

[Mr. Speaker]

able to prevent that. The Minister has to take the responsibility, whether one officer has failed or the other officer was at fault. The Government had not known it because the chief editor had not forwarded it. That also is no excuse. The mistake is regretted; that would have been enough in my opinion. In future also, when this is being said, the Minister ought not to disclose the names; he has now disclosed the name of the office, and said that the officer who is holding that of rice is at fault.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Not at fault.

Mr. Speaker: That he did not intimate the fact to the Government.

Shri A. M. Thomas: It was not within his knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister is entitled to all information that is there in the office, whether it is attached or directly under the Government, whatever it may be. Therefore, the Minister is responsible to the House for whatever happens even in those attached and other offices and he is answerable to the House. If he had simply said that the mistake was regretted, that would have finished the matter.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagao): I am just seeking one clarification of what you said.

Mr. Speaker: Why waste the time of the House on this now?

Shri Shinkre: I never waste the time of the House. I will finish in two minutes.

Sir, you just now said that the Minister is always responsible before this House for whatever mistakes that the officers might be committing. What I want to ask is, whether the Minister is also responsible when he has no control over his officers, as was very apparent in the case of the Secretary of the Ministry of Home

Affairs? Who is responsible in such a case.—is it the official or the Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He has taken the time unnecessarily. We shall now pass on to the next item.

14 hrs.

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

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Vidya Charan Shukla on the 30th November, namely,

“That the Bill to provide for the taking of an opinion poll to ascertain the wishes of the electors of Goa, Daman and Diu with regard to the future status thereof and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration,”

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Jagannath Rao): What is the time allotted for this Bill? One hour was spent yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: I appeal to the House that hon. Members should try to finish some business now.

Shri Jagannath Rao: By 4 O'clock we will finish this.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hosangabad): We shall finish it of course, but not at the cost of clarity and efficiency.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): We can finish it by sitting longer. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Does he mean to say that we will finish it by 8 O'clock or 9 O'clock? I am not particularly pointing at him, but I was just enquiring as to what the total allotment should be and how soon we will finish it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Five hours.

Mr. Speaker: That is too long.

Shri Jaganatha Rao: By 4 O'clock it should be finished.

Mr. Speaker: 4 O'clock should be sufficient.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There are amendments.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow till 4.30.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 5 O'clock.

Mr. Speaker: I would request Members to be brief in their observations.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How much time for general discussion and how much time for the amendments, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: One hour for amendments.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: An hour and a half.

14.02 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Alvares: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, before the House adjourned yesterday, I was critical about the manner in which this Government treats the ministries of the Congress Party and otherwise. Now that I have done with it, let me explain the background of the three main provisions of the Bill. There are two contingencies provided in the Bill: one is in regard to the opinion poll in favour of merger and another for opting for maintaining the *status quo*. Behind each of these cases there is a tale. The demand of the people who want merger with Maharashtra is a logical consequence of the development of political history in this country, following the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission of which Shri Fazl Ali was the Chairman. This Commission ruled and recommended that all States should follow the basis of linguistic affinity provided those areas lay predominantly in a particular linguistic area or

were contiguous with each other. On this basis, all the States were reorganised. Those that were not reorganised on that basis find themselves pitted against each other. For instance, there is the case of Kasergod between Mysore and Kerala, and there is also the question of the border areas of Maharashtra and Mysore. It is, therefore, necessary that there should be a rationalisation of all these things, and it is in furtherance of that, that the majority of the people of Goa are asking for merger with Maharashtra.

What is the basis, and what is the demand for linguistic affinity and contiguity. May I give some statistics to show that the demand of the people of Goa is eminently reasonable and imperative? When Goa was liberated and became free, the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, had appointed a language Commission with Shri Amar Nath Jha as Chairman to determine what is the mother-tongue of the people of Goa so that they could be provided an opportunity for education in their mother-tongue. It was possible for the people of Goa to say whatever they liked. There was no bar or restriction. I have got some statistics showing the basis on which the people of Goa have opted as far as language is concerned. Today, the vital statistics are that 72,000 children study Marathi voluntarily, while only 20 children study Kanarese. Let us realise what it means: 72,000 against 20. I am not deriding anything. I am only trying to prove that the demand for the merger of Goa with Maharashtra is reasonable and overwhelming, and therefore the basis of this demand must be conceded.

What about the other languages? It was said that Konkani is the language of the Goan people. I am not entering into the controversy whether Konkani is a language or not. I only know that against 72,000 children are studying Marathi; as far as Konkani is concerned, the number is less than 2,000. Thus, we have 72,000 ver-

[Shri Alvares]

sus 20,00 versus 20. I am sure it will not require any exercise of the mind to find out whether this is true or not.

Secondly, may I give the House some other statistics? Is the demand for merger with Maharashtra justified by linguistic affinity? The Portuguese in their history have said that Dadra and Nagar Haveli are inhabited by people of Maharashtra who speak Marathi language. This is in the historical records. Also in Goa, what is the position? The Portuguese Government Gazette, up to the last one day before the liberation, was being published in two languages. The official gazette or the *Bulletin Official* was published in two languages only; in Portuguese and in Marathi. Therefore, it is conclusive evidence that the demand of the people for merger with Maharashtra is a demand in keeping with the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission and with the process of political development of this country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. 10 minutes each; he has already taken more; the time of the House is limited.

Shri Alvares: Mr. Shinkre and myself are the two people representing that territory in this House. Please permit us to speak. Now, let us examine the second demand. The House is not very well aware of what the second demand implies. The second demand implies isolation and abstention from the mainstream of cultural development in this country. I say with all sense of responsibility, if the House would think twice before, it would not encourage such a situation where abstention of this type is encouraged and given sanction to. Why should there be such a demand? Do not a lakh and a half people, Maharashtrians, the cream of intelligentsia, reside there and have been residing for the past over 100 years and have been participating in the cultural and economic and educational development of this area? Have they not developed themselves and grown up?

Have they not acquired property and have pursued their professions? Therefore, it would be an indictment of the secular character of our country, if these claims were allowed to continue and a section of the people in Goa would say that these *gadies* from Maharashtra would like to take charge of Goa. There is no demand from Maharashtra to take Goa; the demand is from the Goan people to be integrated with Maharashtra. Please let the house realise this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Alvares: How is it possible, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have 21 names.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The time should be extended; extension is inevitable.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Time is limited. I am sorry.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We will all walk out if you apply closure.

Shri Alvares: Within 10 minutes I will finish.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Non-Maharashtrians and non-Mysoreans should also be given an opportunity to speak.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes; Punjabis are more interested.

Shri Alvares: What is the genesis of this? As one who has participated in the freedom movement of Goa for many years, I can say that this is spearheaded by a section of the people whose leadership is with the national Congress. The Congress party in Goa is opposed to merger, and a leader of that party is a person who led the Home Ministry in a dance when he absconded. When the whole apparatus of the Home Ministry was looking for him, he was enjoying this *tamasha* from a peephole in Rishikesh.

This was the situation; this was the demand for the preservation of each other! And the House must think twice before, whether they will concede that for merely cultural purposes we would carve a State rather than on the basis of linguistic affinity because, if that is so, we will come across many difficulties whereby those who say that we are culturally apart may like that; but there cannot be any such thing that anybody anywhere in this country is culturally apart from anybody else. Therefore may I warn the House that this question of cultural detachment with one's neighbours is a dangerous proposition and the House will never sanction it.

Let me come to the immediate necessity of taking this opinion poll. It has been said here, let it carry on as it is till 1971; Jawaharlal Nehru gave his sanction to this ten-year scheme. I was associated with this when the Prime Minister made that attempt. He made it during the intense Goan freedom struggle. He tried to persuade Dr. Salazar to give freedom to Goa by saying, because Dr. Salazar was maintaining that Goa is an oasis of western culture in the East, "If you give freedom to Goa, we shall adopt all measures to maintain this basis of western culture in the East". But Salazar did not respond and the Indian army had to liberate Goa. Surely, this attempt made under certain circumstances, to evoke a certain response from a dictator like Dr. Salazar, if that did not fructify, that cannot be held up to day demanding that the Prime Minister had made an offer for 10 years.

In conclusion, may I say, Sir, when Shri Morarji visited Goa when he was Finance Minister, he said, "This cannot remain a Union Territory. I cannot find funds for it. Some day or other it must merge with a bigger State. Let it decide with which State it will merge." Similarly Shastriji also made a similar statement when he visited Goa. I am sure the House will realise the urgent necessity of it

and pass this Opinion Poll Bill, so that immediately the people of Goa can make their choice.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore, City): Sir, may I make an appeal to you? As you know, this is a very controversial Bill, a controversy which involves two State Assemblies, because the Maharashtra Assembly passed some resolution and the Mysore Assembly passed some other resolution, and the PCCs also. I request that a little more time may be given to whoever voices representative opinion. The same concession may be given to Mr. Shinkre when he speaks. With this preliminary request, I want to make a few observations.

Mr. Alvares, for what I know, is one of those leaders of our country who can be elected to this House not only from Goa but from any other constituency in the country. There is no necessity whatever for him to take a partisan view. I am happy to see that all the time he has argued on a high plane from the all-India viewpoint. He has brought in the SRC and then the name of Jawaharlal Nehru. I would appeal to him to examine my arguments advanced from the same level. If Shri Morarji Desai has said that there is no necessity for a centrally administered area to continue because of expenditure, I would appeal to Mr. Alvares to extend the argument to all centrally administered areas. Why should it not be made applicable to Pondicherry, Himachal Pradesh, Tripura and Manipur which are white elephants on the Indian budget?

I plead that this House should not be pressurised into taking decisions. The Cabinet should not be working under any pressure. This will be conceded by everyone in this House. All the time it was not the Goans who were in the picture so far as this agitation is concerned. But the leaders of Maharashtra in Bombay have been all the time behind this agitation sometimes overtly and sometimes covertly. It has been said that the Maharashtra leaders did not do any-

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

thing and only the Goan people are agitating for this merger. Sir, I ask for the appointment of a Commission to find out who sponsored this agitation, who led it and who are behind it. All the time the Chief Minister of Goa, Mr. Bhandarkar, was taking instructions from the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, whether it was Mr. Chavan or Mr. Naik, who advocated the merger with that amount of force which has made this House get into this awkward situation of taking a decision like this, even though Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru repeatedly declared that it should not be done in a hurry?

The first principle that has been violated in this case is that a decision is being taken and a Bill is being sponsored to meet the demands of a particular section of the people, leaving alone Pondicherry, Manipur, Tripura, etc. If this is not a partial or pressurised decision, what else is it, I ask? After Goa was liberated, Pandit Nehru wrote a letter to Mr. Purushotham Kakotkar, the President of the PCC of that place, saying:

"I see that some people are laying great stress on the merger of Goa with Maharashtra. I think this is very wrong and foolish of them. I have said that the future of Goa will be decided by the people of Goa. That does not mean that so soon after liberation, we should consider the merger of Goa with Maharashtra or any such other thing. For the present, it is essential that Goa should remain a Union Territory and settle down."

Ever since Goa was liberated, the Maharashtra leaders never allowed a chance to the Goans to settle down. All the time they have been agitating and doing all kinds of legal and illegal things for the merger of Goa. The sound advice that the people should be allowed to settle down for some time so that they can take a decision impartially objectively and on merits was never given a chance

by the leaders of Maharashtra. What I am opposing to day is the trend of policy that is guiding the Cabinet and those who are behind the Cabinet. Outwardly they say that agitational approach should not be countenanced. But all the time agitational approach has been the policy that has been pursued by the Maharashtra leaders and the Government of India has succeded to it.

In the country, Sir, we see so much agitation today, whether it is Andhra, whether it is in Bengal or whether it is in any other part of the country. It may be territorial, it may be ideological, it may be communal. But all these people have come to feel that here is a Cabinet which is not able to take a decision on merits, on the basis of justice, but it decides because of political pressure, because of the block votes. It so happens that in the present set up, some States have the good luck of, what is called, being under the captains of the team in the totalitarian sense. They have with them 40 or 50 votes, as the case may be, and they may throw them in the way they like in the AICC forum or in the parliamentary forum. It is this fact which has come to determine the decisions of the Government of India. It is not that only I am saying so. One of the leading papers of this country, which is said to be of the largest circulation, says, on some other occasion when this very same question of Goa was discussed:

"Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that various groups have their patrons in the High Command and the Cabinet, and through this client-patron relationship factionalism thrives and preflerates. Similarly, the warring organisational and ministerial wings in various States have their counterparts at the top. To some extent the fires of inter-State squabbles are stoked from the Centre since States, like groups, have also their patrons at the level of the Union Government. Mr. Hanumanthaiya was not far

wrong when he said that the Central Government was 'incapable of taking an impartial decision in inter-State disputes.' "

An hon. Member: Which is that paper?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: *Indian Express (Interruption).*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, I will not be able to finish my speech in two minutes. If you want me to stop I will stop, but I cannot finish my speech in two minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A very large number of hon. Members want to participate in this debate.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Then you may ask others to speak and let me walk out in protest. Let it be recorded. This cannot be decided in two minutes. I have already made a request in my preliminary remarks. If you want other hon. Members from Mysore and several others will give their time also to me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have already taken ten minutes.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: We have come here to make a point of view before the House. It is not that we are much anxious to get time to speak.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, let us hear both sides. We have heard Shri Alvares. Let us hear him also.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Shri Alvares is the protagonist of one point of view. Shri Hanumanthaiya is the protagonist of another point of view. He should be given as much time as he wants.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): There the three points of view and not two—Maharashtra, Mysore and Gujarat.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may finish in another five minutes.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, here it is not a question of five minutes, but the point of view to be explained—the time that has been taken in this miscellaneous discussion need not be counted against me.

Sir, I want the leaders of the P.S.P., in particular, for whom I have the greatest respect—I concede they are not influenced so much by communal politics as some other parties are—to consider one thing. In the present state of our democratic evolution somehow these caste feelings, these communal feelings in the country are shaping our political decisions from behind the scene. It is impossible for justice or merit to prevail fully, and with time we see more and more democratic institutions bogged down in this mire of communal and caste politics.

Take the statements of some of these Maharashtra leaders—I won't say 'all' Their deity is not Bharat Mata, their 'Father of the Nation' is not Mahatma Gandhi; it is all the time 'Shivaji', Shivaji' and nobody else for them.

Shri Bade (Khargone): That is wrong. Sir, I object to this....

Shri Hanumanthaiya: You may object to it later. The other day, as statue of Shivaji was unveiled in Shivaji Park, near about Matunga in Bombay, and fiery speeches were made against non-Maharashtrians in Bombay. It was asked why the non-Maharashtrians should continue to stay in Bombay. The "Siva-Sena" volunteers, may be of a type of Red Guards as in China, went about smashing hotels of South Indians and other people. This has appeared in the papers. When I went to Bombay I found that many South Indians are feeling apprehensive as to what will be their fate in future in Bombay. The intolerance of some of the Maharashtra leaders has reached such a pitch that they say no non-Maharashtraian should

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

remain in Bombay. It is not an allegation that I make. It is a matter for Government to investigate, I am sure, if they seek the truth, they will have to verify what I have said. The cult of Shivaji, the cult of Maratha caste has reached a stage that it has not only made the democratic institutions in the State of Maharashtra communally contaminated, but the day their representative came into this House and the Cabinet even this atmosphere has become contaminated. Now it is all a matter of 'block votes'. There is no question of discretion, there is no question of using brains, no question of using arguments. It is all the time the pressure of 'block votes'. It may be that my voice today is a lonely voice, but in times to come the people who come to this House will know that what I have said today is truth and nothing but truth.

Even so great a Prime Minister as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who said that this Goa must remain as a separate entity for some time was bamboozled, but he was such a great personality, he was not afraid of people, and he kept this issue pending.

Shri D. C. Sharma: You have realised it now.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I have all the time realised it, only I did not do as my hon. friend did—I was not a blind admirer of Nehru, I knew where he was weak and where he was strong. (Interruptions).

This communalism has grown so much, has grown so powerful in that State, that it has taken this Goa as the first sacrificial goat. I do not know why Shri Alvares had to argue on the basis of a Goan demand for a linguistic State and all those things. It is a case on the basis of language, as he says, let it be referred to the one-man commission which has been appointed to settle the border dispute between Mysore and Maharashtra. It should not be a question of pressurised decision; it is a question of scientific

examination of the subject. I do not want to have prepossession on the subject. Let it be decided by the one-man commission. My hon. friend wants to hand over Goa to Maharashtra. There is an age-old proverb: robbing Peter to pay Paul. Here it is a case of robbing Paul to pay Peter.

Shri Alvares: What do I gain?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: In order to just, all the Centrally administered areas must be dealt with alike and under one law.

At the present time, there is a feeling in the country, everywhere, in every State, that the Central Cabinet is being pressurised by one or two States to take a decision in their own favour. Even the constitution of the Central Cabinet is not based on proper representation to all the States, or on the basis of ideology or justice. Therefore, any decision it arrives at does not carry conviction to people, and the proof of it is the agitation that we see everywhere in the country. They are not able to command that respect, that obedience which is due to a Government, because the decisions that they take are contaminated by these extraneous considerations. It is wise for them to think over this matter.

Thirdly, as the subsequent speakers will explain—perhaps I may also speak again on the amendments—"Goan" must be defined, not according to my inclination or my formula, or according to the formula of my hon. friend, Shri Alvares, but according to the notifications issued by the Government of India previously when there was no such controversy. That notification must be made applicable to determine who a Goan is. That notification says:

"In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Citizenship Act 1955 (57 of 1955) the Central Government hereby makes the following order, namely:"

It is according to this Notification and subsequent orders that who a Goan is must be determined.

The Bandodkar Ministry, it is alleged—I do not know the truth of it, but it is alleged—and there are several papers here to prove that—I have no time to read them—so manipulated the voters' list as to make many a voter included in the list . . .

Shri Alvares: Sir, on a point of order. It is a false charge against the Bandodkar Ministry. Shri Bandodkar is not here to defend himself and so it is not proper for a senior Member of the House to make such false charges. I hope it will be expunged. It is a charge against a responsible person who is not present in the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, he is not here to explain the case. So, he should not be referred to here.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: We are speaking of the voters' list, and this voters' list was not properly prepared.

Shri Jedhe (Baramati): Sir, on a point of order. Shri Hanumanthaiya, a learned Member of this House, in the course of his speech, said earlier that Shri Naik is taking advice from Shri Bandodkar, the Chief Minister of Goa. I submit that this sentence should also be expunged from his speech.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: If the newspapers of each day are referred to, they will show whether I am right or my hon. friend is right. Therefore, this voters' list is not a voters' list which is considered to be impartial by the Goans and others. The voters' list must be so prepared that all people who are Goans, as determined on the basis of the notification I have referred to, are included in the voters' list. I have given notice of an amendment to give effect to this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I will take only one more minute to answer a point raised by my hon. friend, before

I close my speech. My hon. friend from Goa said that there are only 20 Kannada students and only 2,000 Konkini students. I have made enquiries. The fact is that the Bandodkar Ministry, because it wanted to hustle a decision on the merger of that State with Maharashtra, deprived opportunity to other communities. They opened only Maharashtra schools and spread Shivaji cult, which has a parallel only in Hitler's Nazi Germany.

Shri N. Dandekar (Gonda): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in view of the highly partisan speeches that have been made, one by my hon. friend, Shri Alvares and another by my hon. friend Shri Hanumanthaiya, I think I should begin by saying quite clearly and beyond any equivocation that I am not interested in whether Goa merges into Maharashtra or chooses not to merge, or to stay as it is. There is here an endeavour in this Bill to ascertain by public poll just exactly what the Goans want in this respect, and it is only from that point of view, namely, whether this Bill is designed to secure a fair opinion poll, that I am considering the Bill.

Having studied the Bill, I would like to begin by stating my conclusions. I think the Bill is dishonourable because it is fraudulent. I would like to say straightaway, first of all, looking at the statement of objects and reasons, it begins by *suppresio veri*, that is to say, by not telling the whole truth. It is stated:

“There has been a demand from certain sections of the people of this territory for merger of Goa with the adjoining State of Maharashtra. There are other sections of people demanding its continuance as a separate entity.”

Actually, the real genesis of this Bill which ought to have been stated here, has been the innumerable assurances and promises made, both at the highest political level as well as at the highest governmental level, that it

[Shri N. Dandeker]

would be for the people of Goa to decide, after a certain period of time, what shall be the status of their territory: whether it shall continue as a separate union territory, or be merged with one State or with another. There are any number of assurances and promises of that kind, some made immediately before the liberation of Goa, others after the liberation of Goa, some made immediately before the 1963 elections, others immediately after those elections and, again, some recently after the agitation for merger into Maharashtra began. I will not take you through all these statements, but I would just like to refer to some representative assurances and undertakings of this kind.

I will take, first of all, Shri Chavan's own statement. In 1963, before the elections took place, this is what he said at Bicholim, Goa, on the 4th December, 1963:

"It is true that it is not a question (of merger) to be decided in the present election; because this is not a referendum on the question and that is what my mergerist friends have failed to see."

Then, Prime Minister Nehru, on the eve of the 1963 elections said:

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

I will read only one more of these assurances and statements, in order that the air may be cleared, that what we are or should be doing here today is not pleading the case of Maharashtra, nor pleading the case for a separate Status, but what we are trying to do is to evolve a mechanism and to provide an opportunity where the people of Goa, those who are Goans, may express a view on the matter.

The particular statement that I would like to read is one of April, 1964, made by the Congress Parliamentary Board. It is:—

"The Board considered the future of Goa and decided that it should be made clear that for the coming ten years Goa will continue as a Union Territory. After that, the wishes of the people of Goa will be ascertained in regard to the question of merger and the final decision will be taken in accordance with their wishes".

It is at this point that I support Shri Hanumanthaiya in saying that there has been considerable pressurisation of a most undesirable kind. The period at which or round about which the Goans were to decide was a period of ten years after liberation, so that they may settle down, take a look round and decide in a proper atmosphere what was the right thing for them, and not for Maharashtra or any other part. It was pressurisation of a very undesirable kind that has resulted in the date of this opinion poll being advanced by something like five years.

The other feature of this Bill, to which I take exception on grounds on which I suggest that this is not an honest Bill, is that while intending to implement the assurance to the Goans or pretending to do so, it does so only partially. I have been endeavouring to find out a definition of Goans, and I am bound to say that there is available a clear-cut definition of "Goan" concerning which there can be no doubt whatsoever. There ought not to be any dispute as to who are "the people of Goa" that are being referred to as the Goans. It seems to me that true Goans, quite clearly, are only those who, immediately after the liberation, were notified by a notification under the Citizenship Act as persons who would automatically become Indian citizens unless they chose to opt differently.

I will take the liberty to read from that order which is known as the Goa, Daman and Diu (Citizenship) Order, 1962. It says:—

"Every person who or either of whose parents or any of whose grand parents was born before the twentieth day of December, 1961, in the territories now comprised in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu shall be deemed to have become a citizen of India on that day."

I suggest that under this Bill, to the extent that it excludes large numbers of genuine Goans from voting in the Opinion Poll, as I shall presently show it does, and to the extent that it includes large numbers of supposed Goans who are not Goans, as I will presently show it does, the result would be an opinion ascertained from people not competent to give the opinion, and an opinion not ascertained from people who should be competent to give the opinion. I suggest this is somewhat odd, to put it mildly, and I know what the consequence would be. The consequence would be a pre-determined result which, I think, is what is desired by the framers of this Bill; and I am shocked that we should be expected to countenance a thing of that kind.

Let me turn now to the question just why, in the first place, was any undertaking of any kind given to Goans at all. I think that is important. I have got three questions here which I consider important. Why were undertakings given? To whom were these undertakings given? And what precisely was the undertaking given?

Here I will take the liberty, first of all, of answering in the words of Prime Minister Nehru in the Lok Sabha in August, 1964 why any assurances were given to the people of Goa? This is what he said in the Lok Sabha:

"I would like to take this opportunity of stating once again some

aspects of our basic approach in respect of Goa, when it becomes a part of Indian Union:"

I will omit one sub-paragraph which is not relevant.

"(b) The special circumstances of culture, social and lingual relations and the sense of a territorial group which history has created will be respected.

(c) Laws and customs, which are part of the social pattern of these areas and which are consistent with fundamental human rights and freedom, will be respected and modifications will be sought only by negotiations and consent."

That is a statement of why these undertakings were given.

To whom was the undertaking given? This is an equally important question and this is what Prime Minister Nehru said, again long before these matters became questions of dispute, at a mass rally of Goans in Bombay in 1965. That was the time when all the Congress leaders, the Congress organisation and indeed everyone in the whole of this country was seeking the willing cooperation and backing of Goans residing in India to a movement for the liberation of Goa. This is what he said on June 4, 1956:—

"Citing the example of Pondicherry and Karikal, Mr. Nehru said, "So here is an example for you which obviously would be applied by us to Goa when the time comes. What I have stated previously in the shape of assurances about various matters like freedom of conscience, practice of religion and cultural matters or customs, can now be viewed in terms of the actual example of Pondicherry and Karikal and the other French settlements. Here it is not merely a question of academic talk but of what we have done in practice."

What follows is very important.

[Shri N. Dandekar]

"I am saying all this to you because some people are misled, either by false propaganda or by over-enthusiastic people in India who say that Goa would be attached to Maharashtra or the Karnatak Province. Of course, you are close neighbours of Maharashtra and the new Karnatak Province and I hope you will be very friendly and co-operative neighbours.

But the point is that we feel that Goa's individuality should remain and that whenever the time comes for any changes, internal or others, it will be for the people of Goa acting freely to decide upon them."

As to the third question, namely, just what precisely was the assurance, this is the latest that I have of Prime Minister Nehru:—

"The matter of merger must be decided by the Goans themselves"

Goans—

"when they are in a condition and the proper state of mind to consider it calmly and with the requisite understanding of the issues and consequences involved. This they are definitely not in a position to do today,"

that is, in 1964—

"after their sudden liberation from 450 years of intransigent Portuguese domination and all round unsettlement of life which had resulted from it. They must have time to settle down and achieve the capacity to think calmly and democratically. The implications of the success"—

of the Gomantak Party—

"do not affect our decision to keep Goa as Union Territory until the time is ripe for the people to decide whether they want merger or not."

I hope, I have made quite clear the position I take. The position I take is that these assurances to Goans must be honoured. These assurances are part of the fabric of the honour of this country. It is not merely a question of shuttling a lot of cattle around from one part of India to another part of India. These assurances were given before the liberation of Goa, after the liberation of Goa, before the 1963 elections, after the 1963 elections and so on. So, the question that now arises for examination is: how this Bill stands up in the light of these undertakings.

In the first place, it excludes by the definition of "elector" those Goans who have resided and continue to reside outside Goa and to whom the Prime Minister, at a rally, specifically addressed this particular assurance in 1956. It excludes Goans who have always resided out of Goa, who have always been treated as foreigners in this country under the Citizenship Act of 1955 and who became citizens of India only on the 20th December, 1961, by the Goa, Daman and Diu (Citizenship) Order, 1962. It thus excludes vast numbers of Goans to whom these assurances and promises were addressed.

On the other hand, it includes a number of people, not Goans by any stretch of imagination, who, quite naturally and in the course of events, particularly after the 1963 elections, have moved into Goa as part of India to earn a decent living; but although they are Indians, they are not Goans.

I suggest, this kind of rigged opinion poll, that is going to be taken, by exclusion of people who ought to be voting on this but will not be voting, and by inclusion of those who ought not to be voting on this but would be voting, as something I cannot but describe as fraudulent. I have endeavoured to correct this matter by writing to the Election Commission; I have endeavoured in this matter to write also to the Prime Minister. In res-

ponse to the latter, I have got a reply from the Deputy Minister dealing with this which just makes no sense at all because he talks of Goans resident in Goa and I am talking of Goans not resident in Goa. But the argument that I hear being advanced is the impracticability of getting non-resident Goans into the electoral roll for the Opinion Poll. I have been in the District administration for a number of years and I know something about administration. And I can see no difficulty. It is said that, firstly, there is impracticability of defining who is a Goan. There is no difficulty at all. I have tabled an amendment which defines what a Goan is in the simplest possible term. Then, secondly, there is said to be a difficulty of enrolling these Goans residing out of Goa on the electoral roll. But I can see no difficulty whatsoever. If applications are invited from Goans residing out of Goa to be enrolled on the electoral roll for this special purpose—we are not talking about an ordinary election,—of ascertaining their opinion, there can be no difficulty whatever in the registration of these people not residing in Goa, if they are Goans, and if they wish to vote on this, I repeat, there is no difficulty for the simple reason that the definition that I have suggested is that a Goan is one born in Goa who became an Indian citizen under this particular Citizenship Order. Now, the advantage of saying that a Goan is one who is born in Goa is this, that the Goa Administration always had compulsory birth registration. Anyone who cannot prove that he was born in Goa prior to 1961 and so became a citizen of India only in 1961 may not be registered. Because of this Citizenship Order, those and only those people covered by it who can produce Goan birth certificates should be registered.

Similarly, about organising the voting by these people, surely, we have heard about the postal ballot. I have tabled an amendment by which these people would be eligible for voting by the postal ballot.

2323 (A) LS—8.

Sir, the burden of all that I am saying is quite simple. We have been pressurised into advancing the date of expression of opinion by Goans. I would not go into it. It is unfortunate. But it is being done now in 1966 instead of in 1971; and we now have a Bill before us for that purpose. Having been pressurised into advancing the date by five years, we are again being pressurised as to who shall vote and who shall not—by bringing a Bill before the House which looks to me fraudulent in the sense that it excludes large numbers of people who ought to be expressing an opinion and includes large numbers of people who ought not to be expressing an opinion. That being the case, Sir, I would take the liberty, finally, of reading two little bits, one by no less a person than the President Dr. Rajendra Prasad who said this in March, 1962, three months after liberation. He said:

“We have, however, repeatedly assured the people of Goa and the world that the personality that this area has acquired . . . shall be preserved.”

And, Prime Minister Nehru, just one month before he died, said this at Bhubaneswar to all these people who even then were trying to grab Goa. He said:

“The world should know that there is some honour left among us in India.”

In conclusion, I suggest, if we wish to behave dishonourably, we may pass this Bill as it is. But if we wish to behave honourably, we do amend the Bill, more or less, on the lines I have suggested. The only objective I have in the amendments I have tabled is that those entitled to vote should come on the rolls and those not entitled ought to go out. The rest is a mere matter of mechanism or administrative arrangement appropriate to that situation.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, two powerful speeches have been

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

made, and they are entitled to all the respect coming as it does, by my hon. friends, Mr. Hanumanthaiya and Mr. Dandeker. I think, at no time there was greater need for an all-India outlook on which my friend Mr. Hanumanthaiya has laid great emphasis. There are very few friends in Parliament who are nearer to me than he is. Both physically and mentally, we sit together, we talk together and we exchange our views. But I do not see how my friend feels that the all-India outlook is in danger with this Bill being passed. I can understand when he talked about the cult of Shivasena. As a matter of fact, when we carved out linguistic States and when there was a discussion on the reorganisation of the States, I raised my lone voice against dividing India on the basis of languages and it is unfortunately that, I must say, which has been plaguing us all the time and which is responsible for so many disruptive tendencies which have developed in this country.

Today, Mysore itself is thinking of bifurcating itself, as a matter of fact.

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): Mysore is not thinking like that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: There are voices. . .

Shri Basappa: A few voices; you can ignore them.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I do not know what I should ignore and what I should not ignore. But I know that there are voices raised and those voices cannot be ignored surreptitiously. There is something deep-rooted in that. Let us understand it. Therefore, anything which goes counter to the all-India outlook has got to be examined with great care and we cannot ignore simply because of passions and certain outlooks.

Shri Basappa: That way, everywhere there are dissensions.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I would very much like that this cult

of Shivasena should be dealt with a firm hand and the Government which has all the time in these last few days and weeks been talking of taking firm action should give a good evidence of this that they will deal with all such tendencies firmly and without any let or go.

While I say all this, I would like to remind my friend that it was Mr. Chavan who was the first to raise his strong voice against the activities of Shivasena and he made a public speech. There is no secret about it. If it is reported what Shivasena is about, it is also reported what Mr. Chavan has said on this particular issue.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Every sensible man in Maharashtra condemned it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: So, instead of again trying to dissociate the people, instead of trying to drive a wedge between those people, let us have all those people who are condemning such activities with us and encourage them and acknowledge what they do instead of trying to create an atmosphere of mistrust. It would be much better if we take a more reasonable line and I am with those who will urge upon the Government to take a firm line of action against such activities.

I could not also appreciate when my friend talked about one-man commission. That would be just a negation of all the assurances which have been given. It is not a matter for any one-man commission to say what is going to be the lot of Goans.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: That was not my suggestion. I merely replied to Mr. Alvares when he made that suggestion.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: What is the role which one-man commission can play in this matter? That is exactly what I want to understand. There can be no one-man commis-

sion, whether it is suggested by someone else or whether it is endorsed by you or not, and it is not a matter for anybody, howsoever a distinguished person he may be, whether he is a Supreme Court Judge or anybody, but it is a matter for Goans only to decide.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: The difference of opinion between me and Mr. Alvares was that he referred to the language and the culture of Goa and it is only those two questions that are sought to be referred to the commission.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I do not think there is any issue which can be referred to the commission. It is for the Goans to decide what they want and how they want to go about it.

Again, my friend, in his great anxiety—I can appreciate his absolute sincerity—said that all centrally-administered areas should be treated alike. All centrally-administered areas cannot, unfortunately, be treated alike.

15 hrs.

Himachal Pradesh cannot be treated as Nagaland is to be treated. It cannot be treated as Pondicherry is to be treated. It cannot be treated as Goa is to be treated. I can understand the administrative aspect of it. The administrative aspect is quite a different thing. We will say, this is the administrative unit; we have got to deal with it in this particular manner, but there are certain historical factors behind it, there are certain backgrounds, there are certain political issues and those political issues cannot be the subject matter of any administrative decisions.

Again my friend was talking about poll and electoral rolls. It will be very uncharitable to blame the Chief Minister of Goa, Daman and Diu regarding electoral rolls because we have got the Election Commission. If it is said that the Election Commission

has no jurisdiction over electoral rolls, then there would be some justification, but when we know it fully well and when it is clear that there is an Election Commission which exercises its jurisdiction in all matters of elections and that the electoral rolls as they stand today are subject to its independent jurisdiction, then it would be very uncharitable and unfair to blame the Chief Minister or Mr. Bhandodkar or anybody.

Let us now come to the brass-tacks. These are the points which have been raised and these are my reactions to these points.

Let me now come to the assurances about which so much talk has been made. My friend, Mr. Dandekar, who is not here now, profusely referred to the speeches made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He said, "let us understand what the genesis is". If he had read the speech fully, if he had gone to the second and the third para, he would find Jawaharlal Nehru saying, "it may be ten years, it may be five years or it may be any period". He never said that it should be ten years. When you have to go to the genesis, the most appropriate thing would be to go to the Resolution passed by the Elected Assembly of Goa, Daman and Diu. That is the genesis from where the thing starts. Then there had been negotiations with Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, who came in the picture. Mr. Chavan was nowhere there to influence him. If everybody is pressurized, if Nehru was pressurized, if Lal Bahadur Shastri was pressurized, if Indra Gandhi is pressurized, then I hope there is no saving for this country. It was Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri who had almost come to the conclusion and this poll was to be taken somewhere by the end of 1965, but simply because the war intervened, this could not be done. What is wrong about it, what is wrong about this particular poll, I cannot understand. I think the Government would be accused of vacillation if they do not.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

go forward and put this Bill through.

I have to touch only one point which Mr. Dandekar has made. That was the only point which he was stressing. He is not concerned with merger with Maharashtra or Mysore. Nor are we concerned about it. Whether he is concerned with merger with Maharashtra or Mysore or its remaining independent, I am not concerned; I am the least worried about it. What my friend said was, "you are denying the right to the Goans who are living outside Goa and who have no resident rights in Goa". He says that an undertaking was given to Goans all over. Will he stretch it further and say, "Goans living all over the world and not only in India"? Am I to understand that he wants to confine himself to Goans living in this country or he is talking about Goans who are spread all over the world doing business everywhere and is asking why should they not be consulted? Does he mean that? He will never mean that. It should be obvious to anybody with a little commonsense that the undertaking is to the persons who are affected, to the persons who are living in Goa and who are likely to be affected by the merger or otherwise. Who are those people who are affected and to whom such an assurance means anything? These are the persons who have the resident rights. If the electoral rolls have anything missing, certainly there is no reason why we should not look into them. If there are people who have surreptitiously gone on the electoral rolls, their names should be struck off so far as the polls are concerned. I can understand that. But to say that every Goan, whether he has a resident right or not, whether he is qualified to be an elector or not, should be consulted is, I think, putting too much of a meaning into it. Here who are the people who are affected by the merger? These are the people who are affected by the merger and they have got to be consulted because these are the people to whom the undertaking is supposed to have been given

by any standard of common sense. Therefore, I think he was unnecessarily making too much out of it and I wish we take a balanced view and we do not hesitate about it.

श्री मधु सिन्घे (मुंजर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, गोवा की आजादी की लड़ाई में एक सैनिक के नाते मैंने हिस्सा लिया है और मुझे बारह साल की सजा भी हुई थी। ये तो हवा में बात कर रहे हैं, हम दिल की बात कर रहे हैं। इसलिये आज मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि जिन सिद्धान्तों के लिए यह लड़ाई चल रही थी कि गोवा विदेशी हुकूमत से मुक्त हो और उसके बाद गोवा की जो जनता है उसको हिन्दुस्तान की राज्य पुनर्रचना के बारे में अपनी राय व्यक्त करने का मौका मिले उसको आज पूरा किया जा रहा है। जनता की इच्छा हमारी दृष्टि में सर्वभूमि है। विदेशी राज से गोवा मुक्त हुआ। उसके तत्काल बाद, एक साल के अन्दर या डेढ़ साल के अन्दर आज जो आप फैसला करने जा रहे हैं, वह फैसला हो जाना चाहिए था। लेकिन यह सत्कारुण्य दल हर एक मामले को चीपट करने का काम करने में बड़ा माहिर है। राज्य पुनर्रचना का मसला सौ साल में एक दफा उठना चाहिये और हमेशा के लिये जनतांत्रिक ढंग से उसका हल निकालना चाहिये। लेकिन इधर हम उन्तीस साल से यह तमाशा देख रहे हैं कि हर एक दो साल के बाद राज्य पुनर्रचना सम्बन्धी विधेयक यहां पर आते हैं। असल में राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन ने शुरू से इस सिद्धान्त को माना है कि भाषा के आधार पर राज्य की पुनर्रचना करनी चाहिये। फिर उसके बाद हर सावार्स को बिगाड़ने का प्रयास क्यों किया जाता है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है।

अभी अभी पंजाब की पुनर्रचना करने के सम्बन्ध में एक विधेयक हम लोगों ने पास

किया था। उसमें भी चंडीगढ़ का मामला इसी तरह हमने भ्रष्टाचार छोड़ दिया था। इसका कारण यह है कि ये चाहते हैं कि आइन्दा भी हरियाणा और पंजाब के लोग आपस में लड़ें

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha):
 What will the future generations do if you do not leave the problems to them?

श्री जयु सिन्घे : समस्यायें पैदा करना, उनको चौपट करना, उनको और पेचीदा बनाना यही तो वर्तमान सरकार का काम है । !

यहां पर भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू के द्वारा या भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी के द्वारा जो आश्वासन दिये गये थे उनकी काफी चर्चा की गई। लेकिन मेरी दृष्टि से जनता की इच्छा के सामने जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के आश्वासन या राजेन्द्र बाबू के आश्वासन दो कीड़ी का भी मूल्य नहीं रखते हैं। इसलिये बार बार यह कहना कि जवाहरलाल जी ने यह कहा था, राजेन्द्र बाबू ने यह कहा था, फलां फलां नेता ने यह कहा था, और यह कह कर इस सिद्धान्त का विरोध करना कि गोम्रा के अन्दर गोम्रा की जो जनता है वह अपने भविष्य का फैसला करे बहुत अनुचित है। इस सिद्धान्त को फाटने का जो प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है, उसका मैं घोर विरोध करता हूँ, उसकी मैं घोर निन्दा करता हूँ।

राय शुमारी का एक नया सिद्धान्त रहा है। मैं तो निश्चयन करूंगा कि अन्य सीमा सम्बन्धी जो मामले हैं और चंडीगढ़ का जो मामला है या दो राज्यों के बीच में सीमा के जितने झगड़े हैं, उन झगड़ों का हल निकालने के लिये भी यदि इस राय शुमारी के सिद्धान्त का हम लोग इस्तेमाल करेंगे तो मेरा खयाल है कि हिन्दुस्तान में राज्यान्तर्गत जितने झगड़े हैं वे तुरन्त खत्म हो

जायेंगे। आखिरकार हम सब लोग लोकतंत्र को मानते हैं, जनता की इच्छा सार्वभौम है, इसको मानते हैं। तो क्या वजह है कि विभिन्न राज्यों के बीच जो इस वक्त झगड़े चल रहे हैं उनका हल भी राय शुमारी के सिद्धान्त के जरिये हम नहीं निकाल रहे हैं ?

यहां पर बड़ा झगड़ा हुआ कि किसको बोट देने का अधिकार हो। बिल्कुल साफ बात है कि अन्य जगह और अन्य सवालों पर हम जो व्याख्या, भाष्य या परिभाषा करते हैं, उसी के अनुसार अब की बार भाव्य होना चाहिए। जो नया पीपल्स रिप्रेजेंटेशन कानून हमने यहां पर पास किया है, उसमें इस बात की तजवीज़ है कि ग्राम चुनाव, या किसी भी चुनाव, से पहले मतदाताओं की सूची का नवीकरण किया जाये और हर एक योग्य-क्लासिफाइड आदमी को उस सूची में अपना नाम दर्ज कराने का मौका मिलना चाहिए। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि गोम्रा में यह जो रायशुमारी की जा रही है, उससे पहले यहां के उन सभी लोगों को, जिनका नाम नियम के अनुसार मतदाता सूची में आ सकता है,— मैं गोम्रा में रहने वालों की चर्चा कर रहा हूँ, दुनिया में या हिन्दुस्तान में अन्य जगहों में भी रहते हैं, उन की चर्चा मैं नहीं कर रहा हूँ—इस सूची में अपना नाम दर्ज कराने का मौका मिलना चाहिए।

जहाँ तक बाँवोडकर मंत्रि-मंडल का इस्तीफ़े का प्रश्न है, उसके पीछे क्या सिद्धान्त है ? चूंकि श्री बाँवोडकर की गोम्रा के विलीनीकरण या गंग्रा के अलग रहने के बारे में एक निश्चित राय है, इसलिये यह आश्चर्य था, यह सन्देह था कि अगर ऐसे आदमी के हाथ में गोम्रा की सरकार की बागडोर रहेगी, तो शायद उसके द्वारा पक्षपाती व्यवहार होगा, और इसलिये उनसे कहा गया कि वह इस्तीफा दें। बहुत अच्छा काम किया। लेकिन दूसरी जगहों में कांग्रेस के हाथों में शासन है और कम से कम हमारे मन में कांग्रेस के बारे

[श्री मधु लियवे]

में बढ़ा सन्देह है कि उनके द्वारा पक्षपाती व्यवहार किया जायेगा, सत्ता का दुरुपयोग किया जायेगा। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस सरकार ने जो अच्छा सिद्धान्त गोवा में लागू किया है, क्या कारण है कि वह इसको आगे नहीं बढ़ाती, उसका विस्तार नहीं करती। आज मैं मांग करता हूँ कि सभी राज्यों में जो वर्तमान कांग्रेसी मंत्रि-मंडल हैं, उनको, और यहां तक कि केन्द्र सरकार को भी, 31 दिसम्बर से पहले इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिए, ताकि समूचे हिन्दुस्तान में चुनाव निष्पक्ष और प्रजातांत्रिक ढंग से हो सके।

ये इस विधेयक के सिद्धान्त का स्वागत करता हूँ और आपकी मार्फत मांग करता हूँ कि राज्यों के बीच में कितने झगड़े हैं, उनको खत्म करने के लिये भी इस सिद्धान्त को अपनाया जाये।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सरकार हमेशा राष्ट्रीय एकता की चर्चा करती है और उसके लिए सम्मेलन बुलाती है, लेकिन क्षेत्रीय और भाषायी विवाद को बढ़ाना, जनता की इच्छा का अपमान करना राज्या-तर्गत झगड़ों को उकसाना और हिन्दुस्तान की एकता को चौपट करना यह तो इस सरकार का हमेशा का धंधा है। इस सरकार का घोष राष्ट्रीय एकता का है, वह राष्ट्रीय एकता स्थापित करने की घोषणा करती है। तो फिर वह अपना काम और व्यवहार भी अपनी घोषणा के अनुसार करे।

Shri Shinkre (Marmagao): Before speaking on the political aspect of this Bill, I think there is a very great need to refer at least in brief terms to the background of what is called Goa. Just now, some hon. Member had said that Goa had been under foreign political domination for about 450 years. That is only a half-truth. Goa is comprised of 11 talukas out of which only 4 were

under foreign domination for 450 years. I belong to the remaining seven which were under foreign domination for hardly 150 odd years.

The most surprising thing that Shri N. Dandekar does not know—and I shall come to him later on—is that the urge for keeping the territory as a separate entity, as a Union territory, comes exactly from those people who are in those four talukas, whereas the people in the remaining seven talukas representing the overall majority of the people of Goa have been and are and have always been rightly or wrongly for merger with Maharashtra. So, I say that this craving or this urge for keeping it as a separate political entity comes from those people only as a by-product of foreign domination which for over four hundred years they could not shed.

There is another fact also which I would like to bring to your notice. While these four talukas are called *junia kabijadi*, that is, the old conquests and are really the products of the Portuguese conquest, the remaining seven talukas were never conquered by the Portuguese. They were only ceded out or they were transferred to Portuguese rule through treaties. And by whom were these treaties made? One treaty was made by the Raja of Savantwadi regarding Pedne and a part of Dicholi. Another treaty was made by the Raja of Sundhe. My hon. friend Shri C. R. Basappa may perhaps know that the Raja of Sundhe was a Kannadiga ruler in those days but today he has become a Goan ruler or Goan prince. And the Ranis of Sattari fought the Portuguese domination till as recently as 60 years back, upto about 1913 or so.

What I want to impress upon you is this that this demand for maintaining the area as a politically separate entity and all this talk of distinct individuality and all this nonsense comes exactly from those people who represent but the by-product of foreign

rule. I am not surprised that men of Shri N. Dandekar's calibre, for whom I have the highest regard, should come forward here as an advocate of those people...

Shri N. Dandekar: I am sorry; my hon. friend is completely misrepresenting me. I did not speak either for the one or for the other.

Shri Shinkre: Shri N. Dandekar was a very good advocate of a very bad case. He veiled his attack and he veiled his statements in a nice way but he could not omit the fact, and he could not but let the fact come to light that he is also swimming in the same pool and swimming in the same waters. I hope my statement will not be taken objection to when I say that Shri N. Dandekar unfortunately belongs to that kind of people in this country that still crave for the good old British raj.

Shri N. Dandekar: It is completely wrong. I must contradict the hon. Member straightway.

Shri Shinkre: Let him contradict me when his chance comes. But what I want to submit is that these are the people who even today, after nineteen years of Independence, have doubts about whether this country will continue as an independent nation and if so, for how long. The raj presently might have gone to bad hands or inefficient hands or incompetent hands, but there is no denying the act that the destiny of this country is already marked and marked for ever. But these are the people who have still doubts about that, and, therefore, I am not surprised at his making this advocacy here of a lost cause.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Let not my hon. friend spoil his good case by bad arguments.

Shri Shinkre: Shri Hanumanthaiya spoke of pressurising and he spoke of agitational methods. He just launched one of the most sweeping attacks on

Maharashtra and Maharashtra leaders. I do not hold any brief for Maharashtra, but I want to remind him of two things.

When the late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had gone to the AICC meeting at Bangalore, it was his own people who had almost smashed Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, so to say; they could not smash him and, therefore, they smashed the windowpanes of the house where he was staying.

Shri Basappa: They only reminded him of the democratic way of dealing with it.

Shri Shinkre: Again, it was the Congress people who had burnt on the streets the effigy of Shri Bandodkar. Shri Bandodkar is only an instrument of the people; he is only a symbol of the great inner urge of the Goan people for generations; he is nothing more than a symbol. It was this Government here which had thrust on him power unnecessarily and reduced him to the state which he is presently in. He never wanted to rule. This Government knows that he never came to rule. The Assembly in Goa was formed not to rule over the territory; even our election to the Assembly was fought mainly on this very issue whether the people wanted to merge with Maharashtra or not. There were only two voices in Goa; one was for merger with Maharashtra and the other was for a full-fledged State. These were the only two demands in Goa. The other demand is just a demand of the minority; it cannot be conceded under any circumstances. It cannot be conceded at all.

Now come these people like my very esteemed friends Shri Hanumanthaiya and Shri C. R. Basappa who want to move amendments to add the words 'or Mysore'.

Where is the need for it when the Bill is so clear and so correct?

Shri Basappa: It is because of the attitude of partiality that they have to come forward and table amendments.

Shri Shinkre: What I want to submit is this, that this is a very funny party. The press had reported that they had dealt with the matter and had gone into all the aspects of it in the party executive, but because these people had been completely overruled and set aside and everything had been settled right there, they still come to this House and raise the old bogey.

Regarding the tolerance or intolerance of Maharashtra . . .

Shri Basappa: You could speak of your own party; do not speak of other parties.

Shri Shinkre: Regarding the alleged intolerance of Maharashtra, let me say this. In Bombay alone, according to Shri Dandeker's estimate, there are more than 50,000 Goans.

Shri N. Dandeker: Again I am being misquoted. I did not mention any figure.

Shri Shinkre: Day in and day out, hour in and hour out, they have been agitating against the merger of Goa with Maharashtra, and no Government of Maharashtra, no Chief Minister of Maharashtra and no Home Minister of Maharashtra ever came forward to suppress it. Do you mean to say that it is difficult or impossible for the government of the day in any first-class, full-fledged, autonomous State like Maharashtra to suppress and shut down the mouth of those people who do such things? Still these people want to say that Maharashtra has been intolerant.

I do not want to make any case for Maharashtra *a fortiori*. But I want to place before you a few bare and plain facts regarding the assurances that have been quoted by my hon. friend, Shri Dandeker. What is the worth of those assurances? (*Interruptions*). I will come to it. They are of a poli-

tical nature. Shri Dandeker himself says that in 1954, the late Shri Nehru made this statement. Why? On what basis? France had then given up her possessions in India and poor Shri Nehru was all the time living in a fool's paradise thinking that Portugal would also one day do likewise. He made that statement in that context.

Then again in 1956, the second statement that he referred to was made. Under what circumstances was it made.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You cannot say he was living in a fool's paradise.

Shri Shinkre: He wanted to show to the world that Goans were agitating, were waging this campaign, this freedom struggle and he delivered all these homilies to Goans in Bombay. At that time, he tried to persuade them to go and enter the freedom struggle and participate in it in a more active, energetic and enthusiastic way. But what happened?

Shri Basappa: You want a breach of faith to take place?

Shri Shinkre: No breach. I will come to that.

All these so-called Goans in Bombay were ready to make all the agitation and the freedom struggle, most of them in Bombay and in other places of India, but never in Goa. So the late Shri Nehru became a disillusioned person. His illusion remained much longer to our bad luck, to our misfortune—I will come to that.

Shri Hanumanthaiya was being very shrewd. He did not want to disclose the name of the paper. When we forced him, he said, *Indian Express*. Do you know why he did not want to disclose it? This *Indian Express* is being edited by one of those Goans whose only son gave up and renounced Indian nationality and Indian citizenship on that day when Shri Nehru ordered army to march into Goa and liberate it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: The father is responsible for the son?

Shri Shinkre: He is not. At the same time, he has also not renounced his son or given up the son.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: How can anyone give up his son? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Shinkre: Everything is being done by the father for the son. It is this sort of people who are coming in the way of our natural development.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His time is up.

Shri Shinkre: I think I have not taken half the time taken by Shri Hanumanthaiya.

Shri Nath Pal: The House must hear the authentic voice of Goans represented by two Goans here. Let us not be very rigid. You will be a little flexible.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Let the time be extended. Many of us have to speak.

Shri Basappa: Time must be extended.

Shri Sonavane: He comes from that place. Let him have his say.

Shri Shinkre: Regarding pressurising, believe me, take my honest word, the day I heard on the radio that Shri Chavan had become Home Minister of this country, I was not happy. You can check up with Shri Chavan or his Deputy. I was not one who offered him any felicitations or congratulations as Shri Basappa did, because I know that Shri Chavan is the man who would always play safe and who would never care for our future if it meant involvement of his own prestige with the Prime Minister, and with the Cabinet.

Shri Basappa: You go and ask Shri Chavan what he had said.

Shri Shinkre: I am entitled to express my opinion in this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Do not go into personalities.

Shri Shinkre: I would much rather that Shri Nanda was there, piloting the Bill because I know I can at least get from him the fairest possible deal which in truth I cannot now. May I ask what prevented Shri Chavan from coming here and piloting the Bill? After all, it is a Cabinet functioning on the basis of joint responsibility. It is a whole Cabinet decision. What is this bogus statement of Shri Chavan that as far as Goa and the border question are concerned 'I am out of it'? Why this lack of moral courage? It is the decision of the Cabinet to which he belongs and the decision which he has to carry through.

All this only goes to show that if there was pressurising—my hon. friend was talking of pressurising—all these years it is only from Mysore, from Shri Hanumanthaiya and the members of his clan. They have no case so far as Goa is concerned.

Much was made of contiguity. I concede that on three sides Goa is connected with Mysore. But what is there to it? After all, it is the wishes of the people of Goa, my own people, which should prevail and will prevail. I can tell you that my family is half located in Bombay and half in Goa. If I can poll 20 votes in Goa, I can poll 20 votes in Bombay too. But under no circumstances, am I prepared to let my brother, sister or father to decide what I am going to do for my future.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: That is nobody's case.

Shri Shinkre: Whatever may be the political set-up, the Goans will choose for themselves. Their constitutional and fundamental rights are not going to be touched. They are not

[Shri Shinkre]

going to be less or more than other Indians elsewhere. So why this hue and cry about Goans elsewhere also being entitled to vote? For whose sake? Am I going to allow my brother or sister or father to tell me what I should do tomorrow in Goa? Why this love for those who have their own distinct individuality? Why did they not five years ago come and join us in the liberation struggle and settle down in Goa, which is a first-class place, with all amenities to live? What do these people want?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: What are the amenities?

Shri Shinkre: They want to enjoy the best of both worlds. They want to remain where they are and enjoy themselves and for their escapades they want to come to Goa. What for? For their occasional jaunts and this and that. (*Interruptions*). Let them settle down. Nobody denies them that right. But for a first class wonderful person like Shri Dandekar to plead for those people is the last straw. (*Interruptions*). I just got wild on this. Because I was used to hear all this time of the ICS people as people with poise, accomplishment, balance, people with so many good qualities . . .

Shri Bakar Ali Mirsa (Warrangal): Bank balance.

Shri Shinkre: My hon. friend says 'bank balance'. I was surprised. I did not want to say that Shri Dandekar is one of those unfortunate people who did not confirm the rule. I do not want to believe it. But to come forward and make a case for those who do not even have love for the nation, for the country, who still want to live in the colonial empire . . .

An hon. Member: Do not say that.

Shri Shinkre: I state facts.

Goa comprises all talukas, only 4 of which are anti-merger. The remaining 7, who are the predominant section, 99 per cent, are for merger. What

does it explain? These people of the 4 talukas have been, as I said, under foreign rule from the very beginning for 450 years, while we of the other 7 talukas have been hardly under it for 150 years; there again we were never conquered. We may have been ill-treated or mal-treated by Salazar and his clique. So, their position is just like a bird in the cage, which has been too long in the cage. One day the master said, "Please go away, I cannot tolerate it"; the bird went away but returned, saying "I cannot fly freely." That is what they want, that is what they want to have perpetuated here. Under no circumstances the Parliament of this country and the nation is ever going to allow any such nonsense.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Tulsidas Jadhav.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I have given my name long ago. My views are well known, and therefore you do not want to give me time? I gave my name two days before, and I do not understand why I am not being called. The time may be extended, we want to speak.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): At least five minutes to each member.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): I make the motion that the time be extended by two hours.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What does the Minister say?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): You know the time that is available to the House, and it is for you to decide whether any more time can be given.

Shri Raghunath Singh: The Speaker has not to decide, we have to decide.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: As for the Government, we want to finish according to the schedule fixed by the Speaker.

Shri Raghunath Singh: What about the motion for extension of time? The motion is before the House. Everybody wants to speak. It is not a matter of only Maharashtra and Mysore, it concerns us also.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: After the hon. Members have spoken for some time, we can decide, if necessary, to extend the time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Speaker told the House that this should be finished by 4 O'Clock. Then he extended by half an hour to 4.30. We will go up to 5.30.

Shri Alvares: You extend it to 6 O'Clock.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Half an hour is not enough. We are making a motion under the rules. You take the view of the House.

Shri Humayun Kabir (Basirhat): If it is the unanimous desire of the House, and there is a very strong feeling . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We must close all the stages by 5.30. I will call the Minister to reply at 4.30.

Shri Sonavane: Your extension is reasonable, and the House should agree to it.

Shri Tulsidas Jadhav (Nanded): Please give us 10 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Five minutes.

Shri Raghunath Singh: In five minutes what can we speak? All right, I will not speak. Everybody knows my views. You are restricting our time to five minutes. We say the time should be extended. What can I reply to Mr. Dandekar and others in five minutes.

Shri P. B. Patel: It is not proper.

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो बिल हाउस के सामने आया है, मैं इसको सपोर्ट करता हूँ। इस बिल के बारे में मैंने जा देखा और जो कन्दोवर्षी

सुनी, उस में मुझे कोई तथ्य दिखाई नहीं दता है। बान यह है कि—

“There has been a demand from certain sections of the people of this territory for merger of Goa with the adjoining State of Maharashtra.”

गोवा के जो लोग हैं, वे चाहते हैं कि हम अपना मत दें कि हमको कहाँ जाना है। कोई आदमी यदि यह कहता है कि मुझे प्रमुक्त जगह जाना है, तब दूसरा आदमी यह बहै कि तुम मत जाओ, यह तो मेरे समझ में आने वाली बात नहीं है। जो उनका डेमोक्रेटिक राइट है, जो उनका इन्हेरीटेड हक है उस में आप कैसे दखल डाल सकते हैं, इस में तो झगड़ने की कोई बात ही नहीं है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि—इसमें लिखा है—

“whether the Goa area should merge in the adjoining State of Maharashtra or not and whether the Daman and Diu areas should merge in Gujarat or not.”

यानी हम जैसे पहले थे वैसे ही रहें या जो हमारी एडजवाइनिंग स्टेट है, उस से मर्ज हो जाय, यह बात उन को स्वयं तय करनी होगी। हमारे विद्व हनुमंतीया जी ने कुछ महाराष्ट्र के बारे में कहा, जैसे मनुष्य को कभी-कभी कोई गलतफहमी हो जाती है, हो सकता है कि उनको भी कुछ गलतफहमी हो गई हो। उन्होंने शिव सेना के बारे में कहा, शिव सेना या शिवाजी के बारे में यदि हमारे मन में कोई आदर है, तो वह कोई बुरी चीज नहीं है। जैसे घर में, फैमिली में कोई आदमी होता है, जो घर का कर्ता होता है, उस के प्रति आदर हो, पड़ोसी के लिये भी आदर हो, वही स्थिति यहाँ पर है जैसा शिवाजी के लिये आदर है, उसी तरह से गांधी जी के लिये भी आदर है। फिर शिवाजी के लिये कहते हैं, शिव सेना बनाते

[श्री तुलसी दास जाधव]

हैं, अतिक्रमण करते हैं, ऐसा कहना बहुत गलत है। पुत्रोत्तम भाई पटेल साहब भी कहते हैं, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि ऐसा विचार मन में क्यों लाया जाता है। जब आपने भाषावार प्रान्त रचना के सिद्धांत को कबूल कर लिया है तब जो जो प्रदेश मराठी भाषा बोलने वाले हैं, उन को कैसे रोक सकते हैं।

उन्होंने बम्बई के लिये कहा। मैं उनको वतसाना चाहता हूँ कि वहां पर कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं हुई जिससे कोई वहां जुझ किया गया हो या कोई अप्रिय बात हुई हो। दिल्ली में यदि कोई डिमांडेशन होता है तो मोटरें जलाई जाती हैं, लेकिन महाराष्ट्र में कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं हुई, जब बाईनाग्रन रहा, तब भी वहां डिमांडेशन हुए, लेकिन दूसरी कम्युनिटी के लिये कोई ऐसी बात नहीं हुई, जिसमें कि कोई तकलीफ हुई।

श्री पु० ए० पटेल : ग्राम भूल गये कि क्या हुआ था।

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव : जैसे दूसरी जगहों पर होता है, वैसे नहीं हुआ था।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जब बम्बई को प्रलग रखा जाता है, बेलगांव जो कि मराठी भाषी प्रदेश है, उस को प्रलग रखा जाता है, पहले ही जब कमीशन बना था, उसी वक़्त यह चीज तय हो जाती तो यह झगड़ा पैदा नहीं होता। हिन्दुस्तान में कोई हिस्सा ऐसा अलग नहीं रखा जो कि उसके भाषावार प्रान्त के साथ न हो, लेकिन महाराष्ट्र ही ऐसा प्रदेश है जहां बेलगांव, कारवाड़ और गोवा को प्रलग रखा गया। जब वहां के लोग उसके लिये प्रतिकार करते हैं तो उस पर आपत्ति प्राट की जाती है। जैसे एक बूड़े रास्ते से जाती है एक आदमी धा कर उसको प्रक्का मार कर चला जाता है, जब वह बूड़ी कहती

है कि धक्का क्यों मारते हो, तब एक तीसरा आदमी धा कर कहता है कि तुम दोनों क्यों झगड़ते हो, बिलकुल ऐसा ही महाराष्ट्र के झगड़े का सवाल है। जब बम्बई को बाहर निकालते हैं, तो उसका यह कहना है कि हमारे इन प्रदेशों को तो, हमारे भन्दर रहने दीजिए।

मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि गांधी जी का जितना आदर आज दूसरे प्रांतों में है, उस से ज्यादा महाराष्ट्र में है। जब भी वहां पर कोई झगड़ा होता है तब वहां के लीडर अपनी जान का रिस्क लेकर वहां पर जाकर लोगों को सम्भालते हैं।

Shri Hanumanthaiya : I request you, if it is so, to have Mahatmajji's statue near the India Gate, and not Shivaji's statue in Bombay.

श्री तुलसी दास जाधव : ठीक है, आप सजेन दे सकते हैं।

दूसरी बात यह है कि ऐसा कभी नहीं हुआ कि महाराष्ट्र अतिक्रमण करता हो। पहले कुछ भी हुआ हो भाषा के नाम पर लेकिन आज चूंकि साउथ शोलापुर के लोग कन्नड़ बोलने वाले हैं इस लिये हम उनसे नहीं कहते हैं कि तुम बाहर चले जाओ। यह बात भी नहीं है कि गोआ के साथ कोई दूसरी बात हो और मणिपुर, हिमाचल वालों के साथ कोई दूसरी बात हो। सारे प्रांत एक तरह पर हैं। हम लिये एक प्रांत का दूसरे प्रांत पर इस तरह का आरोप लगाना ठीक बात नहीं है।

दूसरी बात यह कि पंडित जी ने महाराष्ट्र को जो आश्वासन दिया था वह हो सकता है, लेकिन महाराष्ट्र ने ऐसा कौन सा आश्वासन दे रखा है। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि मैमूर वाले भी हमारे भाई हैं। हमारा उनसे प्रेम है। हमारे साथ वह बहुत दिन रहे हैं? इतना ही नहीं, हमने उनसे उलगा भाषा

सीखा है। गुजराती भी हमारे भाई हैं, हमने उन से सबक सीखा है पार्लिटिक्स का श्री गान्धी जी का। हमारे दिल में यह गुजरात का है, यह महाराष्ट्र का है, ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है। उनके लिए हमारे अन्दर प्रेम है, आदर है।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is not often that we have the pleasure of recording our support to legislation sponsored by Government. But on this occasion I am glad that I can say that we are in favour of the Bill which is being placed before the House. This Bill would mean, I hope, the return of Goa which was sought for a long time to be drawn away from India's bosom and which has been paraded to the world outside as a western basis in our Indian desert and this legislation will, I hope, conclude the process of the return of Goa to India. On this occasion we must salute the memory of the freedom struggle of the Goan people because we all know the kind of repression that used to be the rule in that part of the country; we all know how the Portuguese militia has been mobilised in proportion to the population in a measure which was not even conceivable in the conditions that prevailed in the British India of the old days. I, therefore, welcome the possibility which is envisaged in this Bill of the completion of the process. The footling little controversies apart, between the States of Maharashtra, Mysore or Gujarat or whoever else it may be, we hope to see the return of Goa to Maharashtra and of Daman and Diu to Gujarat. If there are some discordant voices like the very formidable voice of Mr. Hanumanthaiya and those who are supporting him asking for the Canarese people to be brought into the picture, I am afraid it is a little too far.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Have a soft corner for them also.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is rather out of tune with the situation. Can

we ask them in all humility not to talk in terms of chauvinism of the Maharashtra or any other part of this country in order to bring forward, as it were, the non-chauvinism and the humility of his own region? We better not have this attitude. I may say that in certain matters, I do feel slightly rattled by the Maharashtrian attitude in regard to its dispute with Mysore. For that reason I am not going to countenance the kind of reference which Shri Hanumanthaiya made to Maharashtrian chauvinism as he put it. I am sure Mr. Hanumanthaiya knows that the events which happened in Bombay to which he made a reference are events which every decent Maharashtrian regrets very deeply. There is no doubt about it and therefore let us not drag this skeleton of chauvinism which might be lurking in the minds of many. In our country we are trying to see an integrated India. The process of the completion of integration of our States into a national entity called India would be helped by the legislation before us. I would however like the Government to make the poll really free and honest.

Mr. Dandekar is not here and at one period of time I was slightly attracted to the idea of Goans outside Goa even being entitled to take part in the opinion poll because I know in places like Bombay there are large numbers of Goans who possibly send their earnings back home. But I have since heard the argument of Mr. Shinkre and other speakers and I think that this would be a rather dangerous precedent and unnecessary also and so I would not press that point of view.

It is a good thing that the Bandhodkar Ministry has offered to quit office before the poll is taken on that issue. I agree with my friend Mr. Limaye that this is a precedent which the Congress Government should have tried to apply in the case of the general elections which are in the offing. Over and over again reference had been made to Jawaharlal Nehru's assurance

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

regarding Goa retaining her own identity for a period of time. He never said that it is to be for ten years or it should be more. He has envisaged that even inside of ten years we can conclude that process. I am very much at one with Mr. Shinkre and I think when the emphasis on the cultural and social pattern and the history of Goa is made only to highlight the separation of Goa from the rest of India it is entirely misplaced and entirely mischievous. We cannot forget that these people who are now coming forward to champion the separate identity of Goa as a cultural entity used to call the people of Goa Goanese just as at one time we were called Asiatics all over the world and this word Asian came into the picture to express our sense of detestation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I shall take only two more minutes; I represent a Party. They used to be put in a separate compartment, as it were. They used to be isolated from the rest of the Indian community. We are told about a particular spiritual climate which seems to have pervaded Goa. I know a certain kind of Latin European temperament got injected to some parts of India. But our country is hospitable to all kinds of influences and we can afford to have pockets here and there where foreign European influences can often be seen to operate. But merely because the upper stratum of Goan society had imbibed something of Latin European culture, that does not mean to say that the desire of the overwhelming majority of the population would be thwarted and the merger with Maharashtra which is very natural process should be delayed. This reminds me of one thing which has happened only recently.

All of us were very happy when the news came that an Indian girl Miss Reita Faria was crowned as the beauty queen of the world. She comes from

Goa. We were all happy about it. We were unhappy that the Prime Minister, a woman Prime Minister at that, forgot to send her congratulations. Later she said she was sorry; she did not congratulate her in time. We were surprised perhaps we should not be surprised at the practised ineptitude of our High Commission in London. The High Commission took no notice whatever of an Indian girl having been crowned as Beauty queen of the world. Anyway, she comes from Goa. After sometime we discovered that she was moving into some kind of an entertainment racket . . . (Interruptions.) for American troops in Vietnam. Then came the news that she was not going there. I am concluding, Sir. Then again comes the news that she has changed her mind and whether it is Viet-Nam or moon she is going wherever she wants to go. She is a lovely woman and I do not want to say anything against a lovely woman but when a lovely woman stoops to folly, she should know how far she should go. On this occasion, what I fear is, she has inherited some of the hangovers of the old days when these people seem to think that they are not Indians and that they belong to a different category of human beings and therefore want to demarcate themselves away from the rest of us in India. It is only an illustration of the kind of isolationism in which this part of our country has been placed by the former regime and I feel it is about time that we take all possible steps in order to rectify the whole process.

Shri Hanumanthaiya very correctly referred to certain things happening in the Congress party. He referred to a particular gentleman from Goa—Kakodkar or somebody—performing the vanishing trick. He referred to the factions proliferating inside the Congress party and the State interests militating against the Central interests and the faults and foibles of the Congress party. But they should be no argument for denying the principal demand which is that the people of Goa

should express their opinion freely and frankly in regard to the proposed merger of Goa with Maharashtra and that the people of Daman and Diu should express their views in regard to their merger with Gujarat.

Therefore, I support this Bill and I oppose the kind of suggestions which were otherwise made.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Basappa.

Shri Raghunath Singh: So, I am not speaking? Is there any chance for me? I gave my name two days ago. I am the Secretary of the party.

Shri Joachim Alva: He is an important Member; he is also Secretary of the party. He may be given a chance.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I will go out then. (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. You will get your chance, I have got your name here.

Shri P. R. Patel: You are not giving chance to the Gujarat people; it seems so. From Maharashtra, so many Members spoke; from Mysore, so many Members have spoken. But from Gujarat none of us has been called. Has Gujarat nothing to say on this? This Bill affects Gujarat also.

Shri Basappa: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, speaking on this Bill, I would like to make the position of Mysore clear in this respect. We have been saying that in respect of Goa, the national interests must be the primary consideration. The late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru considered all these aspects and said that for a certain period Goa should remain as a Union territory. To change that thing is not in the interests of Goa nor in the national interests. Those who want to say that it should merge with Maharashtra have quoted the historical reasons and records, and mentioned the geographical contiguity, administrative convenience and all that. If you say that all these factors go

against Mysore, then I do not want this territory to come to Mysore and I am prepared to withdraw my amendment. But let us consider it. Let the House, in a decent manner, consider these aspects. (Interruption).

An. hon. Member: What is this "decent manner"?

Shri Basappa: I meant only in a proper manner. After all, English is not my mother-tongue. Therefore, you must take the spirit in which I am saying this. I may put forward those reasons on which they claim that Goa should go to Maharashtra. If for any reason you come to the conclusion that it should not remain a Union territory, then, if those people make a claim on other grounds for merging it with Maharashtra, I want to join issue with them. I may be defeated but I do not mind it.

Sir, you come from Shimoga district. You know how the rulers of Shimoga had made treaties with Goa at that time. Historically also,—these are historical reasons—from 119 A.D. to 1312 A.D. Goa was under the Kadamba rulers. Afterwards, the rulers of Hikeri, in 1632, made a treaty with the Portuguese. Again, as my hon. friend said, in 1763, the Karnataka ruler, Raja Sondha, ceded some of his territories. So, nowhere does Maharashtra come into the picture. At no time were they the rulers of Goa. I may make bold to say that. I would say that even on economic grounds, the Vijayanagar rulers had control over Goa and they were sending cloth to other countries and from that port they were importing horses to the military. These are the historical facts.

On the question of hinterland, the hon. Member admitted that three-fourths of the hinterland belongs to Mysore and only 20 per cent or so comes under Maharashtra. On the question of geographical contiguity, only 20 per cent lies along Maharashtra, while 80 per cent of it is contiguous to Mysore. My hon. friend does not deny it. Then, in Malnad

[Shri Basappa]

area of Mysore and in Goa, the physical features are all the same. Goa gets food materials, its vegetables and all these things from the Mysore area. I therefore emphasise that for economic reasons, on the grounds of administrative convenience, geographical contiguity and historical connections, Mysore has something to do with Goa, and if only on these points you are going to consider it and decide the issue, you consider it impartially and come to whatever decision that is necessary.

15.55 hrs.

[SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF in the Chair]

I welcome the Bill. I am not opposing the Bill. What I want is, because of the democratic features and because the assurance was given and they are going to implement a policy in this Bill, let the opinion be fair and free. What we are asking is this: there is now a hustling through of the Bill and there is already a weightage given on the clauses which are in favour of a merger with Maharashtra. That should not be done. The Bill must be corrected and therefore I say we should not hurry through the Bill. When I say that the Bill must be postponed, it is not my intention to see that I must stop this Bill. My intention is that the feelings which are running very high in this country must be cooled down before you take up a Bill of this kind, and a decision must not be taken under pressure. I say even today that this decision has been taken under pressure. You can examine it, and if you do not, in the case of Pondicherry, Manipur and Tripura, find the need for any merger, why should there be this hurry only in the case of Goa?

Shri Shinkre: Because the people of Goa want it.

Shri Basappa: Let them get accustomed to the present situation for some more time. (Interruption). Let us consider the pre-requisite. After all, when you decide a change or want

to amend any article in the Constitution, you want two-thirds majority. But here, by one single voting you are going to transfer a part of our land to another. Let us have, give consideration to the aspect of a fair, bigger majority in this matter. That is what I would like to say.

Take the electoral rolls. There are the legal questions, whether Goans should be taken as voters or not. On legislation, it is a special kind of poll which we are introducing for the first time. If you want to have the elections, you get into play the Representation of the People Act. For an opinion poll, you must have separate piece of legislation which will incorporate also the other parts of India which will include some other people also to vote.

The late Prime Minister's assurance has already been quoted. I do not want to go into the details. After all, there is suspicion in the mind of the people; the interest of Goa is going to be sacrificed at the altar of opportunism and balance of power at the Centre. This should be stopped. This thing must go and it must be erased from the mind of the people. I do not say that; but there are people who entertain it; it must be erased from the mind of those very people.

Goa is of strategic importance; it is a place of great importance, of naval importance and of military importance. It should remain as it is for some more time, as a Union territory, so that you can consider it later. When Nehru made his statement, he had an international aspect in mind and it had wider implications. So, let us not hurry through this Bill. What is the situation in Goa? Is there any administration in Goa today? Who can say that there is administration? Is there a judiciary existing? Let us ask the Law Minister whether the judiciary is functioning there. Under these circumstances, let not any extra influence come in and pressurise the poll. If Maharashtra people are prepared to

do it, the other people also will also go out and do a lot of things there. The Government must take care to see that a free and fair election is conducted only through impartial people. Not only must the Ministry there resign but those political officers and the Maharashtra officers who are controlling the election must also be removed from that place. Others who are the proper man should conduct the election. I am for opinion poll. Let it not come to Mysore, but only if they join issue with me, I am prepared to join issue with them and say that it must come to Mysore.

16 hrs.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Bardwan):

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to make an objective approach and I want to start by saying that I am not actuated by any animus or any antipathy against Maharashtra. As a matter of fact, a good part of my political life was spent with great Maharashtra leaders like Dr. Savarkar, Kelkar, Keskar, Dr. Moonje and the great Tapade, and I know they are not only great sons of Maharashtra but great sons of India. I am only pointing out that we had given certain solemn pledges—the nation has given certain solemn pledges to the people of Goa. I am merely pointing out the solemn pledges given at the highest possible level. At the Jaipur session the Congress first of all gave the pledge that the cultural heritage of Goa should be maintained. Some extracts were quoted by Mr. Dandekar. Presiding over the Goan Rally in Bombay, Jawaharlal Nehru gave a definite pledge in June 1956. Even later in 1962 Jawaharlal Nehru wrote to Mr. Nijalingappa, the Chief Minister of Mysore, as follows:

“We have decided and we hold to that decision that Goa should remain a separate entity in the Union of India. Why should there be this hankering for Goa to be merged into this State or that State? I do not understand it. Goa can develop as it likes within the framework of India and add to the richness of India.”

At the opening of the Parliamentary Session which enacted the Union Territories Act, Dr. Rajendra Prasad said:

“We have, however, repeatedly assured the people of Goa and the world that the personality that this area has acquired, shall be preserved.”

On 4th December, 1963, Shastriji said at a public meeting in Panjim:

“The degree of autonomy which Goa will enjoy will be as full and complete as that of any State.”

We are now having this constitutional device of a referendum. We welcome it. If the people of Goa want to remain as a separate State in the Indian Union within the framework of the Constitution, let them decide like that. The only thing we want is, let there be an honest effort; let there be a proper and full observance of the pledges. To whom did the Congress, Jawaharlal Nehru and other national leaders give this pledge? It was given to the Goans. 85,000 Goans are living in Bombay. They played a magnificent part in the liberation struggle of Goa.

Shri Alvares: They did not.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: They are trying to whittle it down. They did their best. As a matter of fact, the response to Jawaharlal Nehru's appeal was there. We are very proud of the part played by two members of the Lok Sabha. The first was the great son of Maharashtra, Prof. Deshpande, who started the movement, who was in Dr. Salazar's jail for a long period and who was given 80 stripes. He came back and we welcomed him. Then Mr. Tridib Kumar Chowdhury, one of our colleagues, spent 18 months in Dr. Salazar's jail.

The call was given by Jawaharlal Nehru. The Goan Congress itself, said, “Quit Goa”. That was the cry they

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

raised and it was ultimately fulfilled. Should not this pledge be redeemed? Should not those 80,000 or 100,000 Goans in Bombay who fought against the ruthless, autocratic Portuguese fascist despotism and did their best for the liberation of Goa be allowed to have their say? The Minister is basically wrong when he points out to the Representation of the People Act which says that an elector can only be a person normally resident in that territory. This is not an election for 5 years of a member to the Assembly or Parliament. This is for ever, not for generations, but centuries together. You are determining the future of Goa. Therefore, all the Goans should have their say. There are 20,000 of them who are seamen operating in different parts, because that is one of their main occupations.

Shri Raghunath Singh: It is wrong.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I stand corrected. Whatever be their number, have they got the right to give their opinion? Make the redemption of this pledge comprehensive, consistent, honest and sincere. Don't deprive these people in the name of the Representation of the People Act. It does not deal with referendum or destiny of a State for ever. There only local problem and local grievances are to be redressed. Here we have to deal with the future of the entire Goanese people to whom you gave the pledge, who participated in the liberation struggle and who did their best for rescuing Goa from the dictatorship of Dr. Salazar. That is the point which should be considered.

I have tabled a motion and so have Mr. Dandekar and Prof. Ranga that you should exclude from the poll those who are really not Goans. The House should know that for three successive elections, the 85,000 people in Bombay were excluded.

Shri Shinkre: They chose to remain out.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I have got the letter of the Government. It says:

"The Goans are not eligible for enrolment as voters in the electoral rolls for Parliament and Assembly.."

They were living there fighting for Goa's liberty. They are as much Goans as anybody else. They are sons and grandsons of those who were in Goa. But they are told, "You have got to fight for Goa". Should we not make our pledge effective so far as they are concerned and say that those who have been excluded from participating in our democratic life should be given a chance of having their say as to what shall be the permanent future and reshaping of the destiny of Goa? That is my point.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : सभापति महोदय, मैं माननीय सदस्य, श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी की इस भावना का आदर करता हूँ कि देश के अन्य क्षेत्रों की तरह गोआ भी हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा था और जो दो भाई बहुत दिनों तक अलग अलग रहे, अगर वे आज मिल रहे हैं, तो यह हमारे लिये हर्ष की बात है।

श्री हनुमन्तैया ने शिवाजी की बात उठाई। कुछ साम्प्रदायिक बात उठाई। शिवाजी की भावना क्या थी? शिवाजी चाहते थे हिन्दुस्तान में हिन्दुस्तानियों का राज्य हो। उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि यहाँ पर ब्राह्मण, क्षत्रिय, वैश्य, शूद्र या तामिल अथवा आन्ध्र के लोगों का राज्य हो। उन्होंने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान एक है। हिन्दुस्तान में हिन्दुस्तानियों का राज्य होना चाहिए। जो लोग शिवाजी की इस बात को नहीं मानते हैं, वे शिवाजी का अनुकरण करने वाले नहीं हैं। मैं श्री हनुमन्तैया को विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि भारत-वर्ष का शासन एक सेंकुलर शासन है, धर्म-निरपेक्ष राज्य है, उसमें सम्प्रदाय का कोई स्थान नहीं होगा और अगर सम्प्रदाय का स्थान होगा, तो वह इस सदन को मान्य नहीं होगा।

गोवा को 1961 में यूनिन टैरीटरी करार दिया गया उस के बाद 1963 में यूनिन टैरीटरीज एक्ट पास हुआ, जिस के अनुसार गोवा में नया शासन आया। 9 दिसम्बर, 1963 को गोवा में जनरल इलेक्शन हुआ। वह इलेक्शन किस बुनियाद पर लड़ा गया था? वहां पर दो इलेक्शन मैनफेस्टो बहुत इम्पोर्टेंट थे? पहला इलेक्शन मैनफेस्टो गोमान्तक पार्टी का था, जिसमें "इम्पी-जिएट मर्जर विद महाराष्ट्र" का नारा लगाया गया था। दूसरा मैनफेस्टो कांग्रेस पार्टी का था, जिसके आइटम 16 में यह कहा गया था :

"The Government of India have made it clear that the future of Goa and whether it should merge with the adjoining territory of Maharashtra will be ultimately decided according to the wishes of the people of Goa."

जहां तक उस एलेक्शन का सम्बन्ध है, गोवा की 3,50,039 लोगों की इलेक्ट्रेट में से 2,49,535 लोगों ने इलेक्शन में भाग लिया, जिन में से गोमान्तक दल को 1,00,117 वोट मिले और कांग्रेस दल को 43,000 वोट। इसका अर्थ यह है कि गोवा के 1,43,117 वोटर्स ने महाराष्ट्र के साथ मर्जर के पक्ष में मत दिया। अब दंडेकर जी ने प्रश्न उठाया कि इलेक्शन के बाद गोवा को जोड़ने के लिए जवाहर लाल नेहरू का मैं उनको दो पत्र पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। पीछे की बात सन 50 की 54 की या 55 की क्या थी, उसमें कोई मतलब नहीं है। हमारा इतिहास गोवा के साथ, हमारा संबंध गोवा के साथ सन 1961 के बाद आरम्भ होता है। 1961 के बाद हमारा इस गवर्नमेंट का क्या सिद्धांत या उस सिद्धांत को देखना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य के पास समय ज्यादा नहीं है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : अगर आप कहें तो मैं इस को रख दूँ, न पढ़ूँ।

सभापति महोदय : आप उसका सार कह दें।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : सार ही कहूंगा।

काकोडकर जी का नाम बहुत कोट किया जाता है। 2-1-63 को उन को पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने पत्र लिखा :

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

फिर 9-7-63 को दूसरा पत्र लिखा :

"I have said that the future of Goa will be decided by the People of Goa."

अच्छा, इसके बाद क्या होता है? ...
... (व्यवधान)

इस प्रकार से अगर कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी ने कोई प्रस्ताव पास किया कि दस वर्ष तक के वास्ते स्थगित रखें तो यह गवर्नमेंट कांग्रेस कमेटी के प्रस्ताव से वाध्य नहीं है। हमें तो यह देखना है कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से डिक्लेरेषन क्या हुआ, प्राइममिनिस्टर ने क्या डिक्लेरेषन किया? प्राइममिनिस्टर ने दो बार डिक्लेयर किया कि गोवा का फेट क्या होगा, गोवा वालों के द्वारा उसका निर्णय लिया जायेगा। फिर गोवा की असेम्बली ने 22-11-65 को प्रस्ताव पाम किया :

"Immediate merger of Goa with Maharashtra and Central Government would respect the above resolution."

यह आपकी गोवा असेम्बली का प्रस्ताव था। इस गोवा असेम्बली के प्रस्ताव के बाद जब कि गोवा के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब यहां आये तो उन्होंने श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री से कहा कि मैं तैयार हूँ कि इसी बुनियाद पर कि गोवा का मर्जर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हो या न हो, फिर से इलेक्शन करालिया जाय।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

उन्होंने इस बात को फिर दोहराया। तो आप देखेंगे कि वहाँ की असेम्बली ने श्रीर वहाँ के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने दो दो बार कहा। दंडेकर साहब ने कांग्रेस का गवान उठाया। वहाँ की पी० सी० सी० में 28 मेम्बर हैं, उनमें से 23 ने लिख कर दिया कि हम गोआ का मर्जर चाहते हैं। तो कांग्रेस को क्यों कंट करते हैं? जो प्राविशियल कांग्रेस कमेटी वहाँ है वहाँ के 28 में से 23 प्रादमियों ने कहा है कि इसका मर्जर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ होना चाहिए। लिहाजा आप कांग्रेस को दोष नहीं दे सकते।

अब हमारे मित्रों ने एक यह बहस की है दो तिहाई मेजारिटी की। आचार्य कृपालानी जी बैठे हैं। हिन्दुस्तान का जब डिवीजन हुआ तो नार्थ वेस्ट फ्रंटियर प्राविट को किस बुनियाद पर आपने अलग किया? क्या परसेंटज था? वहाँ पर 75 परसेंट मेजारिटी की बात नहीं की, दो तिहाई मेजारिटी की बात नहीं की। बल्कि डेढ़ परसेंट मेजारिटी के ऊपर नार्थ वेस्ट फ्रंटियर प्राविस को पाकस्तान को दे दिया। साढ़े अड़तालीस परसेंट पाकिस्तान साथ के रहने के पक्ष में नहीं थे, साढ़े 5 परसेंट पाकिस्तान के पक्ष में थे। 'सिम्पल मेजारिटी' से आपने किया। तो जब सिम्पल मेजारिटी से आप हिन्दुस्तान के पार्टीशन के सिद्धान्त को मानते हैं तो आज कोई प्रश्न नहीं पंदा होता है कि आप उसी सिद्धान्त को यहाँ मानने के लिये तैयार न हों।

श्री ज० भ० कृपालानी : वह बेवकूफी की थी।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : उस बेवकूफी का प्रायश्चित हम लोग कर रहे हैं। दूसरा सवाल उठाया जा रहा है लैंग्वेज का। आप लैंग्वेज देखें 1960 के सेन्सस के अनुसार...

श्री हनुमन्तया : वह ठीक नहीं है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : गवर्नमेंट का रिकार्ड है। मैं उसे ठीक मानता हूँ। आप न मानें।

एक मिनट में मैं समाप्त करता हूँ। 1960 के सेन्सस में आप देखें क्योंकि 1960 में इंडियन टैरीटरी यूनियन ऐक्ट नहीं अप्लाई हुआ था। उस में आप देखें कि 4,97,227 कोंकनी बोलने वाले, 9142 मराठी बोलने वाले और 813 कन्नड़ बोलने वाले हैं। और इस बात को आप देखें कि प्रियमन ने लिखा था कि महाराष्ट्रियन और कोंकनी क्या है? यह जो प्राकृत भाषा है उसकी दो शाखायें हैं। इस वास्ते लैंग्वेज को देखें तो उसमें भी यह बात नहीं आती कि हम इस बात को न मानें।

कल्चर की बात कही गई। एन० सी० चटर्जी साहब ने कल्चर की बात उठायी। हिन्दुस्तान का कल्चर एक है। मुस्लिम लीग के नारे को हमने नहीं माना। मुस्लिम लीग कहती थी कि हिन्दुस्तान के कल्चर दो हैं। हमने कहा कि एक है। आज आप किस बुनियाद पर कह सकते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान का कल्चर अलग है और गोआ का कल्चर अलग है? आज आप यह कहेंगे तो कल को यह भी कहेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान का कल्चर अलग है, काश्मीर का कल्चर अलग है, यू० पी० का कल्चर अलग है। इस सिद्धान्त को हम नहीं मान सकते। हिन्दुस्तान का एक कल्चर है। कायदे आजम जिन्ना ने इसको नहीं माना लेकिन हमने बराबर यही माना।

सभापति महोदय : अब समाप्त करिए।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : आज किस आधार पर हम दो कल्चर को मानने के लिए तैयार हैं? इस वास्ते मैं बड़े भूदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई प्रश्न नहीं है कि गोआ का मर्जर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ न हो।

अब एक प्रश्न सिर्फ़ और रह गया है कि गोष्ठा के बाहर जो रहने वाले लोग हैं उनको भी वोट देने का अधिकार हो। गवर्नमेंट एक प्रमेंडमेंट शायद ला रही है कि गोष्ठा के रहने वालों को भी जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर हैं और जो कि कहीं वोटर नहीं हैं, उनको गोष्ठा में वोट देने का अधिकार हो। यह सिद्धान्त बड़ा अच्छा है। लेकिन इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि इस सिद्धान्त को हम इनडेफिनिटली मान लें, सारी दुनिया के जितने लोग हैं जब तक वह वोटर न हो जायें तब तक गोष्ठा का मर्जर न हो। मैं सरकार से कहूंगा कि एक टाइम लिमिट होना चाहिए कि इसके अन्दर पीपुल्स रेप्रेजेंटेशन ऐक्ट के अनुसार गोष्ठा में आ कर के जो लोग गोष्ठा के नागरिक होना चाहते हैं उनको अवश्य वोट का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए। लेकिन अगर आप इस सिद्धान्त को लागू करना चाहते हैं तो जो राजस्थान के आसाम में हैं उनको फिर राजस्थान में वोट देने का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए, और जो काश्मीर के लोग काश्मीर के बाहर हैं उनको वोट देने का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए। अगर इस सिद्धान्त को लागू करेंगे तो फिर सारे हिन्दुस्तान की अवस्था बिगड़ जायगी।

एक बात और हमारे हनुमन्तैया जी ने कही ब्लाक गोट की। तो ब्लाक गोट तो डेमोक्रेसी में होती ही है। अगर ब्लाक गोट नहीं होता तो कांग्रेस की गवर्नमेंट कैसे बनती? डेमोक्रेसी जहां होगी वहां तो ब्लाक गोट होगी ही। अगर हमारी ब्लाक गोट नहीं होगी तो हम आचार्य कृपलानी के स्थान पर बैठेंगे। ब्लाक गोट के कारण ही हम पावर में आये हैं। तो इसमें घबड़ाने की बात नहीं है। घबड़ाने की बात यह है जो ब्लाक गोट हो उसमें लोग मज्जन हों, अच्छे हों, सहिष्णु हों, उदार हों।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Chairman: Shri Bade.

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir may I remind you that the Speaker promised to call me today?

Mr. Chairman: The direction that I have here is that the hon. Minister should be called at 4.30. I have requested him to speak a few minutes later. If hon. Members help me by confining their remarks to five minutes, I will be able to accommodate more hon. Members.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, once you occupy the Chair, all powers of the Speaker are vested in you.

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir, what I want to submit is that the Speaker promised to call me today.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Alva should know that it is not only from one side that hon. Members have to speak. Turn by turn, Members from this side and that side speak. Perhaps his chance also might come.

Shri Joachim Alva: My constituency is on the borders of Goa.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order—Shri Bade.

श्री बड़े : सभापति महोदय, यह जो बिल लाया गया है ओपिनियन पोल के वास्ते हमको फिर ओपिनियन देना है। यह ओपिनियन के लिए क्या यह एक विचित्र पोल निकला है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। कांग्रेस शासन का हर एक जगह अलग अलग स्टैंडर्ड है। कभी पंजाब और हिमाचल प्रदेश का करना हो तो उसके वास्ते अलग स्टैंडर्ड, नर्मदा के पानी का झगडा हो तो वहां अलग स्टैंडर्ड और यहां इस बिल में अलग स्टैंडर्ड। जब कि वहां की विधान सभा ने, गोष्ठा की विधान सभा ने निर्णय ले लिया था कि महाराष्ट्र में इसको मिलना चाहिए, ऐसी स्थिति में यह ओपिनियन पोल लाने की क्या आवश्यकता थी? वास्तव में दाना डाल कर मुर्गी लड़ाने से ही इस कांग्रेस शासन का काम चलता है। पहले वह इसको

[श्री बड़े]

टालते रहे, लेकिन जब गोम्रा में एक फीलिग उत्पन्न हो गई कि हमको महाराष्ट्र से मिलना है, उसी समय मैसूर ने भ्रावाज उठाई, उसके बाद इस ओपिनियन पोल को सामने ले आये।

आज मेरे सामने हिन्दुस्तान का नक्शा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बीर मोहन रानाडे आज पुर्वगीज की जेल में हैं, जिन्होंने गोम्रा को मुक्त कराया, उनको छुड़ाने के लिये इस शासन ने क्या किया है? आज जब महाराष्ट्र और मैसूर में झगड़ा उत्पन्न हुआ तो हमारे हनुमन्तैया जी कहते हैं कि वहां पर शिवाजी का स्टेबू क्यों होना चाहिये? मैं उनको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र के प्रत्येक भादमी के दिल में शिवाजी भरे हुए हैं, स्टेबू की तो आप क्या कहते हैं। राणा प्रताप, शिवाजी, गुरू गोविन्द सिंह, ये हमारे राष्ट्र पुरुष हैं

सभापति महोदय : आपने उनको गलत समझा है।

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, on a point of personal explanation. My hon. friend belongs to a party whose ideal is Akhand Bharat. I agree with that ideal. I was pleading for his cause that no sectarian personage should be sponsored as the leader of the nation. Any person who is sponsored as the leader of the nation must be a person of all-India character, not a sectarian character. That was the point I was making.

श्री बड़े : उन्होंने अपने इन्टरप्रेशन में कहा था, इसीलिये मैंने ऐसा कहा।

मैं इस समय तीन मिनट में केवल तीन प्वाइंट्स हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ—पहला तो यह है कि जब गोम्रा में इलैक्शन हुआ था, उस इलैक्शन से ही यह निर्णय ले लिया गया था। क्योंकि इसी प्वाइंट के आधार पर इलैक्शन लड़ा गया था कि गोम्रा

महाराष्ट्र में मिले या उससे अलग रहे और जो पार्टी महाराष्ट्र से मिलना चाहती थी, वही पार्टी मेजोरिटी में जीत कर आई थी।

दूसरे उसके बाद वहां की विधान सभा ने एक प्रस्ताव पास किया जिसमें महाराष्ट्र से मिलने का निर्णय किया गया, लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी यह ओपिनियन पोल वहां पर लाया गया, यह प्रेशर की वजह से नहीं हुआ तो किस वजह से हुआ।

तीसरी बात गोम्रा के बाहर जो लोग रहते हैं, उनको वोट देने का अधिकार क्या है? मैं महाराष्ट्री हूँ, लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश में रहता हूँ, तो क्या मैं महाराष्ट्र में जाकर वोट दे सकता हूँ? दाण्डेकर जी इन्दौर के महाराष्ट्री हैं, तो क्या वह दूसरी जगह जाकर वोट दे सकते हैं? चैटर्जी साहब क्या कलकत्ता में जाकर वोट दे सकते हैं, जो लोग तीन तीन पीढ़ियों से गोम्रा में रहते हैं, उनको ही यह अधिकार होना चाहिये। जैसा हमारे मित्र ने कहा कि दाण्डेकर जी एक लाबी को रिप्रेजेंट करते हैं, तो उनको नाराज नहीं होना चाहिये . .

Shri N. Dandekar: I never represent any lobby.

Mr. Chairman: He equally meant so.

श्री बड़े : It is in good sense.

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग तीन-तीन पीढ़ियों से बम्बई में रहते हैं, जिन्होंने वहां के कारपोरेशन के इलैक्शन में भाग लिया, वहां पर जैनरल इलैक्शन में वोट दिया है, जिनका इन्टरेस्ट बम्बई में है, वे गोम्रा में जाकर वोट क्यों दें?

एक मुझे यह कहना है कि बन्दोडकर मंत्री मंडल को इस्तीफा देने के लिये क्यों कहा गया, वास्तव में यह सरकार मैसूर से इतना ज्यादा प्रेशराइज्ड थी गई है कि आज दाण्डेकर साहब भी यहां आने को तैयार नहीं हैं। वह समझते हैं कि हम "सोडा" हो गये

हैं, हमारे यहां मराठी में सोडा को अछूत कहते हैं। उनको देखना चाहिये था कि यहां इस हाउस में उनके खिलाफ क्या बोला गया है। शिव सेना की बात तो कैबिनेट तक पहुंच गई है, उन्होंने शिव सेना के विरुद्ध भाषण दिया, इस प्रकार का एलीगेशन लगाना—चव्हाण साहब और मिनिस्टरी पर प्रेशर डालना है। इसका मतलब है कि एक स्टैंड तो गोप्पा के लिये कर दिया और दूसरा दूसरी जगह कर दिया। आपको दूसरी जगह भी वैसा ही करना चाहिये था, मध्य प्रदेश में डी० पी० मिश्र को राजीनामा दो, तो लेंगे, वहां से कोई त्याग-पत्र नहीं लेंगे। इसलिये बन्दोडकर से त्यागपत्र लेना—एक स्टैंड बनाया, लेकिन दूसरी जगह उस स्टैंड को लागू नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि उससे कांग्रेस शासन फेल होता है, आपस के झगड़े शुरू हो जाते हैं।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hold that more than any individual I am responsible for the liberation of Goa, because if I had not stood as a candidate for North Bombay, probably there would have been no liberation of Goa, whatever my friends might say.

I am afraid that there is a lot of confusion caused by the speeches that I have heard so far. Linguistic provinces do not mean that there cannot be two provinces of one language. If that were so, then Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Haryana would be one State. So, the sooner this confusion is taken away from the minds of the people, who are thinking in terms of linguistic provinces, the better it will be. Even if we think in terms of linguistic provinces, Goanese language is not Marathi language.

Shri Shinkre: Then what is it?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I know much more than you know.

Shri Shinkre: Presumption.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: It is not presumption. I am going to refer you to a very learned man....

Shri Nath Pai: I can refer to three learned men.

Shri J. B. Kripalani:... a very highly learned man, Kaka Kalelkar.

Shri Shinkre: Of all men?

Shri Raghunath Singh: Why not Grierson?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Grierson can also speak. But I can tell you the views of Kaka Kalelkar on Marathi language. I am not giving my views. I am giving the evidence of learned people.

Shri Shinkre: Do not accept the views of Kaka Kalelkar on Marathi language. You can accept the views of anybody else. I have no objection.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He is considered a very learned man. Our friend might not admit it, but the Government of India has admitted it.

Shri Shinkre: Oh!

Shri Nath Pai: That is one of the major mistakes of the Government of India.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am only giving you his opinion. You may accept it or not accept it. That is your look-out. As I said, let there be no confusion about it; linguistic provinces do not mean that every language should have only one province. Any language can have two provinces or three provinces. There is no bar to that. What I mean to say is that the language spoken in Goa is certainly not the same language which is spoken in Poona. It is Konkani. That is what I say.

Shri Shinkre: Is the language spoken in Poona the same as the language spoken in Khandesh?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I also think that the Bill is good. The opinion of the people of Goa should be obtained; there is no dispute about that. Do not be fanatical. The question is only about the definition of who is a Goan. That is all. There is no dispute about it that the Goans should decide their fate. We stick to that, apart from the previous commitments made by this man or that man. We have no respect for even Gandhiji's commitment. Then, what is the fate of commitments of others? Why do not hear his name in political circles any more. So, let us not think of that.

Let us think of who is a Goan and should be entitled to vote. That is the question that has to be decided here. I think, when you are going to decide the fate of a particular region, it is necessary to decide as to who is a citizen. I will leave it to the Government to decide as to who is a Goan, because in the past they have said that the Goans are those whose father and grandfather were Goans and if they went to Bombay to earn their livelihood and did not go to Goa because Goa was under foreign rule that is no disqualification for them... (Interruption). Please listen to what I say. I am neither a Goanese nor a Marathi.

An hon. Member: Your are a Sindhi.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Unfortunately, I am not a Sindhi. I am not a UP-man; I am only an Indian. I am talking from the Indian point of view. Here the Karnatikas are allowed to speak and the Maharashtrais are allowed to speak but those who have nothing to do with this quarrel are kept away. I think, about this Bill the Maharashtrais and the Karnatikas should have been prohibited from speaking.

An hon. Member: The Goans alone should have spoken.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: And if there are no Goans here?

Shri Nath Pai: There are two Members of Parliament.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But one swallow does not make a summer. And one of them lived all his life in Bombay; as if I do not know him. What are you talking? He himself having remained for umpteen years in Bombay does not want the Bombay Goans to be associated with voting. (Interruption). It is not a question of disparaging him. Let him deny and say that he has not lived all his life in Bombay because Portugal was in occupation of Goa.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): Do you allege that he does not represent Goa?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I do not allege anything, my dear friend. But to say that the other Goans, who are living in Bombay, do not belong to Goa, while he himself belongs to Bombay, is that logic? Look at what you are talking. They do not understand that I am talking plain logic. But there is no need of talking rationally to people who are irrational. They are only excited by their own emotions and by partisan spirit. I have nothing to do with Goa or Karnatak or Maharashtra. I am only stating a fact that the Marathi language is not the same as the Konkani language.

Shri Shinkre: That is true.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He says, "That is true". A Daniel come to judgement.

Shri Basappa: Shri Shinkre admits it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Another thing is that one language need not have, and has not, one province to itself. The third thing is that of the two representatives of Goa, one has always lived in Bombay. There must be many Goans who like him were remaining in Bombay because they did not want to go under the Portuguese rule. There are others who have

come there only for earning their livelihood. There may be 10, 12 or 40. All these men, I think, legitimately should be brought in. This is reason; all other is prejudice.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Dube.

Shri Joachim Alva: Will we get a chance at all, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: I cannot say yet.

Shri Joachim Alva: I want you to know that the Speaker said yesterday from the Chair that he would call me.

Mr. Chairman: I have called Shri Dube.

Shri R. G. Dube (Bijapur North): Mr. Chairman, Sir, there was a reference to Shivaji. Actually, we have to judge the role of Shivaji in the context of those days. He was a very great patriot and it was he who was responsible for the liberation of the country from foreign rule. He inspires us. I personally got my inspiration from Shivaji for my future life.

Then, Shri Chavan is above board because he has withdrawn from it. But it is no denying the fact that there is a section of the people who are trying to raise this communal feeling and hatred.

Now, the position is this. There are no two opinions about this that this cannot be postponed indefinitely. The point is whether this is the proper juncture, whether at this juncture, we can go hurriedly through this Bill or not, because, as Mr. Bade referred to Ranade who is rotting in the Portugal jail and there are other friends also, say, Kakodkar who has spent 20 years in prison. I do not know the composition of the Bondodkar Ministry. But there are persons who have suffered and made sacrifices in their lives and we have forgotten them. So, 1962 election, I am afraid, is not the proper criterion for judging the opinion of Goans. I am told that there are Goans, outside Goa, in

Bombay and in Calcutta and in 1962, according to my information, subject to correction, many of these people had no right to vote during the 1962 elections because the Portuguese Government had driven out Goans and they had not exercised the right of vote. So, the only point for the serious consideration of the Government is whether Goans who are about 80,000, who had not exercised the right of vote in 1962 elections, and there are some who have suffered and made sacrifices, should be out of the picture. The Chief Election Commissioner might have gone into this carefully but—I am subject to correction—if 80,000 Goans are outside and if they have not had the right to vote, that factor should be taken into consideration.

It is a fact that there is a tendency in the country now to create an ill-feeling between Maharashtra and Mysore. It is necessary for us sometime to remember that this country is great and that the country's greatness and solidarity is the first thing. After all, it is not a question of Goa or Maharashtra or Mysore. That is not the point. But the point is that there is a tendency in the country now to forget the country's interest and to set aside the country's interest. This is the point.

I would request the Minister in-charge that we should not hurriedly go through this Bill. Let us examine the electoral roll and let these Goans who were, unfortunately, driven out by the Portuguese Government have some opportunity to exercise their vote. That takes time.

With these few remarks, I repeat that this matter should be given a careful thought before we hurriedly go through this Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Humayun Kabir.

श्रीमती सहोदराबाई राय (दमाहे) :
सभारति महोदय, महिलाओं को भी भोका मिलना चाहिये।

Shri Humayun Kabir: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity of speaking on this subject which has, to my mind, quite unnecessarily excited a lot of passion.

The first thing I would like to say is that Goa is in India and, therefore, I was a little surprised when my friend Mr. Mukerjee suddenly said that this Bill is somehow going to complete the integration of Goa into India. I just could not understand him. How on earth a new Bill is going to integrate Goa into India as if the integration did not take place some five years ago?

Shri Shinkre: It is complete now.

Shri Humayun Kabir: There is no question of completion.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Completion of linguistic integration.

Shri Humayun Kabir: There is no question of linguistic integration either.

The point is, Goa is already a part of India and if we overlook that fact, then, I think, we shall be fighting windmills and I know my hon. friend is occasionally prone to fight windmills and sometimes windmills that do not exist.

The second thing is that there is no difference of opinion whatsoever that the will of the Goan people should decide this matter. This has been the assurance not only of our late Prime Minister but even, apart from any assurance of the Prime Minister or anyone else,—it is an inherent right of the Indian people. In deciding about the will of the Goan people, we have to find who are the Goan people and that is where some difficulty has arisen. A very fine example has been given of Shri Alvares whom I have known for 25 years and he, I believe has not lived in Goa. Most of his life, he has lived in Bombay and yet, if I am not mistaken, he is some kind of a representative of Goa in Parliament. (Interruptions.)

An. hon. Member: Why some kind?

Shri Humayun Kabir: In the form in which the Bill has been presented, he will remain only "some kind" of a representative. That is my grouse against this Bill. I am glad to learn that the Government have had second thoughts and they are intending to move an amendment. This is what we were told a moment ago by the Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Party in this House that the Government would consider the case of those Goans who live outside Goa but who are not enfranchised anywhere else. The point is that over the last three General Elections, a number of Goans living outside Goa, living in different parts of India and who have lived in this country for two or three generations, were not given the vote on the ground that they were nationals of, what was at that time, a foreign territory. They could not vote even in 1962 because the time when the integration of Goa took place was so late that their names could not be included in the voter's list. Therefore, even though they were given the vote in civic elections, they were not given the vote in Parliamentary or Assembly elections. From that point of view, I think it would be less than fair and this House would be committing a travesty of justice if it did not allow persons of this type to be enrolled. I am quite prepared to accept the suggestion that there should be a time limit. This cannot be indefinite. Government may give one month or two months or whatever the period is and say that within such and such a period any Goan who may be an Indian national and has been an Indian national for the last five years but has not, for one reason or another, been enfranchised in any other part of India, should get the vote in deciding this question. The reference to the Representation of People Act has been disposed of by my hon. friend, Mr. Chatterjee. But even the Representation of People Act allows persons to be enrolled. Any one can make an application.

I remember the period of residence has been defined differently at different times. If a person has a house, he does not have to reside even for a day. At another time—I think in the amendment of 1956—it was provided that 24 hours before, one can make an application and yet get himself enrolled as a voter. If that is so, then why should there be this bar to the enrolment of the peoples of Goa?

The third point that I would like to make is this. It is true that an election has been held (*Interruptions*). I am speaking objectively. I do not belong to either Maharashtra or Mysore and I do not have the good fortune of being a Goan either. I speak as an Indian and I would say, looking at the facts objectively, that the results of the election in Goa were inconclusive; no Party had a clear majority. My friend, Mr. Raghunath Singh, referred to the figures: about 3 lakhs of people voted, out of which 1,09,000 supported the Gomantak Party. If 1,09,000 out of 3 lakhs supported the Gomantak Party, it cannot be said that there was a clear evidence in favour of immediate merger. I do not deny that there is a strong feeling. (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding.

My point is that till now there has been no clear expression of opinion and all that we want is an expression of opinion. I am not opposing the poll. I am saying that there should be an opinion poll, but the opinion poll should be under conditions where not only is there justice but the people also believe that there is justice. That is even more important.

I am glad that the Government have already decided that the present Ministry there would resign as soon as the Bill is introduced. The Bill has been introduced. Whether they have stepped down as yet or not, I do not know. I do not want to cast any reflection on any officers. I know some of the officers. The Lt. Governor is a man of the highest integrity and he himself, when he was appoint-

ed, told me that it was a little awkward for him; even if he acted with the greatest of discretion and impartiality, there would be people who would be a little doubtful.

For these reasons, it is necessary that in deciding this issue, we should decide dispassionately, we should decide objectively, we should cut out passions and we should decide in the best interests of the Goan people in the context of the Indian union. It is immaterial whether Goa goes to Maharashtra or Mysore, so far as the rest of India is concerned.

I would very humbly plead with my friends from Maharashtra and Mysore that they should also look at it from that point of view. They should not look at it from the point of view of accession of some territory and a few more citizens to one State or the other.

Shri Joachim Alva: Goa has been the sick-child of Indian politics. For a long time, Goa gave great anxiety to the fathers of Indian nationalism, because Goa had been under Portuguese imperialism. The Portuguese are the blackest sheep in the dark garden of imperialism. They have been hauled up for judgments at the seat of the United Nations. They have been oppressing people in Angola. As one political analyst has said, but for the Portuguese landing in China, and but for their having been the first western colonisers in China, the Chinese would not have hated the west so much that they had finally to embrace communism with the result that they have become a menace to us. The original sin was committed by the Portuguese conquerers or the colonisers who went to China.

The Portuguese have still left cups of poison in Goa and I say this with all sense of responsibility and seriousness. I am a practising Roman Catholic, and I would like my Roman Catholic friends not to be afraid of India. There is no country like India

(Shri Joachim Alva)

in the world; this country is a country of tolerance of so many faiths and religions. As I said on the platform of the Ernakulan AICC meeting just two months ago, and I shall repeat it now. For the first time when I landed down in Kerala and I came down to the plains, I saw nothing but the towers of the Catholic churches there; I did not see any single temple roof there. That was due to the tolerance of the Hindu religion which has become mixed with Buddhism and some of the finest tents of toleration.

For long, Portugal had harassed us. I say this because I have been a victim of this. I was put up by Sardar Patel and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as a candidate for election in 1937 in Bombay from the Christian communal seat to represent the Indian Christians of Bombay in the Assembly there. My hon. friend Shri C. R. Basappa perhaps does not know these facts. There were not less than 5000 Goan voters there who turned me out and they defeated me on the ground that I was a Hindu and I had married a Protestant and could not represent the Catholics. But that is another story.

I want to submit that this fanaticism must be destroyed root and branch from India. Whether it be existing among Christians or Hindus or Muslims or Sikhs or people belonging to any religion, unless we destroy this fanaticism we cannot build up this new India. It is unfortunate that even after twenty years of freedom we are still talking in terms of communities. The whole trouble has been due to this. Let the sick child of Goa be led into the garden of Indian democracy by Maharashtra and Mysore together without any bitterness and without any hatred.

I may tell you that I am a child of the fortunes of all the provinces or the States of India. I have been born under the influence of the tem-

ples of Udipi where the famous Madhwacharya was flourishing. But for the fact that I had read Ramayana in my younger days I would not have been what I am here. Then, I was educated by the jesuits, the greatest educators of the world. It is with that background that I say with all sense of responsibility that this fanaticism should be done away with. There are some Catholics in Goa who still think of their connections with Portugal. Until we cut off those connections, visible or invisible, we cannot put this country aright. The Mysoreans are charming and sweet people. The Maharashtrians are forthright valiant fighters and they speak out whatever they feel. I would appeal to the people of Maharashtra to put an end to the cry that may end in Bombay. Bombay has been known to be a cosmopolitan city. I have lived there for forty years. I started there on a salary of Rs. 15. I started from scratch, and I am not a rich man. But I must say that Bombay is a cosmopolitan city. Let not the Mysoreans and the Maharashtrians allow the sense of communalism to come up in Bombay, but let them all live together in Bombay. Barring some other hotels, the Udipi hotels are some of the finest hotels there, they have sweetened the mouths of the people of Bombay and the people from all over India and they have given lovely cups of tea and coffee to the people of our country. They should not be driven out. Let there be a sense of tolerance there.

Let the people of Goa give their verdict and let them have this opinion poll. I think it is a wise decision to have this poll. We had to take a decision in this matter and let the decision be taken. But the question of deciding it by simple majority has also got its own danger. We cannot just decide questions by a simple majority, but there are certain matters where we shall have to decide on the basis of a two-thirds majority.

Let every genuine Goan vote in this poll. Let every genuine Goan, wherever he may be, if he is not found as a voter in any part of India, vote in this poll. Let us not allow outsiders to flock into Goa.

Goa is a very beautiful place. Let us keep it going as it is, minus its religious fanaticism wherever it may be found. We all want Goa, because it is a beautiful place and it has got a wonderful harbour, and we must keep it going. Let that be preserved.

I want to pay a tribute to the hon. Members of Parliament, to that great and gallant band of MPs among whom there is only one woman who have all sacrificed for Goa. I would rather read their names. First, Sahodara Bai—here she is. Pandit Nehru one day came into the House and announced that she was dead. In half an hour, he came back to announce that she was alive. Her hand was lacerated. She had got her hand dangling out of its place amidst agony. She would not obey the doctor's instructions. Therefore, she cannot use her hand. I remember how Pandit Nehru tenderly went up to her and asked how she was. I have seen it with my own eyes. He also gave her money to her to go to the doctor. But she was bad patient. The result is a bad hand. We shall always pay this tribute to her that as long as there are women like Sahodara Bai in our land we shall not be afraid of attack from China or Pakistan. She has never been to a university; she has never visited a dance hall or any fashionable place. But she is a great patriot. When we have women of the calibre of Sahodara Bai, our faith and confidence in ourselves and our country goes very high indeed.

The Americans objected to our taking over Goa. The great Mr. Kennedy was a great friend of ours. In fact, Pandit Nehru went away from here when the Goa and Daman incorporation Bill had finished being discussed upon to keep a luncheon appointment with Mrs. Kennedy. He stood here till 2 o'clock waiting to

speak. There were also other waiting to speak. My friend, Shri Nath Pai, was one, Prof. Mukerjee was another, I was another and I do not remember who else. Pandit Nehru wanted to speak on that Bill providing for the incorporation of Goa into India in 1962.

These are facts. Yet the late Mr. Adlai Steyenson said that we had unjustly taken Goa into India. Yet they could not succeed in their invasion of Cuba; it became a fiasco for which they sacked Allon Dulles, chief of CIA.

We must remember that the African leaders told Pandit Nehru, 'if you do not clear out the Portuguese from India, we will be strangled in Africa. Angola is still suffering'. Then we had the great national movement for freedom in Goa; and then the liberation masterminded by the former Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, and led and inspired by Pandit Nehru, which resulted in bringing Goa into the Indian nation.

Then there is Shri Tridib Chaudhuri. Then we have Shri Madhu Limaye—I salute him from here because he has first been in jail in Goa. Then we have Shri C. V. Deshpande, the only Indian—he belongs to the Hindu Mahasabha; I regret he is not here—the only Indian who has been elected from two constituencies at one and the same time, Gwalior and Shivpuri.

Then there is Dr. Lohia who is also a pioneer in that movement. Then we have Sudha Joshi and Shri Gore, and no doubt, Shri Peter Alvares who led a skirmish from outside Goa and led the campaign for liberation.

Also let us not forget Shri Ranade who is still in a Portuguese jail. A rotten, imperialist power like Portugal, without any background of Christianity behind it, never practising religion—they murdered a would be President—this regime is still keeping Shri Ranade in jail. Let this Parliament demand his release and also the

(Shri Joachim Alva)

release of Dr. Mascarenhas who is also in jail in Portugal. They are the two hostages whom Portugal is keeping and we must demand and secure their release.

Lastly, there are 40,000—50,000 sailers, seamen. I think it is but honest and just that they should be allowed to vote, wherever they may be. They have served India from far away places. We should see that justice is done to them.

I welcome the Bill. I am glad that the issue of merger is being decided by means of the provisions of the Bill providing for an opinion poll.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कोपल) :
समापति महोदय, मैं एक मतदाता होने की हैसियत से मतदान संबंधी इस बिल को सपोर्ट करता हूँ, लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब चार सी के करीब रियासतें हमारे देश में मर्ज की गई थीं, तो उम वक्त वहाँ के लोगों का मत लेनेकी बात नहीं कही गई थी। मैं यह भी महसूस करता हूँ कि एक दिन यू० एन० ग्र० में इस बिल को वोट कर के कहा जायेगा कि इस प्रकार मत लेने की व्यवस्था काश्मीर और पांडोचेरी में क्यों नहीं की जाती है। इस दृष्टि से सरकार एक गलत रास्ते पर जा रही है।

अगर सरकार ने यह मसला हल करना है, तो उसको गोवा को लिग्विस्टिक ऐफ़िनटो को देखकर किसी पड़ोसी राज्य में मर्ज करने की व्यवस्था करना चाहिए। आज गोवा में साढ़े पांच लाख कोंकणी लोग रहते हैं। 1931 की कांफ़रेंस में जब कोंकणी लोगों ने यह साफ़ कर दिया कि कोंकणी भाषा का मराठी से कोई टाल्लुक नहीं है, बल्कि वह मराठी और कन्नड़ से भी पहले बोली जाती थी। आज भारत वर्ष में कोंकणी बोलने वाले तकरीबन 14 लाख लोग हैं, जिनमें 7 लाख आदमी मैसूर के बांडर पर बसे हुए हैं। मैं मैसूर या कन्नड़ भाषा की तरफ़ से नहीं बोल

रहूँ, लेकिन यह तथ्य है कि मैसूर में 7 लाख कोंकणी-भाषी लोग बसे हुए हैं। इसकी तुलना में महाराष्ट्र में कोंकणी-भाषी लोगों की संख्या 80 हजार या एक लाख से कम है।

मैं इस बात के पक्ष में हूँ कि गोवा को या तो महाराष्ट्र में और या मैसूर में मर्ज किया जाये, लेकिन मैं उसको एक अलग इंडिपेंडेंट स्टेट बने रहने की आजादी देने के खिलाफ़ हूँ। महाराष्ट्र में जो कोंकणी-भाषी लोग रहते हैं, वे केवल बम्बई में रहते हैं और अन्य कोंकणी-भाषी लोगों के साथ उनकी कोई कानटिग्विटी नहीं हो सकती है। अगर गोवा के कोंकणी-भाषी लोगों की कानटिग्विटी कहीं हो सकती है, तो वह मैसूर की बांडर पर रहने वाले सात लाख अरबों भाई-बहनों के साथ ही हो सकती है।

अगर गोवा के लोग महाराष्ट्र में जाना चाहते हैं, तो वे जरूर जायें, लेकिन अगर कोई कहता है कि उन्होंने महाराष्ट्र में जाने का बिल्कुल फ़ैसला कर लिया है, तो यह बात बिल्कुल ग़लत है। गोवा की विधान सभा में महाराष्ट्र में मर्ज का समर्थन करने वालों को केवल एक मदद की मंजूरिटी है, जबकि वहाँ के साढ़े पांच लाख लोग मैसूर में शरीक होने की अपनी राय जाहिर करेंगे। गोवा को जरूर महाराष्ट्र या मैसूर में मर्ज किया जाना चाहिए। मैं उसको इस तरह आजाद रखने के खिलाफ़ हूँ।

16.58 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

गोवा का एक अलग स्टेट के रूप में बना रहना भारत की राष्ट्रीय एकता की दृष्टि से ठीक नहीं है। इसलिए उसका किसी पड़ोसी राज्य में मर्ज जरूरी है। इस बिल में उसको एक अलग स्टेट के रूप में रहने का जो अधिकार दिया जा रहा है, मैं उसकी पुरजोर मुखालिफ़त करता हूँ। गोवा का नमर्ज केवल मैसूर या

महाराष्ट्र में ही हो सकता है—और कहीं नहीं हो सकता है।

जहां तक कोंकणी भाषी लोगों का प्रश्न है, मैं आपके सामने 1961 की सैन्य रिपोर्ट में से कुछ आंकड़े और तथ्य बताना चाहता हूँ।

"The 1961 census shows that in Kerala there are about 80 thousand people and in Mysore there are 5 lakhs of people of whom a lakh and a half live in urban areas and the rest in rural areas showing that the are dispersed in Mysore whereas in Maharashtra they are only in the City of Bombay. In Goa, Diu and Daman there are 5-1½ lakhs of people. This is according to Page 73 of the 1961 census, Volume I—Part II C-V(B).

"Of the 13½ lakhs of people with Konkani as mother tongue, about 2½ lakhs of people have Kannada as their subsidiary language and only 45,000 people know Marathi as subsidiary language. Even the Marathi speaking people, out of about 3 crores about a lakh and a half have Kannada as their subsidiary language."

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं आपको यह भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि पोयनारी, जूहो, विशाल कोंकणी और मित्रा आदि कई मैगज़िन और समाचार पत्र कोंकणी भाषा में, कन्नड़ स्क्रिप्ट में, प्रकाशित होते हैं। मैं इस निहाज में गोआ पर कर्नाटक का कोई क्लेम पेश नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन अगर लिग्विस्टिक एफिनिटी की दृष्टि से देखा जाये, तो सात लाख कोंकणी-भाषी लोग मैसूर के बांडर पर बसे हुए हैं और अगर ज्याॅ्याफ़ी की दृष्टि से देखा जाये, तो गोआ का अस्सी फीसदी बांडर मैसूर से लगता है। अगर सरकार कोई अलग कोंकणी स्टेट बनाना चाहे, तो गोआ को एक

अलग कोंकणी स्टेट बना दिया जाये। नहीं तो बड़े स्टेट में फिर मिलना है तो वह सिर्फ मैसूर और महाराष्ट्र ही हो सकते हैं न कि इन भाइयों को कभी आजाद रहने का, अपने कल्चर को अलग बनाने का किसी तरह से मौका दिया जाय।

17.00 hrs.

यहां पर मैं मैसूर के चीफ मिनिस्टर का— वह कांग्रेस के अच्छे लोगों में से समझे जाते हैं, उनका कहा हुआ पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ। वह कहते हैं :

"Goa is very much in the lime-light due to the very loud and persisting and ill-founded propaganda that is being carried on by Maharashtra belonging to all political parties. Their demand for merger of Goa will have to be looked into from all the aspects concerned with the problem. There is ignorance, misunderstanding and wrong understanding on this subject on all hands. Few people know the history of Goa, its language and its geographical situation and economic development. Before any decision can be taken about Goa one has to know and appreciate certain important aspects. One of them is history."

एकोनामिक डेवलपमेंट गोआ का अगर कहीं हो सकता है तो मैसूर के साथ रहकर ही हो सकता है। तरकारी भी अगर वहां आनी है तो मैसूर स्टेट से ही आ सकती है। महाराष्ट्र से कोई चीज नहीं आ सकती है। महाराष्ट्र में अगर मिलना है तो उत्तर का भाग महाराष्ट्र में मिल सकता है लेकिन दक्षिण का भाग, जो है, उनकी लैंग्वेज, एकोनामिक एफिनिटी वगैरह सब मैसूर के साथ मिली हुई है। कोंकणी भाषा उनकी जो है वह मैसूर में जो बसे हुए हैं उनके साथ मिलती है। इसलिए उनको उनके साथ मर्ज करना चाहिए और उन्हें आजाद नहीं रहने देना चाहिए।

श्रीमती सहोबरा बाई राय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमको मौका मिलेगा या नहीं ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Shukla
(Interruptions.)

श्री मधु लिमये : गोव्रा आन्दोलन में उनको मौका मिला था, पांच मिनट उनका दीजिए ।

Shri Nath Pai: She is one of those who participated in the struggle.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall give her a chance in the third reading stage.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Sir, she took part in the struggle and she may be given a chance.

श्रीमती सहोबरा बाई राय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका आभार प्रकट करती हूँ कि आपने पांच मिनट का मौका मुझको दिया। मैं सन् 55 में गोव्रा में सत्याग्रह के लिए गई थी। कांग्रेस की तरफ से तो नहीं गई थी। कांग्रेस का कोई आदेश नहीं था। हमारे मध्य प्रदेश में और नागपुर से बहुत सी महिलाएँ और लड़के सत्याग्रह में गए थे। दूसरी पार्टी वाले भी थे। तो मैंने तो वहाँ देखा है गोव्रा में नाथ-पाई को, भलवाय को, गोरे को, गायटोडे को और चितले को और बहुत सी महिलाओं ने वहाँ काम किया है। जितना काम महाराष्ट्र की महिलाओं ने किया है, गोव्रा के आन्दोलन का श्रेय उन्हीं को है। गोव्रा की महिलाओं ने और महाराष्ट्र की महिलाओं ने वह सारा आन्दोलन किया है। वहाँ की महिलाओं ने इतनी व्यवस्था की थी, पुरुषों को इतना सहयोग दिया था गोव्रा के हक में कि रात दिन जूटकर के काम किया था। मैंने घाँखों से देखा है। मैं जब सत्याग्रह में गई थी, बांदा बाउंट्री से प्रवेश किया था, 12 सी लड़के आये थे, गायटोडे भी थे, चितले भी थे, गोलियों की वर्षा हो रही थी लेकिन हमारे महाराष्ट्रीयन्स ने पांव पीछे नहीं रखे। आगे की बढ़ते गये। गोलियों के सामने बहू टिक नहीं सके, कई लड़के मारे गए। उसमें मैं भी थी और

दो गालों मुझे भी लगीं लेकिन आपके आशीर्वाद में मुझे बचा लिया गया। सन् 1962 में मैं फिर गयी पंडित जी का आजा मे। कुछ साथ जल्थे भी गए। उड़ीसा वाले भी कुछ थे उनके साथ म गईं। मैंने गोव्रा में जगह जगह देखा और भाषण भी किया। महिलाओं की मभा थी। महिलाओं में मैंने पूछा कि गोव्रा को मैसूर में मिलना चाहिए या महाराष्ट्र में तो महिलाओं ने कहा कि महाराष्ट्र भाषी ज्यादा है, महाराष्ट्रियन ज्यादा बोली जाती है, कोंकणी कम बोली जाती है। मैंने ईसाइयों से भी पूछा, मुसलमानों से भी पूछा। वहाँ के लोगों ने हमको यह सलाह दी कि गोव्रा मिलेगा तो महाराष्ट्र में मिलेगा। वहाँ की महिलाओं ने पह सजेसन दिया। और है भी यही बात। मैसूर में जरूर मिलना चाहिए था लेकिन यह गोव्रा का मसला ऐसा है, मेरा आपसे कहना है कि महाराष्ट्रियन लोग बहादुर है, इनको उम विद्या में पा नहीं सकते मैसूर वाले। इसलिए वह महाराष्ट्र में मिलेगा। कोई लाख उपाय करे, गोव्रा महाराष्ट्र में मिलकर रहेगा। गोव्रा मैसूर में मिलेगा या अलग रखा जायगा तो वहाँ सेवा हो नहीं सकती क्योंकि महाराष्ट्र वाले चाणव्य नीति में बड़े चतुर हैं। उन्हीं की चतुराई से गोव्रा चल सकता है। मैसूर वालों से नहीं चल सकता है। मैसूर वाले भालेभाले लोग हैं। मैसूर वाले नहीं जानते इस चीज को। इसलिए मैं समझती हूँ कि गोव्रा को महाराष्ट्र में मिलना चाहिए जिससे कि हमारे देश की समृद्धि बड़े और गोव्रा भाग्य को बड़े। सारा श्रेय वहाँ की महिलाओं को है। महिलाओं को चुनाव में ज्यादा मौका चाहिए क्योंकि महिलाओं ने ज्यादा सहयोग दिया है। वहाँ महाराष्ट्रियन भाषा ज्यादा है। कोंकणी तो थोड़ी बोली जाती है। महाराष्ट्रियन ज्यादा बोलते हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि महाराष्ट्रियन से गोव्रा चलेगा। मैसूर वालों से नहीं चल सकता। आप लोग बिल्कुल सीधेसादे हैं, इसलिए आप नहीं संभाव सकते। इसलिए यह महाराष्ट्र में मिलना चाहिए। इतना

कहकर मैं समाप्त करती हूँ। गोव्रा महाराष्ट्र में मिलेगा, गिलकर रहेगा। गोव्रा मंसूर में कभी नहीं विद रहता।

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I want to thank the hon. Members who took part in this debate and it is fortunate for me that most of the Members have cancelled each other in their arguments. A lot of arguments have been made on this side and on that side, and so there is very little for me to add. But there are a few points which I would like to clarify.

First of all, I want to emphatically repudiate the suggestion that this Bill has been brought before this august House under any pressure. This Bill has come before this House in pursuance of the solemn assurances given, that the wishes of the people of Goa, Daman and Diu will be consulted before any decision, is taken about the future of those territories. Whatever assurances have been quoted by hon. Members, everything ended with the observation that ultimately the wishes of the people living in those territories will be consulted. It was only a question of time. Some people suggested that it should be later and some people suggested that it should be earlier. It was never suggested that there should be any decision about these territories without consulting the wishes of the people of Goa, Daman and Diu.

This is a very non-controversial Bill. It only prescribes the machinery which would be used to ascertain the wishes of the people living in those territories. It is not controversial. It does not decide the status of the territories; the status of the territories will be decided after the will of the people living in those territories is known by the machinery which is being devised by this Bill which is before the House.

Sir, the citizenship order was quoted; it was sought to be made out that non-Goans are going to be allowed to vote. The position is very simple.

2323 (a) LS-10.

According to all democratic principles, the people who live in a particular place are supposed to decide what should happen to them, either for five years or for ever. It is not our intention to allow people who have nothing to do with Goa to vote in this; that is to say, in my opening speech, I have referred to a provision which is in the Representation of the People Act: any person who is ordinarily resident in Goa or Daman or Diu will be entitled to vote in this opinion poll. So, there should be no misgivings in the mind of the people that people who do not belong to Goa will be inducted or will be allowed to vote. Also, those people who do belong to Goa, if they can satisfy the Electoral Officer that they are ordinarily citizens of Goa, will be definitely allowed to vote in this opinion poll. It is only a question of residence at the place.

There were other suggestions: that the local government or some officers there manipulated the voters' list; this is absolutely unfounded, and I must assure hon. Members here that the polls have been prepared under the supervision of the Election Commission for the forthcoming elections. All the necessary procedures laid down under the Representation of the People Act had been followed in the preparation of these rolls. The draft rolls were published and objections were invited. The rolls have been corrected in accordance with the objections received and other representation. It was open to the people who thought that the rolls were incorrect to have them corrected. Now to say that the rolls are not proper is not fair. The rolls had not been prepared by the local Government and its *bona fides* should not be brought into this.

Shri Basappa: The Maharashtra officers did it.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: There are over 10,000 officers serving in Goa out of which there are only 280

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

from Maharashtra. That is not relevant here.

Some members asked why in this case the local ministry had been asked to resign and why not in other cases also when general elections are held. The difference is obvious. Here it is not a question of personality, Ministers are not contesting elections here. It is absolutely a novel thing. It is only for ascertaining the views of the electors or local residents of Goa, Daman and Diu that this is being devised. Because an apprehension was expressed that there might be some interference here and there, to remove even the semblance of that apprehension the Goa Ministry has decided to resign. I am sure the resignation would be forthcoming.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy referred to this matter being raised in the UNO. This opinion poll is for internal adjustment; it is for ascertaining the wishes of the people for internal matters. It cannot be applied to Kashmir or any international things like that. It is unfortunate that this kind of thing was said here.

For the sake of people who are ordinarily residents of Goa, but who are not registered in Goa as voters, we are going to bring an amendment to facilitate the registration of such persons in the electoral rolls which have been prepared for the Assembly and Parliamentary elections and which are going to be used for this opinion poll. They will not be required to pay the fees of 50 naye paise that is to be paid with the application for registration.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 50 paise, not naye paise.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Any person who claims to be ordinarily resident in Goa can send his application even by post. It is not necessary for him to go to Goa and present it himself. If the electoral officer is satisfied that the applicant is ordi-

narily resident in Goa, he can enter his name in the rolls. The overriding factor is that the electoral officer must be satisfied that the applicant is ordinarily resident in Goa. Only then his name would be registered.

Sir, this is all I have to say, and I hope the House will give its unanimous consent to this Bill.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I want to seek one clarification. In view of what he said yesterday, that if the opinion poll goes in favour of merger only election to parliamentary constituencies will be held in Goa, does that mean that the actual merger *de facto* and *de jure* will be effected by amending the Constitution only after the general elections are over?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I would not say anything about that at present.

Shri Ranga: There is another point to be clarified. My hon. friend said, in regard to those people who are living outside, who are obliged to live outside for carrying on trade and various other activities and who have not been registered there, he proposes to bring forward an amendment according to which, he said, the qualification that they have to satisfy is that they are ordinarily residents in Goa. I do not understand what he means by that. Does that mean that they have to satisfy that they are residents in Goa for 120 days in a year? Because they are doing business in Bombay and various other places, they have to go out. They have got their houses, their relatives, their friends and other members of their families in Goa. What is to happen to those people?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: What is meant by "ordinarily resident" in a place has been spelled out in the Representation of People Act in detail. I would advise the learned professor to go through it. If he wants I can read out the whole thing. It is

quite clear there as to who could be considered as ordinarily resident in a place.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the taking of an opinion poll to ascertain the wishes of the electors of Goa, Daman and Diu with regard to the future status thereof and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Bill clause by clause. There are some amendments to clause 2.

Clause 2—(Definitions.)

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Sir, I beg to move:

(i) Page 2,—

after line 18, insert—

"Provided that all persons who are not Goans as defined in the Goa, Daman and Diu Citizenship Order of 1962 shall not be eligible to participate in the Opinion Poll notwithstanding the inclusion of their names in the electoral rolls;" (3).

(ii) Page 2,—

after line 18, insert—

"Provided that all Goans at present non-resident in Goa as well as Goan seamen on the high seas, who are Goans as defined in the Goa, Daman and Diu Citizenship Order of 1962 shall be eligible to participate in the Opinion Poll;" (4).

Shri N. Dandekar: Sir, I beg to move:

(i) Page, 2,—

after line 18, insert—

"Provided that the said electoral rolls shall be amended as follows, that is to say:—

(i) *Fistly*, the names of all persons who are not Goans shall be excluded; and

(ii) *Secondly*, the names of all those persons who are Goans but whose names are not included in the said electoral rolls by reason only of their not being ordinarily resident in Goa, Daman or Diu shall nevertheless be included in the said electoral rolls notwithstanding that they are ordinarily resident in any other part of the territory of India." (16)

(ii) Page 2,—

after line 22, insert—

"(ff) 'Goan' means a person born in Goa, Daman or Diu who become a citizen of India on the 20th day of December, 1961 by virtue of the provisions of the Goa, Daman and Diu (Citizenship) Order, 1952." (17).

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Sir, I only want to say this. Unless you accept either my amendment or the amendment moved by Shri Dandekar, this Parliament would be held guilty of breach of faith. When you exploited these Goans in Bombay and they sacrificed themselves, gave their blood, gave their tears and did their best in the freedom struggle, when they wanted to vote for elections to Parliament and elections to State Assembly you shut them out and you told them that they were still Goans. When the time comes for ascertaining the will of the Goans, you shut them out. It would be unfair. This is not the pledge that was given, the assurance that was given, the assurance that was given to Goans when the Goa, Daman (Citizenship) Order which Shri Dandekar read out to you, was passed, was that anybody whose father or grandfather was born in Goa—he may be actually living in Bombay, possibly because of economic and other difficulties they are working outside—would be treated as Goans. Therefore, they were ineligible for parliamentary elections and,

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

for being included in our rolls. When the time comes for ascertaining the will of Goans you shut them out. I am submitting, that was not the intention of Pandit Nehru nor the Congress leaders who gave them the word of honour. When the time comes to determine the will of the Goans they should be treated as Goans for that purpose. Now the time has come, but you shut them out. That will disfranchise thousands of people. That is not fair. There are thousands of people whose parents were born there. They are as much Goans as anybody else. For certain purposes, for earning their livelihood, they are outside. They should be treated on the same footing as persons ordinarily resident. This difficulty should not come. The Representation of the People Act is meant for a different purpose altogether. That is not for a referendum. This is for shaping the ultimate destiny of the people and that is only for electing local representatives of a ward, a village or a district.

Therefore, those conditions should not be imported. The analogy is completely misleading and is misplaced. We should not trot out the definition of "ordinarily resident" from the Representation of the People Act and disqualify and disenfranchise thousands of people who are justified, who have an honest claim and who have made their sacrifices and who are entitled to be consulted in this issue.

Shri N. Dandekar: In the first place, I regret that the Deputy Minister deliberately misled the House by saying that the assurances, many of them, were concerned with the people living in the territory of Goa, Daman and Diu. I have not come across that word "living in" in any of the assurances that I have read. All the assurances were always making references to the people of Goa, Daman and Diu and, in one or two places,

to Goa but never, as far as I know, was any assurance confined to the people living in the territory of Goa, Daman and Diu. With that introductory comment, I would like just to say a few words to explain the purport of my amendments.

Amendment No. 17 seeks to put in a very simple definition for 'Goan'. It says:

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

It is a very clear, specific, precise definition of the persons to whom repeatedly, over and over again, assurances were given that they will be the persons who will be deciding the future status of Goa.

Starting with that definition, I now come to my amendment No. 16, whose objectives are very simple. I do not press the first part, to exclude persons who are not Goans; though they should be excluded. I am not particularly pressing that one. But I do press the second part of that amendment, namely,

"Secondly, the names of all those persons who are Goans but whose names are not included in the said electoral rolls by reasons only of their not being ordinarily resident in Goa, Daman or Diu shall nevertheless be included in the said electoral rolls notwithstanding that they are ordinarily resident in any other part of the territory of India."

It is no use for the Deputy Minister to say, as if he was making a tremendous concession, that those who are ordinarily resident can go to Goa and get themselves registered. It means nothing, it is the usual thing for legis-

lative electoral rolls; it is perfectly true. The point I am making in this amendment is that we should include in the electoral roll the names of all those persons who are Goans, as I have defined, but whose names are not included in the said electoral rolls by reasons only of their not being ordinarily resident in Goa, Daman or Diu, they shall, nevertheless, be included in the said electoral rolls notwithstanding the fact that they are ordinarily resident in other parts of India. That is really the crux of the matter. I wish the Deputy Minister said "no, we reject it", but he tried to get round it in a whole lot of verbiage which means nothing at all, which is exactly what the present Bill says. Here I would like to repeat what Prime Minister Nehru said in April 1964 with some change in one word. He said the world should know that there is some honour left among us in India. If this amendment of mine is to be accepted, I would like to quote it as "the world should know that there is no honour left among us in India."

Shri Alvares: I have not much to say on this but only two or three points. Goa is nowhere defined in any Statute or by any person. Shri Dandeker is the first person who is attempting it. It is very difficult and it was attempted without success by many. Here I could claim to say that both Shri Nath Pai, Shri Kamath and Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee, who originally came from Goa and who had to move out of Goa because of Portuguese persecution, could not do it. That is my first point.

Then I come to the condition of "being ordinarily resident". My point is that there cannot be any right in absentia given to the people to determine the future of Ga. Only those people who are ordinarily resident and whose names are in the electoral roll should be able to determine the issue. Therefore, I suggest that Shri Dandeker's amendment should not be accepted.

Then, the question of seamen has been raised. The seamen are ordinarily resident in Goa and there is certainly no objection, as the hon. Deputy Minister, has stated for the seamen, wherever they may be, to seek registration in Goa in the electoral rolls. What Shri Dandeker and others are trying to do is to see that those Bombay Goans, who are resident in Bombay or elsewhere, who never resided in Goa, who treat Goa as a backyard for a holiday, they should be allowed to be enrolled in the electoral rolls to participate in the poll. He is not referring to those who are ordinarily resident in Goa.

There is a grouse made that the Goans were not permitted to enrol themselves in the electoral roll for the Parliamentary and Assembly elections. May I say, Sir, that in Bombay City, where the majority of Goans reside, it was open for any Goan to enrol himself. The Government of Maharashtra and the Election Commission accepted the statement of every Goan provided he said that he was an Indian. There are thousands of people, more than Shri Chatterjee can imagine, who have so enrolled themselves and their entire family; for instance, Shri Shinkre's family, but they have claimed Indian citizenship. It is only those Goans, a very large section of them, who refused to call themselves Indian and who insisted upon calling themselves of Portuguese nationality till the day of liberation, who were not enrolled. Therefore either, Shri Dandeker or Shri Chatterjee will not argue that those who did not claim or who purposely rejected Indian citizenship, who claimed to be of Portuguese nationality, should have been enrolled in the Indian electoral rolls either in Bombay or anywhere else. Therefore, may I suggest that nobody can make a grouse that Goans in Bombay were not allowed to enrol? It is not factually correct. Any Goan, who called himself an Indian, was permitted to enrol and there are thousands of such Goans.

[Shri Alvares]

As far as the provision in the Representation of the People Act is concerned, I think, it should be invaluable. As I have said, it will be impossible to define who is a Goan Secondly, only those Goans, who live in a particular area and whose future is to be decided, should have the right to determine their future. Thirdly, the misconception that seamen cannot vote is wrong because any Goan seaman, who claims to be ordinarily resident, can still enrol himself in the electoral roll.

Shri N. Dandeker: There is a factual error in Shri Alvares' statement. I want to read out from the Election Commission's letter about this question that Goans were allowed to vote in the general elections.

Shri Alvares: Provided they said that they were Indian nationals.

Shri N. Dandeker: I asked him a specific question:—

"I understand that for the general elections of 1952, 1957 and 1962, Goans born in Goa but residing in India, were expressly excluded from the Indian electoral rolls on the ground that they were not Indian citizens. Would you please confirm?"

I will now read his answer:—

"As to the first point, the position before the 20th December, 1961 of Goans born in Goa but residing in India was ambiguous. Rules governing the acquisition of a domicile different from the domicile by birth appear to have stood in the way of these Goans proving to the authorities that they had become Indian citizens under rule 5 of the Constitution by virtue (a) of Indian domicile and (b) continuous ordinary residence in India for the five years immediately preceding 26th January 1950. Indian citizenship being an essential requisite for enrolment as an elector, it is likely that many

Goans who, although residing in India more or less continuously, had not taken the trouble to take out naturalisation certificates,"—it is not just a mere matter of saying, "I am an Indian citizen"—

"were not enrolled at the last three general elections."

That is just a matter of fact.

Shri Shinkre: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I did not expect both Shri Dandeker as well as Shri Chatterjee to insist on this point after it had been extensively discussed during the general discussion and after it was completely set right by the hon. Deputy Minister. But I want to submit to you regarding this amendment of Shri Dandeker and of Shri N. C. Chatterjee that after the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu, which took place on the 20th December, 1961, nothing prevented these Goans residing in Bombay or at other places from enrolling themselves in the electoral rolls of Goa provided they could satisfy the electoral authorities of the day that they were ordinarily residing in Goa.

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): How could a man residing in Calcutta enrol?

Shri Shinkre: In this connection, I say supposing, according to Shri N. C. Chatterjee's argument, a man lives in Bombay for ten months of the year and for two months he goes to Goa, he could still manage to get himself enrolled. He did not care to do so. Now that the Opinion Poll Bill has come before this House and is about to be passed, these people want to bring by the backdoor some people who never cared to get themselves enrolled in the rolls.

Shri A. P. Sharma: No, no.

Shri Shinkre: Regarding the franchisement to which Mr. N. C. Chatterjee referred, I think, it is completely

out of place because, according to the Portuguese law that was prevailing at that time, anybody who was born in Goa was a Portuguese subject and he could never be given, even if he so wished, Indian citizenship under any section of the Indian Citizenship Act. What happened was that some Goans got themselves enrolled in the electoral rolls of India. They were residing ordinarily in India and they wanted to go to Goa occasionally. At that time, the Government of India had restricted the travel and traffic between the rest of the parts of India and Goa and they were only permitting Goans. They wanted to derive all the benefits of being a Portuguese national and going occasionally to Goa. Now that the tables have turned against them, they want to take a different attitude.

As regards the Goa, Daman and Diu Citizenship Order, that was issued by the Government of India, by the Ministry of External Affairs, at that time for completely different reasons and those reasons have no bearing on the people's right to vote or not to vote on this vital question which affects Goans. It will only influence the future of those Goans who have all the time opted for Goa as their own place and their future is connected with that place. Why should these Goans who are settled down for generations elsewhere be allowed to have a say on the future of Goa. Why should, of all the persons, Mr. Chatterjee allow somebody who has never been in Goa, who has never been connected with Goa and who has no real love for Goa, to decide the future of Goa? I oppose the amendments moved by Mr. Dandekar and Mr. Chatterjee.

Shri Nambiar (Trichirapalli): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my party is for a decision to be taken by the Goans only who are resident in Goa. They should alone decide their future, whether in favour of Maharashtra or in favour of themselves being separate.

It is a point to be decided by them and not by anybody else outside Goa. There may be persons who were Goans before and they are conveniently residing in Bombay or in Madras or in my constituency Trichirapalli. Now to take up the position that because once upon a time they were connected with Goa and, therefore, they should get an opportunity to decide the future of Goa is not correct. We cannot agree with that. My party strongly urges upon the Government to see that Goans who are residing in Goa alone should have the right to decide about the future of Goa.

श्री मधु लिमये : जो विधेयक है उसकी ई० ग्री० में आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। ई० में इलेक्टर शब्द की व्याख्या दी गई है। वह इस प्रकार है :

"in relation to Goa, a person whose name is entered in the electoral roll of an assembly constituency for the time being in force in Goa;"

जो नया विधेयक हम लोगों ने पास किया है उसमें इस बात की व्यवस्था है कि चुनाव के पहले मतदाता सूची का नवीकरण किया जायेगा। यह आवश्यक बताया गया है। इसलिए मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह झगड़ा क्या है? अभी भी जो लोग चाहते हैं, जो गोआ के रहने वाले हैं, जो गोआन हैं वे वहाँ जा कर अपने नाम मतदाता सूची में दर्ज करवा सकते हैं, जो कसौटियाँ हैं, उनको पूरा करके। इसलिए अगर मंत्री महोदय इस बात का खुलासा कर दें कि ज. राय शुमारी की जा रही है उसके पहले मतदाता सूची का नवीकरण किया जायेगा, तो मेरा खयाल है कि, यह सारा झगड़ा खत्म हो जायेगा।

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): I want to say that I am inclined to favour the amendment of Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, so far as page 2, after line 18, is concerned, providing that

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

All Goans at present non-resident in Goa as well as Goan seamen on the high seas who are Goans as defined in the Goa, Daman and Diu Citizenship Order of 1962, should be allowed to take part in the opinion poll. As it is, it has been explained and I do not want to take too much time of the House.

I was interested to find that the two Goans in the House explained the fact as to why these Goans were not there by giving different reasons or approaches or motives to them for not being in Goa now. Mr. Alvares said that these are persons who did not want Indian citizenship at any time when Portuguese were there, but Mr. Shinkre says the other day; he says that they do not want now to be Goans and, therefore, they have taken Indian citizenship. You cannot have it both ways. While I agree with Mr. Chatterjee in his amendment, I think what has been suggested by the Deputy Minister—that a month's time will be given for persons to go and enrol themselves as Goans—, if it is properly given and they are able to do so, should be able to meet the main purpose of this amendment. Otherwise, I do feel that the Goans who took part and helped in the struggle for freedom even from outside should not be now merged altogether because they were given the assurance that they would be enrolled. If they are working outside, it does not mean that they are not interested in the future of Goa.

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): As in the case of general electoral rolls where some time limit is given to get the electoral roll corrected and get the name of the person concerned included in the electoral roll if his name is not there, similarly in this case also, since Goa is now a part of India, the same rule should apply. For example, I may tell you that there are a large number of Goans in the Railways, particularly in the eastern part of the country for some reason or the other, have not got themselves en-

rolled in the electoral rolls of Goa. In those cases, as Shrimati Renuka Ray has said, I hope the Deputy Minister will agree for a time limit as it is done in the case of general electoral rolls in the country. These people should also be allowed to enrol themselves on the electoral rolls of Goa because they are Goans. In their Service Records also it is written as Goa, etc. Therefore, if, for some reason or the other, they have not enrolled themselves, they should be allowed to get themselves enrolled on the electoral rolls of Goa before the opinion poll is taken.

Shri Basappa: No residential restriction should be there.

Shri A. P. Sharma: Yes; no such restriction should be there.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: The lot of confusion that has been created would be cleared if we define or we know what the term 'people of Goa' or 'Goans' means. Goan is by no means a race. Everybody living in India is an Indian. We are all Indians. Anybody who is ordinarily resident in Goa at present is Goan and if anybody who is at present not living in Goa but who is ordinarily resident in Goa can satisfy the Electoral Officer to this effect, he can still be enrolled in the rolls that have been prepared for this poll.

Shri Basappa: What about residential restriction?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: There is no such restriction. The Citizenship Order which has been quoted often was not meant for any purpose except one and that purpose was that after liberation the people who were resident in Goa should be enabled to become citizens of India. That was the limited purpose of that order. Anybody who started living in Goa after liberation is as much a Goan as anybody who was born there or whose father was born there or whose grandfather was born there. There is no such thing as a Goan by race

or any such thing. It is a dangerous analogy to accept. Suppose, God forbid, something happens in Bengal and we define Bengalis as people who have been born in Bengal only, then what will happen? We shall only say, therefore, that anybody who lives in Bengal is a Bengali or something like that. I would never accept this that people who have been born there or whose parents have been born there can only be Goanese and nobody else. Anybody who lives in Goa and who is ordinarily resident in Goa can only be a Goan.

I am sorry I cannot accept these amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendments Nos. 3 and 4 of Shri N. C. Chatterjee to vote.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendments Nos. 16 and 17 of Shri N. Dandekar to vote.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are three amendments to clause 4, namely amendments Nos. 6, 7 and 10. Is any of them going to be moved. I think none is going to be moved.

The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I beg to move:

Page 3, after line 14, insert—

"Fees not to be paid on applications for inclusion of names in electoral roll etc.—4A. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Represent-

tation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), or in any rule made thereunder, no fee shall be payable in respect of—

(a) any application for inclusion of any name in the electoral roll of any assembly constituency in Goa, Daman and Diu under section 23 of that Act; or

(b) any appeal preferred against any order made on such application, if such application or appeal is made or preferred within a period of thirty days immediately following the commencement of this Act." (22)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendment is now before the House.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I want to seek one clarification.

The term 'commencement of the Act' is a vague term. Clause 1 (2) says:

"It shall come into force on such date as the Central Government may by notification in the Official Gazette appoint, and different dates may be appointed for different provisions of the Act."

On the basis of this clause, let the hon. Minister say when the period of 30 days would commence.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: The Act will commence from the date it is notified in the Official Gazette.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I think he has not made a correct statement. What he says is not legal.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: The notification will be issued.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: What he says is not legal.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: We may fix a date for Goa, and there might be different dates for Daman and Diu. But I have said in my amendment that it shall come into force one month after the Act commences.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: This is a legal question. The Act commences as soon as it is notified. But there is a further provision here that the different provisions of this Act will come into force from the dates notified according to clause 1 (2). The period of thirty days must be relevant to this. I think the hon. Minister has not understood it properly.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: It is 30 days from the commencement of this Act.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It is not commencement of the Act. It should be commencement after the notification. I think that that should be the proper phraseology.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: There is a factual error in what the hon. Minister has said because the Act does not commence itself by mere notification. The date has to be notified.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: When it is notified in the official gazette, the date will also be notified in the same gazette. The date is one month from that date.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3,—after line 14, insert—

"Fees not to be paid on applications for inclusion of names in electoral roll etc.—4A. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Representation of the People Act, 1950, (43 of 1950) or in any rule made thereunder, no fee shall be payable in respect of—

(a) any application for inclusion of any name in the electoral roll of any assembly constituency in Goa, Daman and Diu under section 23 of that Act; or

(b) any appeal preferred against any order made on such application, if such application or appeal is made or preferred within a period of thirty days

immediately following the commencement of this Act." (22)

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That new clause 4A stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

New clause 4A was added to the Bill.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6—(Opinion Poll Commissioner)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I beg to move:

(i) Page 3, line 21,—for "Government" substitute "the Central Government". (11)

(ii) Page 3,—after line 21, insert—
"Provided that such officer's birth and domicile has been outside the State of Maharashtra and outside the State of Gujarat respectively." (12)

(iii) Page 3, lines 24 and 25,—for "Government" substitute "the Central Government". (13)

Shri N. Dandekar: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 21,—for "Government" substitute—

"the Central Government, not being an officer on deputation with the Administration of Goa, Daman and Diu". (18)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The clause and the amendments are before the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I shall be very brief. It is a happy event that five years after the liberation of Goa by our armed forces, reinforcing the people's satyagraha struggle, just as Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose and his Azad Hind Fauj reinforced Mahatma Gandhi's satyagraha struggle, we are

having this Bill, the first of its kind, for a referendum on the issue of the future status of Goa which is going to be or may be a precedent for the future.

17.47 hrs.

[SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF in the Chair.]

Shri Morarji Desai, former Finance Minister, had darkly hinted that he would submit to a people's referendum on the issue of prohibition. Perhaps later on there may be a referendum on the issue of prohibition also. This would be a good precedent for that.

Be that as it may, as I said earlier, this Bill provides a machinery, means or *modus operandi* for ascertaining the wishes of the Goan people, which may not be perfect, which may not be satisfactory on this issue.

I want to detach my mind—and I would appeal to all my friends to detach their minds—from the result of the referendum or the opinion poll. Let us confine ourselves to the opinion poll itself, the fact of the poll, its machinery, the *modus operandi*, and the supreme need to ensure the Goans that the opinion poll, this referendum, will not only be fair and free, but will also appear to the people to be fair and free, just as in elections it has been rightly said that they should not only be fair and free but should also appear to the people to be fair and free.

That is why I have moved these amendments. There is a vital, basic distinction between an ordinary election and a referendum. That is why the need for these amendments becomes more urgent. I have surveyed the position obtaining in various countries of the world whose constitutions provide for a referendum. Our Constitution does not provide for it. As I said yesterday, my amendment in that regard was rejected by the Constituent Assembly. There are at least half a dozen countries among those whose constitutions I have studied which have provided for a referendum.

In almost every country, the manner of assessing the result is different from the manner of assessing the result in an election. I do not wish to go into details because the House is aware, and the Minister is also fairly well versed in these matters, that a referendum is not on a par with an election.

Shri Shinkre: What is he talking about? Is he speaking on the amendment?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am on the amendment. You try to follow it if you can, if you are competent enough.

Shri Shinkre: To follow you is impossible.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Then, sit quiet, or go back to Goa. That is the fit place for you to go back to.

Clause 6 provides:

"The Chief election Commissioner shall designate or nominate one opinion poll commissioner in relation to the opinion poll in Goa and one opinion poll commissioner in relation to the opinion poll in Daman and Diu and each such opinion poll commissioner shall be an officer of Government."

I want to make it abundantly clear—I do not know, perhaps that is what is meant, though it is not so specified clearly—that this official of the Government means an official of the Central Government, and not to any other Government. My hon. friend Shri Dandekar has gone a step further, and I shall be happy to accept his amendment because it makes it wider and clearer also, because it reads:

"the Central Government, not being an officer on deputation with the Administration of Goa, Daman and Diu"

The need for this amendment, as I have earlier said, is that the people who participate in the opinion poll should be convinced that the officers

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

who manage, conduct, this poll are free from any kind of bias whatever. Not that I suggest that others will necessarily be biased, but, as I said, they should also appear to the people not to be biased. Hence the other amendment of mine:

"Provided that such officer's birth and domicile has been outside the State of Maharashtra and outside the State of Gujarat respectively."

because there are going to be two opinion poll commissioners, one for Goa because there the question posed before the people will be whether they want to merge with Maharashtra or continue the *status quo*, and another for Daman and Diu where the question posed before the people will be whether they want to merge with Gujarat or continue the *status quo*. In both these constituent units of the union territory it is essential, therefore, that the officers who conduct this poll shall not and should not be such as those whose birth or domicile has been inside Maharashtra or inside Gujarat respectively.

My third amendment No. 13 is on the same lines as the earlier one, that Government must mean Central Government.

I commend these amendments for the acceptance of the House.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I have very carefully listened to the very intellectual discourse of the hon. Member who has just resumed his seat. He seems to confuse plebiscite or referendum with an opinion poll. I beg of him to consider that the scheme of the Bill has envisaged an opinion bill. It is in a sense an election, though it is not an election to elect somebody; it is certainly an election by poll to ascertain the wishes of the people, and it is not only for this reason that I consider this to be a poll. All these offences under the

normal election law of the land have been specifically enumerated as offences under this Bill. I am reminded of the historic jibe which Zafrullah Khan had at the Indian Delegate in the Security Council. He said: The Indian delegate does not seem to understand the difference between elections and the plebiscite. According to Pakistan delegate, plebiscite is a thing where there can be communal propaganda while in elections there cannot be such communal propaganda. This sort of distinction between the plebiscite, referendum and opinion poll are not borne out so far as the scheme of the present Bill is concerned. Therefore, I plead with the hon. Member that is amendments which seek to distinguish between officers belonging to one province and another province are not right. He also had been distinguished member of the civil service and should not crudely attempt to form a conclusion that all officials are so regional in their minds and are so much involved in politics that they become part and parcel of that region. They have taken the oath.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Thank God I left that service long ago.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: These amendments cannot be distinguished in spirit from the amendments moved by my friend M. Chatterjee. His initials are N.C.C. and create a sense of national discipline. It is tragic that he should be the further of amendments which are neither national nor inspire discipline. They speak of Goans as Goans residing all over India. He thinks that we are Indians who are not only residing in India but all over the world. It is simple common sense that whatever the affinity of overseas Indians, the fact remains that the overseas Indians are basically the people of the country where they reside. So also Goans who do not reside in the territory of Goa, by the mere fact that their fathers and great

grand fathers were born in Goa does not in any way emotionally or rationally attach them to the territory of Goa nor have they any affinity with Goa. I am a Rajput and I am proud I am one. Does it mean that my opinion should count as to who should be the Chief Minister of Rajasthan or what should be the fate of Rajasthan Government? My opinion would be irrelevant. The amendments of Mr. Kamath, I believe, should be withdrawn.

I have very carefully listened to the intellectual discourse of Mr. Hanumanthiaya. According to him Maharashtrians taking the name of Shivaji smacks of regional and tribal trait. If at all there is any trait, it is a patriotic trait. Whosoever speaks of Sivaji, cannot have a regional trait. Since the epic days till today, Hanumanth has been associated with animal trait. In an attempt to move from tree to tree.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. He should conclude now.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: He tried to have his own prejudices and tried to incorporate them in what is essentially a national question. I urge on him to think on this point. It is not merely from the narrow interest of either Maharashtra or Mysore but from the interest of Goa itself. Instead of others saying that Goa should go to Maharashtra, the Maharashtrians say that the people of Goa should decide and that decision should be respected, not ours.

Shri Bade: Sir, I oppose the amendments of Shri Kamath and Shri Dandekar because it is like expressing feelings of incompetence and no confidence in the services. They have taken the oath that they will be loyal to the Constitution. Then, why should there be difference between Maharashtrian and Gujarati. I do not understand why Mr. Kamath did not say that there should be no Mysorean... (Interruptions). So, I oppose this amendment. At the same time, I

want to say, just as Shri Kamath said, that Shri Morarji is going to have a referendum or a poll like this for prohibition. Then, why not they have a poll on cow-slaughter? If they want to take a poll or referendum on cow-slaughter, I think there will be no cow-slaughter at all.

18.00 hrs.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The discussion on the clauses will take place tomorrow. We have to take up the next business.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Let us finish it.

Mr. Chairman: We have to take up the other business at 6 o'clock. We have to take up the Call Attention Notice at 6 o'clock and then, after the Minister's reply to it, we have to take up the half-an-hour discussion. So, further discussion on this Bill will be postponed to tomorrow.

18.01 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO
MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE—contd.

PROPOSED STRIKE OF ENGINEERS IN
KERALA

Shri A. V. Raghavan (Badagara): I call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The proposed strike of all engineers in Government service in Kerala on the 5th December, 1968."

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri P. S. Naskar): Reports received from the State Government indicate that the Joint Action Council of the Engineering Service Association of Kerala had submitted a memorandum to the