

[Shri P. R. Patel]

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

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

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :कब तक के लिए ;

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The rules will operate.

The question is:

"That the debate on this resolution be adjourned."

The motion was adopted.

15.13 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. GOA

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Your resolution is barred.

Shri Alvares: The resolution cannot be barred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

consideration—I also know the rules—that this resolution does not become barred automatically. This resolution, therefore, can be moved, and then we shall see what its fate is.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Have you got anything to say?

Shri Alvares: Yes, Sir. My resolution is fundamentally different from that moved by Shri Sonavane. He goes into the question of integration, and, as Shri Nath Pai, has very rightly pointed out, the merger of Goa with Maharashtra is merely an incidental issue in that connection. I have not raised, as Shri Sonavane has done, the question of Nagar Haveli or Pondicherry or Daman and Diu. I have confined myself merely to the issue of Goa, and to the implementation of the electoral verdict last December. Therefore, these two resolutions have no common purpose at all. One is the question of integration, the other is the question of an election verdict, and I therefore say that my resolution should not be barred.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): Though my hon. friends have argued that the resolution of Shri Alvares should not be barred on account of the adjournment of the discussion of Shri Sonavane's resolution, I hold a different view.

Though the resolution of Shri Alvares is put in a different phraseology, substantially it is the same as that of Shri Sonavane. There is no substantial difference.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Kindly read it again.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: The only difference is that Shri Sonavane extends the scope of his resolution beyond Goa to some other territories, while the resolution of Shri Alvares limits itself only to Goa. That is the only difference. Goa comes within the scope of Shri Sonavane's resolution, and so I say that by the adjournment of discussion of Shri Sonavane's reso-

lution, the resolution of Shri Alvares has been automatically barred.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There is a vast difference between the two resolutions. I do not agree with my hon. friend Shri Bhattacharyya when he says that they are identical. Shri Alvares's resolution is specific and says:

"This House is of opinion that the elections in Goa to the Assembly and Parliament are a clear verdict of the electorate to merge the territory of Goa with Maharashtra forthwith and therefore urges upon the Government to formulate a scheme in the matter immediately."

Shri Sonavane's resolution starts with national integration, it concerns the whole country, and includes parts of the country which are Union Territories, namely Goa, as also other places like Daman and Diu, Pondicherry etc. So, Goa is only a part, and the whole resolution is on national integration, and it wants the constitution of a committee of Members of Parliament, and hence the resolution of Shri Alvares should not be rejected on the ground that the two are identical.

May I also invite your attention to the fact that there were two motions before this House on the food situation; one was mine, and another, identical in purport but with some English words changed, was in the name of Shri Yash Pal Singh. I remember that both the motions were admitted, though they were identical in purport, because they said they were somewhat different.

I can understand if the Home Minister makes an appeal to Shri Alvares and to the Members of the Opposition or the Members of the ruling party to support his move for adjournment of discussion, and tries to persuade them, but this resolution should not be rejected on the ground that the two are identical. They are not identical.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

I can quote many rules and many instances on this, where similar motions have been admitted.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): In the resolution, consideration of which has now been adjourned, it is stated that a committee consisting of Members of Parliament should be appointed to chalk out a scheme etc. The purpose of that resolution is to appoint a committee. That committee may even say "no" to the purpose in view, may decide against merger. But here, the resolution of Shri Alvares says:

"This House is of opinion that the elections in Goa to the Assembly and Parliament are a clear verdict to merge the territory of Goa with Maharashtra . . ."

The purport of this resolution is to straightaway take action towards merging. Therefore, the content, scope and purpose and purport—everything is different. That resolution wants the appointment of a committee to discuss the question; the committee may do anything whereas this resolution goes straight to the merger. Therefore, to say that this is identical with the other one is wrong and therefore under no principle of any rule or procedure this can be barred. Otherwise, it will be unjust.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I think my first submission should be that the very fact of these two motions having been admitted by the Speaker and having been chronologically put on the list of the day is itself evidence of the fact that they are rather different, substantially different in spite of what my hon. friend Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya may say. I say this because as has just now been pointed out, the first Resolution referred to the larger question and the appointment of a committee and all that kind of thing.

My second point is that when the Home Minister intervened at an earlier stage to suggest an adjournment he had

merely told us in a vague and general fashion that there were certain delicate and difficult questions involved and he would like that the matter be not discussed at the present moment. He did not vouchsafe to us the real reasons behind it. Somehow the majority in this House has accepted him at his word and supported his idea. But I find myself in some difficulty. I say this because this question of Goa's merger with Maharashtra which is the objective of the resolution put forward by Mr. Alvares is being noised about all over the place. Members of the Cabinet, are discussing it, my friend Shri Chavan had even given a press statement on this matter. The All India Congress Committee or some such comparable body recently had to take notice of this matter and the whole country is talking about it. The Maharashtra members are discussing it everywhere, in Parliament. Just because we sit down here together from all parts of the country, we are precluded from discussing something which the whole country is discussing. The papers are talking about it; the Ministers are making comments about it. Differences in the ruling party are coming out and publicised. Only we in this House are precluded by some interpretation of a wonderful regulation from discussing this question. I cannot understand either in substance or in form or in logic or in justice any reason which would mean the identification of the two Resolutions and the pushing out of this resolution, along with the pushing out of the other resolution at the behest of the Home Minister.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
उपाध्यक्ष जी, ये दोनों प्रस्ताव पृथक् पृथक् हैं। इस का सब से बड़ा प्रमाण यह है कि आप के सेक्रेटेरिएट ने इन दोनों प्रस्तावों को पृथक् पृथक् स्वीकार किया है और दोनों प्रस्तावों को पृथक् पृथक् रूप में प्रकाशित भी किया है, दोनों प्रस्तावों पर पृथक् पृथक् शीर्षक दिये हैं। पहला प्रस्ताव जो श्री सीनावने का है उसका शीर्षक दिया है

“राष्ट्रीय एकीकरण” और दूसरा जो श्री पीटर अलवारिस का प्रस्ताव है उसका शीर्षक दिया है “गोआ” । तो इस प्रकार आपके सचिवालय ने दोनों प्रस्तावों को पृथक् पृथक् रूप में लिया है । अगर दोनों प्रस्ताव एक जैसे होते तो वह दोनों को स्वीकार न करता ।

इनके पृथक् होने का दूसरा प्रमाण यह है कि श्री सोनावने का यह स्पष्ट प्रस्ताव है कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों की एक कमेटी बनायी जाये जो राष्ट्रीय एकीकरण के प्रश्न पर विचार करे कि गोआ को महाराष्ट्र में कैसे मिलाया जाए, या पांडेचरी को मद्रास में कैसे मिलाया जाए । मेरा अनुमान है कि श्री सोनावने जल्दी में रहते हैं इसलिये उन्होंने इसमें कैरिकल, यनाम और माही का नाम नहीं जोड़ा, नहीं तो इसकी भाषा पूरी हो जाती ।

इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है, कि श्री हाथी जिन्होंने कि पहले प्रस्ताव के बारे में आश्वासन दिया है, इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में भी आश्वासन दे दें कि इसको भी स्थगित किया जाये । बाद में सरकार इसको स्वीकार करेगी या इसका उतर देगी । दोनों प्रस्तावों को एक न माना जाए । यही मेरा निवेदन है ।

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): My submission is this. There are two resolutions. What should be seen in them is this. What is the purpose of both the resolutions. The purpose and the purport have a great part to play in understanding whether the two have got something in common between them or not. The first one referred to certain parts of India and mentioned how they should be integrated with India. Goa is also one of the areas specifically mentioned. The second one refers to Goa only. As it is there in the earlier resolution also, a decision on this has obviously been

taken when the decision on the earlier resolution was taken by the House. Unless we are prepared to go back on that decision, the question cannot be reopened. You cannot accept this Resolution unless you go back upon the decision taken with regard to the first one. It would be a contradictory position for the Chair to take if you do otherwise. From the common-sense point of view and from the point of view of our Rules also, the decision taken on one is binding on the other also, therefore its reopening is barred.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to differ from Dr. Aney. The purpose of the first resolution is to appoint a committee for complete national integration. The question of Goa is an entirely independent question from Pondicherry and other areas. In the case of Goa there is the verdict of the electorate—they claim like that—to join Maharashtra. To claim that both the resolutions are one and the same will be just like saying that the resolution on the nuclear bomb is also an identical resolution.

श्री शिव नारायण (वांसी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय श्री सोनावने का जो प्रस्ताव है वह एक बड़ा प्रस्ताव है और मेरे मित्र का जो यह दूसरा प्रस्ताव है यह उसका जुज है । जैसे कि हम एक बड़ा सवाल देते हैं तो उसके जुज ए० बी० सी० होते हैं, उसी तरह यह प्रस्ताव पहले प्रस्ताव का जुज है । इसलिये जब पहले प्रस्ताव को स्थगित रखा गया है तो मेरा सुझाव है कि इस के बारे में भी सरकार कह दे कि जब उसको लेंगे तब इनको भी ले लेंगे ।

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Sir, I support the point of order of my friend, Mr. Deshmukh and I shall read rule 182 which seems to operate in

[Shri Sonavane]

this. When a resolution has been moved no resolution or amendment raising substantially the same question shall be moved within one year from the date of the moving of the earlier resolution. That is the rule. The crucial or material wording here is: "substantially the same question." We have to determine this about the second resolution. My answer is that it is not substantially the same question. In my motion, I have raised the question of national integration and put forward an illustration and said that certain steps should be taken to merge this part of the country and for effecting that a committee was suggested. But in his resolution, he has pointed to the results of the general elections in Goa; he wants that immediately certain things should be done. Therefore, the questions raised in these two resolutions are different and they do not satisfy the requirement of rule 182 which says: "substantially the same question."

Therefore, the point of order raised should be upheld.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): The two resolutions are the same. If they are scrutinised, you will find that the first resolution requires the appointment of a committee. What for? To take necessary steps, particularly in regard to the merger of the Union territories of Goa and Nagar Haveli in Maharashtra. That is, for the merger of Goa in Maharashtra. Leave aside the question of Nagar Haveli. The second resolution is practically the same.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri P. R. Patel: Please hear. Do not be perturbed.

Shri Sonavane: He is getting the third chance to speak.

Shri P. R. Patel: The second resolution is the same: "...merge the territory of Goa with Maharashtra forthwith and therefore urges upon the Government to formulate a scheme

in the matter immediately." So, these two resolutions are about the merger of Goa. The Home Minister was good enough to propose a motion to postpone the discussion of the first resolution. I am rather astonished why the Government has not come with a same motion in regard to the second resolution.

An Hon. Member: It is barred.

Shri P. R. Patel: I am told that as it is barred it is not necessary for the Government to bring forward such a motion for that resolution. So, I request you to realise that the points covered by both the resolutions are the same. In the first resolution there are five items. Goa is one of the five items. All these had been postponed. If that question is delicate, as we were told, and therefore we should not discuss the question of merger of Goa and other places, the same question would arise in regard to the second resolution also. So, I feel that the point of order raised is not proper and the motion should be barred.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): I think that in between the two different attitudes taken by hon. Members, the suggestion offered by my hon. friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri may be accepted, namely, the hon. Minister of Home Affairs should give some sort of assurance that the Government are seized of the problem and that the problem will be considered in its entirety, comprising Goa and other Union territories. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is a different matter.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I would like to say a few words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no right of reply. I have heard the arguments on both sides. Rule 182 (1) reads:

"When a resolution has been moved no resolution or amendment raising substantially the same question shall be moved within one year from the date of the moving of the earlier resolution."

The main point for determination is not whether these two resolutions are identical or not. That is not the point to be determined. Again, the question whether the resolution moved by Shri Alvares is the same as the earlier one, as contemplated in rule 182, is not also relevant. The question is, as put by Dr. Aney, whether the objective covered by the resolution of Shri Alvares is covered by the resolution moved by Shri Sonavane or not. I hold that it has been substantially covered and it is substantially the same. There is no point of order and the resolution of Shri Alvares is barred.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, we are bound to abide by your decision. But on a technical point, a very important matter has been debarred from being discussed in the House. May I, therefore, at least expect from the Minister an assurance that the Government is seized of the matter? The matter is delicate and it is urgent. Taking into consideration the overwhelming support that the motion has got from all sections of the House, may we have an assurance that the Government will not follow dilatory tactics, but, respecting the wishes of the people of Goa, will take a speedy decision on the matter? May we have an assurance on that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The rules of the House will cover the resolution.

Shri Nath Pai: I want a specific answer from him. What is the reply? It is not a matter of procedure.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can meet the hon. Minister later. Shri Kachhavaiya.

15.35 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. MANUFACTURE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं सदन में निम्नलिखित संकल्प पेश करता हूँ :—

“इस सभा की राय है कि भारत सरकार को आणविक अस्त्रों का निर्माण करना चाहिये।”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

“This House is of opinion that Government of India should manufacture nuclear weapons.”

The time allotted is an hour and a half.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
मैं चाहता हूँ कि अणु-शक्ति विभाग से जो सम्बन्धित मंत्री जी हैं उन्हें हाउस में बुलाया जाय।

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hathi): I am here. The Prime Minister will reply.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी हाल ही में कुछ दिनों पहले इस सदन ने अपनी इच्छा प्रकट की थी कि हमारे देश की जो परिस्थिति है, हमारे देश से लगा हुआ जो हमारा रडुश्मन चीन है, उसने अणु बम का विस्फोट किया, उसके कारण सारे देश में जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई और देश के सामने जो एक समस्या खड़ी हुई उस के बारे में इस सदन में विचार किया गया। काफ़ी सदस्यों ने अपनी इच्छा प्रकट की कि भारत सरकार को अणु बम बनाना चाहिए परन्तु हमारी सरकार के द्वारा जो उत्तर दिया गया। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री द्वारा जो उत्तर दिये गये, उन के उन