and then any decision may be taken.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): May I say a word of protest against the manner in which some hon. Members have dealt with this question, particularly the speaker who has just spoken. He wants us to be precluded from the discussion. I want to make my position clear. I would not oppose a motion for adjournment on the grounds which have been mentioned by the hon. Minister, but this hon. Member wants to preclude us from discussion on this ground that the question is delicate, and that, therefore, this Parliament is not fit enough to discuss it. Against this I protest, and I therefore say that the question should be discussed.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :कब तक के लिए ;

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Is it for an indefinite period? Let the Minister clarify.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The rules will operate.

The question is:

"That the debate on this resolution be adjourned."

The motion was adopted.

15.13 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. GOA

Shri Alvares (Panjim): I beg to move . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Your resolution is barred.

Shri Alvares: The resolution cannot be barred.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): I rise on a point of order.

Before you gave any ruling that the resolution is barred, I beg of you to consider that the resolution is not on the same subject, and that it does not deal with the same matter. Not only the wording is different, but the subject matter is different.

The Mover specifically wants the attention of this House and the country to be directed to the results of Goa's election and urges the immediate merger of Goa alone, while the resolution moved by Shri Sonavane basically deals with the issue of national integration and says that as a means to national integration it is essential that Government should take necessary steps, particularly in regard to the merger of the Union Territories of Goa and Nagar Haveli in Maharashtra, Pondicherry in Madras and Daman and Diu in Gujarat, before the next General Elections.

The subject matters of the two resolutions are different, and therefore this resolution is not barred.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): May I respectfully invite your attention to the resolution which stands in the name of Shri Peter Alvares?

Though there are similar words appearing in the two resolutions, the essential content of Shri Alvares's resolution is different from that which the House has just agreed to adjourn consideration of.

Whereas an incidental effect of the earlier resolution is the merger of Goa, it is the main purpose of this resolution and not an incidental effect, and it wants it to be brought about on the basis of the verdict of the electorate. The resolution gets barred only if the two resolutions are identical. Here, I beg to state for your