

12.25 hrs.

BOMBAY REORGANISATION BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): Sir, I beg to move†:

“That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration.”

Sir, it is with great pleasure that I make this motion. I had the privilege of laying the report of the Joint Committee on the Table of this House a few days ago. I do not propose to inflict a long speech. I should confine myself only to a few brief remarks, so far as the provisions of the Bill are concerned.

Before I do so, however, I should like to express my gratitude to the members of the Joint Committee. They had to work hard at great inconvenience, and they gave their thought and labour from day to day to the consideration of this Bill. As hon. Members are aware, the motion that the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee was adopted by the Rajya Sabha only on the 7th of April, and the Joint Committee was directed to submit its report by the 14th. So, within a week of the passing of that motion, we were able to present that report here. The Joint Committee, I think, has worked very hard and what is still more creditable is the cordial atmosphere in which the proceedings of the Committee were conducted. Hon. Members dealt with the issues which are involved in this Bill and which were discussed when the Bill was referred to the Committee, in a spirit of understanding, goodwill and, if I may say so, also of accommodation.

So, the Bill has come back to this House. Certain amendments have been made but, apart from a few,

most of the amendments only purport to give effect to the proposals made by the Bombay Legislature. As hon. Members may be remembering, the Bombay Assembly had suggested eleven amendments and the Bombay Council two amendments. We have incorporated all the thirteen amendments, so far as their substance goes, in this Bill. So, the Bill, as amended, fully reflects the opinion of the Bombay Legislature, not only in the matter of principles but also of other petty details that are contained in this Bill. We have made the amendments, as I said, because the Bombay Legislature wanted us to do so.

As to two of these amendments, which raised questions of relatively greater importance, I had occasion to refer to them when the Bill was committed to the Joint Committee. One related to the name of the new State, as it has been then designated Bombay. The Joint Committee had agreed that instead of “Bombay” it should be called the State of “Maharashtra”.

I find that in one of the minutes of dissent it has been contended that the name Maharashtra is not quite appropriate because there will be people speaking other languages in Maharashtra. There is no State in the country where people speaking various languages different from the dominant language of the State do not live in peace and, so far as the directions of this Parliament go, also enjoy or are expected to enjoy equal opportunities with the members of the dominant community. So that is hardly an argument against the course that the Joint Committee has adopted. Whether otherwise Bombay would or would not have been a suitable name is no longer an open issue. We have all decided that Bombay should be called Maharashtra and so it will be.

The other amendment related to the establishment of the circuit bench of the Bombay High Court at Nagpur.

†Moved with the recommendation of the President.

It was proposed that a bench of two judges might be appointed there, but later on the Joint Committee felt that this bench should consist of three judges. So we have decided that there should be a permanent bench at Nagpur and that bench should consist of three judges.

There are other amendments also. Those amendments are rather of a formal or minor character. They provide, for example, for the constitution of a State Finance Corporation for Gujarat by the State of Gujarat or for certain other matters, such as, the opportunity to be given to the practitioners in the courts in Kutch and Saurashtra to join the bar in Gujarat. Also, it provides that the Bombay Government may reconstitute or reorganise its road organisation before the appointed date. Other amendments are also of a similar character.

There are, besides the one note to which I have referred, two other dissenting notes attached to the Bill. They seem to express diametrically opposite views. But I feel that so far as the principles go, here is no marked difference. I do not propose to deal with those notes of dissent. The points raised in those notes have already been discussed here and I imagine that some hon. Members will perhaps be speaking about those matters again here in the House.

I only wish that the parties interested in this measure may come still closer. They have been coming closer day by day. They are still remaining in one common state and I wish that by the time this Bill is implemented there may be full understanding and complete harmony between the two principal sections of our community which will be affected by this Bill.

There are one or two other amendments to which I may refer. One relates to the number of representatives of Maharashtra in the Rajya Sabha. The number is being increas-

ed by one. According to the calculations that we have made it should be 19. Formerly the figure given was 18 in the original Bill. The other relates to the strength of the Legislative Assembly of Gujarat. According to the provision in the Bill it was to consist of 132 members. We have now raised the number to 154 so that the number of members to be returned to the Assembly from every Parliamentary constituency may be seven instead of six.

These were the principal amendments that were made in the Bill. The policy statement made by the Chief Minister of Bombay was unanimously adopted and accepted by the Joint Committee. So my task, as I said at the outset, is very simple. I commend this Bill to the acceptance of this House. This embodies essentially the settlement reached between the leaders of the two States which are to come into existence within a fortnight. The Bill reflects also the collective opinion of this House. Almost the whole of the Bill, barring a few provisions, had the unanimous support of the members of the Joint Committee. There are, however, a few matters on which there was a difference. So we have two notes of dissent signed by seven hon. Members. Still, this Bill bears the impress and imprimatur of the Joint Committee in which both Houses were represented and which had a strength of 45. So I venture to think that in view of the virtual unanimity which has been the privilege of this Bill to enjoy from its very start to this day it will receive the support of all sections here. Even in one of the dissenting minutes a statement is made that it has whole-hearted support to the scheme of the Bill as, if I remember the words correctly, it provides for a great event of historical importance. I should, in the circumstances, request hon. Members to look at the problem in the right perspective. Let not this happy occasion be in any way clouded by small minor things which the leaders of the two States have voluntarily accepted and which has really paved

[Shri G. B. Pant]

the way for the progress that the Bill has made to this stage. So, I trust that hon. Members will be pleased to bear in mind that it is a historical occasion, and if we take a correct view of the thing and do not let the joy of the occasion to be marred by things of relatively, if I am permitted to say so, minor character, if not petty or trivial, considering the large step that we are taking, it will redound to the credit of one and all.

Ultimately I would submit that after all, all these States are but limbs of this bigger organisation. We owe allegiance to India as a whole, and while we have to see that steps are taken to promote cohesion and solidarity between the States, we have to guard against any such consequences and things as would in any way go against our hopes, and have to work in such a manner that the cohesion and solidarity and the emotional integration of all regions and of all communities in the country may be promoted by every step that we take.

Sir, with these remarks I commend this motion to the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Six hours have been allotted for this Bill.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Can we have more time?

Mr. Speaker: That is for all the stages. The hon. Minister started at about 12:25 or 12:20. Then, we can sit till 6:20 and finish it today because we have to start the Finance Bill tomorrow. If hon. Members are will-

ing to sit till 7 O'clock, I have no objection, but beyond that it will not be possible.

There are 96 clauses and 13 schedules, and I have already received as many as 112 amendments.

What is the time hon. Members would like to allot to the general discussion?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Four hours for general discussion and three hours for clause by clause. So far as the Schedules are concerned, these are consequential.

Mr. Speaker: I find from the names of hon. Members sent to me that they have already taken part in the earlier stage. Every group has been represented thoroughly. Except for a few alterations that have been made, what is there to speak generally other than getting to the clauses straightaway? Therefore, out of six hours, let us have two hours for general discussion and four hours for clause by clause, and if we finish the clause by clause consideration, I will allow the third reading some time, so that we can finish all the stages. Let us now devote only two hours.

I would request hon. Members who have already taken part not to speak unless they must intervene at this stage, as also those who were in the Joint Committee except those who have appended Minutes of Dissent and may want to explain things. Other hon. Members who have not taken part at any stage so far may have opportunity. That is what I would advise. There are always exceptions.

Shri Manay (Bombay City Central—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Before you call upon any hon. Member to speak, may I request a clarification from the hon. Home Minister regarding the policy statement of the Chief Minister of Bombay?

Mr. Speaker: How can this hon. Member explain the policy statement of the Chief Minister?

Shri Manay: The hon. Minister referred to Buddhists. The Chief Minister of Bombay State, while making the policy statement, did not touch this point, but when the Members of the Republican Party in the Bombay Assembly raised this issue, the Chief Minister, while replying to the debate, said in the end.....

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of point of order. Already his group has sent me the name of Shri B. K. Gaikwad. The hon. Member will have an opportunity. Let him say what exactly he wants to say then, and ultimately the hon. Minister at the conclusion of the general debate will explain. I am not going to allow it at this stage.

Shri Manay: If you give me one minute, I will convince you.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to give one minute. The hon. Member's party will have an opportunity. Why does he take this opportunity and speak?

Shri Manay: I am not speaking. I do not want to speak.

Mr. Speaker: What all he has said is a speech.

Shri Manay: I only want to know this. The hon. Home Minister has said now that the Joint Committee has accepted the policy statement made by the Chief Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I will give him an opportunity later.

Shri Manay: I only want to ask....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow. If Shri B. K. Gaikwad does not want to speak, I will allow Shri Manay to speak.

Shri Goray (Poona): I would like to suggest that out of the six hours allotted, three hours should be given

for general discussion, two hours for clause by clause and one hour for the third reading.

Mr. Speaker: If that is the desire, I have no objection.

Shri Goray: Shall we not indicate the amendments that we want to move?

Mr. Speaker: Any hon. Member desirous of speaking?

Shri Parulekar rose—

An Hon. Member: He has not spoken.

Mr. Speaker: Those hon. Members who have not spoken and who are from Bombay may rise.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Others also might be allowed.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh (Ramtek): I come from Vidarbha. Last time one viewpoint regarding Vidarbha was put forward by Dr. Aney. I hold the opposite view and I have not had an opportunity to place it before the House. Now I may be allowed a chance.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him later. Shri Naushir Bharucha.

Shri Sonavane (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I have also not spoken.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Will you give a chance to non-Bombay Members?

Mr. Speaker: I will give an opportunity to all sections.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I think most of us on this side of the House will echo the sentiments expressed by the Home Minister that on this memorable occasion, when we are putting through legislation of a monumental character, our approach should be such that the bitterness of the past may be forgotten, and that we

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

should look ahead to the future and see how we can best utilise the opportunity afforded by this measure for the benefit of the people. Even then our hearts linger and we cannot but pay homage to the memory of those who fell in the struggle for attaining their goal, and those who are still rotting in jail.

Be that as it may, our attempt now must be to see that these unhappy memories are left behind, and we should address ourselves to the task of building a strong Samyukta Maharashtra State and a strong Gujarat State which may become strong parts of our country. We have always felt that the creation of unilingual States is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end, and that end is the realisation of the highest and the best by those individuals who comprise the States. We are also fully aware of the fact that more difficult tasks lie ahead of us so far as this country is concerned, and though at one time it was stated that the creation of unilingual States was likely to weaken the unity of the country and the security of the nation, today we feel more than ever convinced that the creation of these States will make our security all the more secure, and there is no reason to fear that our country's unity will in any way be weakened.

Sir, we regret to observe that so far as the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti was concerned, which is the real representative of the views of the people of Maharashtra in this matter, it was never consulted and, therefore, we do not think that this Bill is based on agreement. And we feel that such amendments as deemed fit by us will be moved.

There are two major defects in this Bill. One is with regard to the boundary adjustments and the other is with regard to the financial provisions.

So far as the boundary adjustments are concerned, it is our grievance, grievance of those who have been elected on the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti ticket, that Dangs should not have been included in Gujarat but it should have gone to Maharashtra and my reasons are as follows: the Adivasis form 96 per cent. of the Dangs population of 47,000; secondly, the official language of the Dangs was declared as Marathi by the Government of Bombay in May 1949 as a result of an agreement between the then Chief Minister Shri Kher and the present Finance Minister of the Union Government Shri Morarji Desai who was the Home Minister at that time.

Sir, geographically Dangs is contiguous to Nasik district, not to Surat and out of a total population of 47,000 as many as 45,000 are Marathis. Until 1903 Dangs was under Khandesh for all administrative purposes and all records were in Marathi. The Dang tribes are Bhils, Warlis, Kunlis and Kathodis which are only found in Maharashtra and very seldom in Gujarat. The list of voters was published in Marathi. The Bombay Government published a tentative order on 14th September, 1950 to include Dangs in Nasik district and the Justice Bakshi Techchand Committee unanimously decided to include Dangs in Maharashtra. The State Reorganisation Commission of 1956 suggested inclusion of Dangs in Maharashtra. In 1956 the draft reorganisation Bill and the Select Committee proposals also favoured inclusion of Dangs in Maharashtra. The Bombay Assembly defeated an amendment on the 6th April, 1956 while considering the Bill for inclusion of Dangs in Gujarat by 224 votes to 6 votes only. So far as the claim of Dangs is concerned for inclusion in Maharashtra, it has been repeatedly established and officially recognised. We do not understand why today it is included in Gujarat.

So far as Umbergaon is concerned, there are certain villages which are

predominantly Marathi-speaking villages but still they are being included in Gujarat. So far as parts of West Khandesh are concerned, we are sorry that for the fulfilment of the Ukai project more land and more villages than was necessary have been taken. We have got no grievance against the Ukai project. If I may reflect the views of Maharashtra people, they are not averse to making some sacrifices for the benefit of Gujarat. But we feel that we are making sacrifices for a project which is thoroughly impracticable and it is conceivable that sooner rather than later the Ukai project will be abandoned half-fulfilled and Gujarat may turn to Narbada which is a much better project. But even assuming that the Ukai project will be for the benefit of Gujarat and it is practicable, more villages than would be actually submerged have been taken into Gujarat on the plea that certain more land will be required for the resettlement of those who will be thrown out from the submerged villages. As it is, those villages which are taken for such purposes are already overcrowded and there are people still living there. We do not understand how these lands will be used for the resettlement of villages which are going to be submerged. I think, the excuse is a very lame one and this thing requires to be looked into again. We do not also understand why a two mile belt, a sort of neutral zone, is being created and more land is being taken away. As I said, the Maharashtrians do not grudge making sacrifices for the interests of the new State of Gujarat but those sacrifices must be sensible and practicable and I appeal to the hon. Minister to see whether anything can be done for releasing certain of the villages which are unnecessarily being included in Gujarat.

Now, coming to the financial burden, the cost of construction of capital is Rs. 10 crores. We do not grudge Gujarat good capital. But there are many buildings in Baroda city and I do not see why Baroda

city is not being fully used for that purpose. If the numerous palace like buildings and accommodation were to be utilised in Baroda, I have no doubt the cost of construction of capital will be very much less than Rs. 10 crores. But even if it is Rs. 10 crores, I wonder why the Central Government does not bear a portion of that expenditure? I think, in the case of Chandigarh, the Central Government generously assisted the Punjab Government on the principle that the creation of new States is essentially the work of the Union Government and that the Union funds must pay a portion of the deficits. Now, here is a question of meeting the deficit for ten years. One could understand the deficit being allowed to be met for first two years. But then there will be the Finance Commission for the allocation of Central revenues—excises and taxes—to the States and we do not understand why the State of Gujarat should hot queue up before the Finance Commission for its due share and if that share is generously given, I think Maharashtra will not grudge that. Also, the deficit is based on the exaggerated estimates. I think that the financial obligation on Maharashtra should be toned down.

With regard to Vidarbha, may I say, so far as the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti is concerned, it is fully pledged to the Nagpur Pact. In its every letter and in spirit the Nagpur Pact will be fulfilled and if at all we have any say in this matter, may I assure those friends in Vidarbha that no stone will be left unturned to see that Nagpur is brought back to its eminent position that it first occupied and as far as it is within our powers we shall see that everything is done to preserve and maintain not only the status of Nagpur but to see that the people of Vidarbha rise to this full stature and their economic condition is uplifted.

I am very glad that in this Bill there is no provision for giving

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

guarantees, or so-called guarantees, to so-called linguistic minorities. One of the minorities—if I may say religious minority, the smallest in the whole of India, possibly in the whole world—is the Parsi community which has never asked for any safeguards from anybody. I am glad the Union Government have shown that trust and faith in the ability of Maharashtra to deal justly with all communities.

In conclusion I must say that we regard this day as a memorable day. We feel that it is a triumph of popular will and if we were to draw any lesson from this it is this that no problem is ever settled finally even by Parliament unless it is settled right. But we are going to forget all the past and we are looking forward to the future. If border adjustments are determined finally in the right spirit, in the right way which, I think, could be determined by two parties sitting round the table and talking things over, then both the States will be able to look forward to a very brilliant future and contribute to the greatness and glory of this country.

Shri Parulekar (Thana): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome this Bill because it is a triumph of the cause of the people in Maharashtra and Gujarat. It is the vindication of their demand for the formation of unilingual State which has been incorporated in this Bill. It is a victory of the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat. I am reminded at this stage and I would like to bring it to your notice, Sir, that the people both in Maharashtra and Gujarat had to pay a very heavy price for winning this victory. More than one hundred citizens in Maharashtra and Gujarat had to give their lives. Thousands and thousands of them had to court imprisonment. I shall be failing in my duty if I do not, on this occasion, pay my humble and respectful homage to the martyrs and also express my gratitude to all those who participated in that struggle as a

result of which this victory has been won.

13 hrs.

This victory is precious, and all the more so, because it has been won against most formidable opponents and bitter opponents, who were opposed to the formation of Maharashtra with Bombay city. Shri S. K. Patil, who was then a Member, of Lok Sabha and who is now a Minister in the Cabinet, had declared that Maharashtra would never get the city of Bombay till eternity. Another Minister in the Cabinet now, Shri Morarji Desai, who was then Chief Minister of Bombay....

Mr. Speaker: Why not forget all that?

Shri Sonavane: Have not the Ministers the right to change their views later on? Why should we talk of the past?

Shri Parulekar: I am only expressing what I feel, and this is the occasion when I should express it.

Shri Morarji Desai was more modest than Shri S. K. Patil, because he had said that Maharashtra with Bombay city would not be achieved at least till he was alive. To anticipate the advice which the Home Minister will give, he will say, let us forget the past. It is easy to advise; I wish I could. But I shall be a hypocrite if I were to say that I can forget the crimes of Shri Morarji Desai in this respect; it will be doing injustice to myself, injustice to the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat and also perhaps to him because he takes pride in those crimes.

When this Bill was introduced by the Home Minister, he stated the reasons why it was being introduced. He stated the reasons for splitting up the bilingual State and forming the unilingual States of Gujarat and Maharashtra. He said that the reason was that

the earlier decision, namely the decision to have a bilingual State had not satisfied all concerned. I would like to ask him in all humility when did this realisation dawn on him.

I shall not accuse the Congress leaders of being so unintelligent as not to realise the fact that the people and all those who were concerned were not satisfied with this decision when the bilingual State was formed. But, still, they took that decision because they wanted to impose their decision on the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat. It is only when they realised that the people will not submit to this decision that the earlier decision is being changed.

What was the new factor in their realisation? That new factor which has influenced them in bringing forward this Bill is that if the bilingual State was not split up and the demand for the unilingual States of Maharashtra and Gujarat was not conceded, then they were not likely to be in power after the next elections. Anyhow, whatever may be the reasons which might have impelled them, I welcome this Bill.

I shall now pass on to deal with some of the vital defects in the Bill, and I shall deal with them very briefly. When bilingual States are split up and unilingual States are formed, it is but quite natural that issues about the borders should arise. The solution of the border issue is not difficult if it is solved on the basis of a principle.

The very principle on the basis of which a unilingual State is formed requires that the same principle should be applied when we are considering the question of borders and deciding which village should go to which State, taking its contiguity also into consideration. If the border had been decided on this basis, and if those provisions had been incorporated in this Bill, it would have been quite perfect.

But, the question that arises is this: Does this Bill decide the border on the basis of this principle? My submission is that it does not. The principles which I refer to are what are commonly and popularly known as the Pataskar formula. The Bill does not decide the border on the basis of the Pataskar formula; rather, it negates it, because hundreds of villages where the population speaking Marathi is in a majority and which are contiguous to Maharashtra are included in Gujarat.

What is still worse is that the Bill does not adopt any consistent principle for deciding the border. One could have understood if the border had been decided on some consistent principle, whether right or wrong. But when we examine the provisions of the Bill we find that no consistent principle has been adopted, so far as the question of deciding the border is concerned.

The principle for including 156 villages of East and West Khandesh in Gujarat is that a dam at Ukai which is in Gujarat is being built. The principle for including the Dangs in Gujarat seems to be—because it has not so far been explained—that Maharashtra must pay the price for having the Bombay city. The principle for including the Marathi-speaking villages in the Dharampur and Bansa-taluks in Surat district is that these taluks have been part of Surat district and part of Gujarat all along.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): Any Marathi-speaking area in Mehana district?

Shri Parulekar: I shall come to that later.

If we examine the other provisions, we shall find worse inconsistencies in deciding the border. In the UMBERGAON taluk, village has been taken as a unit; in the case of Dharampur and Bansa, it is the taluk which has been taken as a unit; in the case of Dangs, the district has been taken as a unit.

[Shri Parulekar]

Therefore, if we take a survey of all the provisions in the Bill, the conclusion is irresistible that no consistent principle has been followed or adopted in deciding the border.

It is the contention of the Home Minister that a consistent principle has been applied in deciding the border. And what is that principle? That principle is the agreement between Shri Chavan, who is the Chief Minister of Bombay and the would-be Chief Minister of Maharashtra, and Shri Mehta the would be Chief Minister of the Gujarat State which will come into existence on the 1st of May this year. This agreement between these two gentlemen, the two would be Chief Ministers is the principle on which the border has been decided, and, therefore, he urged on us to accept the decision which they had arrived at.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): One is a Chief Minister *defacto*, while the other is still in embryo.

Shri Parulekar: I could have understood this argument, if these two would be Chief Ministers had agreed on some principle for deciding the border, and whether the principle was right or wrong would have been a different matter. If they had agreed on some principle on which the border had to be decided, really there would have been some force in the argument of the Home Minister. But they agreed on one thing, on one principle, and that principle was one of bargaining; and that is the basis on which the border has been decided. The agreement between these two gentlemen is worthless for our consideration, and I shall state the reasons why I consider it as worthless. These were the two gentlemen who had agreed to accept the bilingual State, to form the bilingual State and work for its success. These very gentlemen had agreed with Shri Morarji Desai in suppressing the demand for a unilingual State, of the people of Gujarat and Maharashtra. These two gentle-

man have adopted a resolution in the last session of the Bombay Legislative Assembly, demanding that the Pataskar formula should be taken as the basis for deciding the border between Maharashtra and Karnataka. They are agreed on that resolution which is a unanimous resolution, and yet, these very gentlemen have also agreed that the Pataskar formula should not be adopted as a basis for deciding the border between Gujarat and Maharashtra. These are the very gentlemen who had agreed that the district of Dangs belonged to Maharashtra, and these are the very gentlemen who today say that Dangs does not belong to Maharashtra but to Gujarat! In face of what I have stated, it will be seen that the agreement which is recommended to us for acceptance is not worth much consideration.

Now I will briefly explain our objections to certain provisions of the Bill dealing with the border. These relate to the inclusion of 17 villages of Umbergaon taluk in Gujarat, the inclusion of the Dangs district in Gujarat, the inclusion of about 156 villages of East and West Khandesh in Gujarat and the inclusion of the Marathi-speaking villages of Dharampur and Bansda taluk in Gujarat. The reason for our objection to the inclusion of 17 villages of the Umbergaon taluk in Gujarat is that according to the census report of 1951, the majority of the people in these villages are Marathi-speaking and these villages are contiguous to the Maharashtra State which will be formed. Those who do not agree with my contention go to the length of saying that the 1951 census is not a reliable census at all. They go to the length of saying that the figures of the Marathi-speaking population in these villages and in the area round about have been manipulated by the Maharashtra officials with the help of Maharashtra officials. This is a fantastic proposition and a fantastic charge. It is flattering to us, no doubt that we are so intelligent as to outwit the then Chief

Minister of Bombay, Shri Morarji Desai, and the Finance Minister of Bombay, Dr. Jivraj Mehta, who was also there, that in spite of the presence of these gentlemen who were the champions of a bilingual State, we, the Maharashtrians, with the help of the petty officials could manipulate of census figures. But this is not a fact.

One of the arguments advanced is that the Warlis, Scheduled Tribes, who live in this area do not speak Marathi and Marathi is not their language. In support of this contention, they take the authority of one Shri Save, who was a Deputy Collector in that area, and who wrote a thesis on the Warli tribes in which he has stated that the Warlis—some of the observations he has made therein are not very clear—speak Gujarati. But he has not said that they do not speak Marathi or that Marathi is not their language. In this connection, I do not accept him as an authority on this subject better than myself. I will state the reason. I have been working in that area. I have been very intimately connected with the Warli tribes for the last 12 years. I have lived among them, I have been moving among them. I have been among these people and I know what their language is. For my services to these Scheduled Tribes, I was rewarded by the hon. the Chief Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, with an order, exempting me from that area for several years and detaining me for a year. So far as my academic qualifications are concerned, I have got the same qualifications as Shri Save.

Shri P. R. Patel: You have prejudice, while he was a *prant* officer.

Shri Parulekar: Therefore, he had much more prejudice than I had. As I said, Shri Save has not stated that Marathi is not their language. Even if he had so stated, he is not an authority on the subject. He was a student who was studying and preparing a thesis for his M.A. He might have

made some study and might have made some observations. But I have studied this problem for the last 12 years and I say on my own authority that the language of these Scheduled Tribes, the Warlis, is Marathi.

I will now explain our objection for the inclusion of the Dangs district in Gujarat. The issue whether the Dangs district was a part of Maharashtra or Gujarat had been decided thrice. Once it was decided by the then Chief Minister of Bombay, the late Shri B. G. Kher, and Shri Morarji Desai, who was then the Revenue Minister.

An Hon. Member: Home Minister.

Shri Parulekar: Home Minister. It makes no difference whether he was the Home Minister or the Revenue Minister. He was a Minister.

They went to the district and made a on-the-spot study. Both of them came to the unanimous conclusion that Dangs belonged to Maharashtra. Again in 1950, when the question of delimitation of constituencies came up, the Tek Chand Committee also came to the conclusion that Dangs belonged to Maharashtra. Once again in 1956, when the question of States reorganisation was taken up and a Bill was introduced, Dangs was considered a part of Maharashtra and not Gujarat.

Now, what has happened after 1956 to change the decision taken on all the three previous occasions and arrive at a new conclusion that Dangs belongs to Gujarat?

Now I will take up the question of the proposed inclusion of 156 villages of East and West Khandesh in Gujarat. Firstly, there is no dispute as regards the fact that these villages are part of Maharashtra. But they are being included in Gujarat on the ground that the Ukai dam is to be constructed.

[Shri Parulekar]

What has the dam got to do with the area and the people who live in these villages? The Ukai dam can be constructed. There is no objection to that. We welcome it if Gujarat is going to be benefited by Ukai. But that cannot be a justification for including these villages in Gujarat.

Shri P. R. Patel: The dam is to be constructed not on the land but in the air!

Shri Parulekar: The spot for constructing the dam is not in the area of the villages. It is far away from these villages. Just because the Ukai dam is to be constructed far away from these villages—I do not know exactly how many miles—they are being included in Gujarat.

There are two issues to be considered in this connection. As regards the Ukai dam itself, the technical experts are divided. Some think that it is not a feasible and practical proposition. They think that Rs. 66 crores which will be spent on this dam will be found to be a waste afterwards. Since the experts are divided on the question, we cannot be sure whether this dam will be a success or not. Even supposing that it will be a success and it will benefit Gujarat, there is no justification for including these 156 villages on that ground in Gujarat.

Then I come to the last point. This is about the provisions which deal with the financial burden which has to be borne by Maharashtra. The Bill provides that Maharashtra will have to meet the deficit of the Gujarat State for the next ten years. The principle underlying this is very novel. The question naturally arises why one State should bear the deficit of another. This responsibility is entirely that of the Central Government. This provision for the payment of the deficit of the Gujarat State by Maharashtra is incorporated in the Bill because the Central Government want to escape from their own responsibility.

They want to see us quarrel among ourselves and sitting there, they will enjoy. It is really the responsibility of the Central Government to bear the deficit, whatever it may be, of any State. If there is any deficit in West Bengal, if there is a deficit in any other State, it is the Central Government which meet it; it is the Finance Commission which takes into consideration the deficit and makes provision for meeting it.

Our suggestion is that Maharashtra should pay the deficit for two years, the rest of the Second Plan period, because arrangements have already been made. But, after that it should be the responsibility of the Central Government to find out what is the deficit of Gujarat State and meet it. We will be supporting the demand of the Gujarat State if they demand from the Centre that the deficit should be made good by the Centre.

An Hon. Member: It is very good of you to suggest that.

Shri Parulekar: Another question arises, a very ticklish question. The Central Government has connived at it because, if they were to consider it, it will be their responsibility to bear that burden. Before the bilingual State was formed, the deficits of Saurashtra and Cutch were borne by the Central Government. Now, the Bill provides that it is the Maharashtra State which has to bear the burden of the deficit of both Saurashtra and Cutch. What is the reason? Because they happened to be part of the bilingual State for three years.

My suggestion is that in calculating the figure of the deficit, the deficit which is to be borne on account of Saurashtra and Cutch should be taken out; and it should be borne by the Central Government to help Gujarat with the amount which is needed for making up the deficit of Saurashtra and Cutch.

These are some of the defective provisions of the Bill. But, on the whole, despite these defects, it is a great historical step; and I, therefore, welcome it. It is the victory of the people. That is why I welcome it.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nathwani.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sir, I want to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Does he belong to Gujarat or Maharashtra?

Shri D. C. Sharma: It should not be made a parochial question because we are all connected with it. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): He belongs to the whole of India.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): I have given a note of dissent, Sir.

Shri Nathwani (Sorath): Sir, I was rather a little surprised and even pained at the tone of the speech made by the last speaker. We had a full-dress debate in the Bombay Assembly. And, during the first stage of this Bill here, several Members gave vent to their feelings. Even before the Joint Committee, during the course of the discussion, all the controversial points had been carefully and thoroughly gone into. So, I expected that now at least, when we are parting and when both the States are on the eve of a new career, the Members from both the parts would refrain from carrying on the debate in a spirit which is not cordial and friendly.

13.24 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

That is why I said I was a little pained to hear the last speaker.

(*Interruption*). It leads me to think that even now certain controversial issues are to be kept alive with certain ulterior motives. I will refer to it at a later stage; but, as the time at my disposal is rather short, I will try to deal with the two main issues which are even now controverted by one group.

It is said that so far as the financial settlement is concerned and so far as the border readjustment is concerned, injustice is done to Maharashtra, that no principle is sought to be followed and so on. I will take up the question of financial settlement first.

We have to bear in mind the entire background. And, what do we find? Here is a great composite State in which we have lived together—these two groups—for over 150 years. Their splitting up into two linguistic groups was found to be the most troublesome issue in the reorganisation of the States. The fate of Bombay or the future of Bombay was the main reason. Besides being a cosmopolitan city, besides being the heart of commerce and industry, Bombay has a huge surplus and from its huge surplus the deficits of both the areas, Maharashtra and Gujarat were met. Therefore, even before the States Reorganisation Commission those who wanted Bombay to be included in Maharashtra had made a suggestion to meet the deficit of Gujarat from the surplus of Bombay. They went further and suggested that this financial settlement should form part of any scheme of separation of these two groups.

So, when we are splitting up the State into two parts, it is natural, it is quite obvious that this should form part of the scheme of separation. That is why the deficit of Gujarat is sought to be met from the surplus which would remain in the other part. Therefore, in this context, it was quite natural that when there were negotiations between the Janata Parishad and the Samyukta Samiti or even thereafter when the leaders of the

[Shri Nathwani]

two groups met and tried to solve this question, they took into consideration the need to supply the deficit of Gujarat from the surplus of Bombay. Therefore, when some Members have now suggested that the deficit should be made good from the Centre, it does not hold good. It has been almost common ground that in case of separation the deficit of Gujarat should be met from Bombay. So, this principle was accepted.

Even when this principle has been conceded, those who object to the settlement do not object so much against the payment but they say that not so much should be paid and why less should not be paid. That is their objection. These friends have, therefore, urged now that it is not the State of Maharashtra but the Centre that should give some loan or subsidy to meet the deficit. But that approach is not correct.

Then, I come to the question of the extent of the deficit that should be met. In this connection, two or three things should be borne in mind. First of all, we say that at least the deficit for 10 years should be met; and we say there is a good precedent for doing so.

In the past, when several States merged into bigger units or some new States were created and when the Centre took over certain sources of revenue, provision was made by the Centre for meeting their deficits for 10 years because it was considered that 10 years' period would be the normal period by which that particular State can find its bearings....

Shri Naushir Bharucha: We have no objection to Central relief being given to them. (*Interruption*).

Shri Nathwani: But why should the Centre bear it? Why should it not be from the surplus..... (*Interruptions*). It was not then a question of splitting up into two States. If my learned friend wants to compare

things, then, he must take the case where a bilingual State was broken up and which had a huge surplus; then the analogy would apply, not otherwise. (*Interruptions*).

The second thing about the period is this. It has been pointed out that it should be met at least for an initial period. And, having regard to the fact that here is a State which continued to exist for 150 years and one part of it is made to come out, I submit that the analogy of a joint partnership or a joint venture, where one partner is asked to go out and start afresh his business, will apply. In this background of a joint venture which has existed for over 100 years, ten years' period would be the minimum which should be allowed to the outgoing partner to build up his own house and set his house in order. It has been stated that Gujarat is rather rich and does not require to be helped financially to this extent.... (*An Hon. Member:* Nobody says so). That myth was exploded the other day when Shri B. G. Mehta spoke during the first stage. He explained the real state of affairs so far as the developmental projects were concerned and how 25 per cent of the population consisted of Adivasis. In this connection, I want to give some figures so that if there is any lingering doubt in anybody's mind, it may be dispelled. In 1956, the Finance Minister had got prepared a statement of receipts and income per head from various districts—both Gujarati and Marathi. It was found that excluding the surplus of Bombay, the *per capita* receipt from Gujarat areas was Rs. 12.36 per annum whereas from Marathi areas it was Rs. 10.32. If you include the surplus of Bombay, the per head revenue receipt of the Marathi area would amount to Rs. 17 whereas that of Gujarat would remain Rs. 12.36 nP. Having regard to all these circumstances, the period should have been a little more. Ten years is the minimum period that should be

provided for. I was rather surprised when I heard my friend Shri Parulekar saying this: why should the deficit of Kutch and Saurashtra be met by Maharashtra? At no stage has this suggestion ever been made. When the Mahagujarat Junta Parishad and the Samyuktha Maharashtra Samiti were discussing, they never referred to this matter. The deficit that was given by the Centre to these States was in consideration of certain resources of revenue having been taken up by it. That was the position. It was not with a view to meet the deficit. The argument that while considering the deficit you should exclude Saurashtra and Kutch merely shows to what extent some of our friends are willing to go in order to keep alive this controversy.

I now come to the other question of the border. It has been stated that no principle has been followed and there should be a boundary commission and so on. It comes with ill grace from these friends who say that some commission should be appointed. Let us take the last Commission. Persons of high calibre and integrity gave their decision whether it was regarding Vidarbha, or the smaller bilingual State or the border between Belgaum and the other places. None of these decisions is found acceptable to them. What is the guarantee that they would first all agree to the decision of a commission? At least there should be some finality about these things now.

It has been said that there is no principle followed in demarcating these lines. I feel that the problem should be viewed in its entirety. When a claim is made for certain things and a settlement is arrived at, it may perhaps be found difficult to justify every item on its merits. In this case however it is possible to justify every part of the arrangement. Principles are borne in mind and every part of the arrangement regarding the border areas can be justified by reference to some principle. Take for instance the case of Umbergaon. It has been

asked: what is the language of this part? Are these people speaking Gujarati or some other language? I need not go into all the details or the reports that are made by Messrs. Save and Kulkarni. So far as the language position is concerned, it cannot be disputed that Gujarati language is predominant. There are in this block 3,117 school boys who are attending Gujarati primary schools.... (Shri Assar: What about the others?) There are 2,460 who are attending Marathi classes. They have got the choice to attend either of the two schools. What does it show? People there are more Gujarati-speaking or more influenced by Gujarati. They speak either Gujarati or a language which is akin to Gujarati. The local boards run the schools in these parts.....

Shri Assar (Ratnagiri): The local boards belong to the Congress and therefore, they are not opening Marathi schools..... (Interruptions).

Shri Nathwani: Truth is sometimes unpalatable. But here are the tell-tale figures. Having regard to that basis, having regard to the present position and having regard to the views expressed by representatives of various bodies, by elected persons, the whole of the taluk should have gone to Gujarat. But we conceded part of the taluk to them and gave them certain villages. Now, they ask: what is the principle which has been underlying this? I say the principle is that either the people, the majority of the people are speaking this particular language or they have passed resolutions in support thereof.

Now, I shall refer to the Dangs district. Even when the representatives of the Samiti and the Parishad met, they agreed to re-examine the whole problem. I can read the text because the decision, it was argued, was arbitrary.... (Interruptions). My learned friend need not interrupt me now.

Mr. Chairman: He is not yielding.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Only one explanation, Sir. He is rightly referring to certain understanding between the Parishad and the Samiti. When he refers to that, he must bear in mind that these bodies were never consulted when they reached agreement at Government level. Otherwise, there would not have been any difference.

Shri Nathwani: You have not listened to me. I am merely referring to one fact. You can ask Shri Dange. It has been reported in the *Nava Sakthi* and it has been referred to in the Bombay Assembly, that he was willing to give away 45 villages from Dangs. On what basis—may I ask? You can look to the number of students who are attending the two schools.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav (Malegaon): There are schools without students.

Shri Nathwani: 7,500 Adivasi children attend the Gujarati primary schools in this area whereas 2,900 Advasi students attend the Marathi schools. These figures have a story to tell. They will satisfy any impartial person as to where the predelictions of the people lie.

Then, I come to Ukai. I would like in this connection to stress one aspect. They say they are opposing it on scientific grounds. That is how it is put in the note of dissent by my Maharashtrian friends. What is the scientific material on which they are trying to dispute it? They rely on two facts. First of all, they say that Ukai Project is not a feasible proposition, there would not be sufficient quantity of water which can be impounded. I have seen a circular, a note prepared by the Ukai Prevention Committee wherein, by manipulating figures, by trying to mis-interpret the correct figures given by the Central Water and Power Commission and by the technical committee, they say that the utmost quantity that would flow in the river is hardly 5 million acre feet. This is not correct. It has

been admitted that even on the most conservative estimate the total flow would be more than 9 million acre feet out of which two-third can be utilised by the upstream regions of Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: What is the source of your information?

Shri Nathwani: Sir, I am willing to meet that point if you give me five minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. This is not the time for that. If any questions are raised now and the hon. Member wishes to reply them when he has almost finished his speech, he will take more than five minutes. He is making a point. Let him continue with it. This is not the time for answering questions.

Shri Nathwani: The total quantity of water that would be available in the river is estimated at 9 million acre feet. The second point is that only 7 per cent out of this should be allotted to Gujarat, because they say that the cropped area in Gujarat is hardly 7 per cent of the total cropped area in the whole region. But there are two fallacies. Firstly, the allocation of water is not based either on catchment area or on cropped area. You have to see the land which is available for irrigation, and it has been estimated that about 18 lakhs of acres of land would be available for irrigation in Maharashtra as against 10 lakhs acres of land available for irrigation in Gujarat. Therefore, in this proportion the total water supply should be divided, and this is the basis on which the waters of Godavari have been distributed.

Again, in computing the total amount that can be available they forget that you cannot prevent or hold back water from flowing. For that a bund, reservoir or a dam has to be built and the nearest point where it could be built in Maharashtra is so far away that at least 5,400 square feet of catchment area would be left for water to flow up to Ukai.

Therefore, there is no difficulty about sufficient water being made available at this point—Ukai. Then, they say that this would lead to flood in the upper region. It is very difficult to understand this sort of argument, because in one breath they say that sufficient water would not be there to fill the lake and, on the other hand, they say there would be so much water that the upper streams would be flooded.

Lastly, they say that there is ample oil and gas available now and, therefore, no money should be wasted on this. I would like to tell these own friends two things. Firstly, one does not know when these would be exploited and, secondly, one does not know how much gas or oil would be available there. Again oil is far more costly than hydro-power. Lastly do not forget that if we have got two resources, namely, hydraulic power and oil and gas, by resorting to our hydraulic resources we would be making available our surplus oil and gas for other parts of the country.

Sir, it is this kind of remarks and arguments which lead me to think, on the whole, that the whole object in their mind is not to see that their point is conceded but to keep alive some sort of controversy, because they have in mind the next elections. As politicians they may bear in mind the next elections, but they should not forget that whereas politicians look to the next elections statesmen look to the next generation. That is the difference between the two. Instead of keeping alive these feelings of bitterness and animosity, would it not be better to foster and promote feelings of friendliness and neighbourliness because, Sir, it is a pity if a nation were to despise passion in dream but submit to it in its awakening.

I want to say a word about the city of Bombay because I have stayed there for a number of years. The best part of my life has been spent there. I would say that this now forms

definitely a part of Maharashtra and its affairs would be administered and controlled by the State of Maharashtra. But when people say that it is a cosmopolitan city they have in mind that the culture, the outlook is not regional. There you find that it is a confluence for the meeting ground of all people from other parts of the country.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It will remain a cosmopolitan city.

Shri Nathwani: It should remain so. Its cosmopolitan character should be preserved. It is rightly termed as "India in a miniature". Therefore, Sir, this policy statement is welcome, whereby its cosmopolitan character is going to be maintained. It will also be to the glory of the State of Maharashtra that it can preserve its cosmopolitan character.

I end, Sir, by wishing to the people of Maharashtra all peace and prosperity so that they can contribute to the strength and glory of our country.

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): In the city of Bombay there are 4 lakhs to 5 lakhs of Kannada people.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me a chance to participate in this debate. Last time, at the time when this Bill was referred to the Joint Committee, my hon. friend, Dr. Aney, for whom I have great regard, made a very forceful but, at the same time, a very sentimental speech, in which he has said that this Bill is nothing but "linguistic fanaticism". Of course, he is ever ready to say that, but, at the same time, in his speech he made a plea for the formation of Vidarbha. Sir, I tried to understand what exactly he wanted to say, but I could not understand both the points which he made, about linguistic fanaticism and the formation of Vidarbha.

The formation of Vidarbha, as everybody here knows, is nothing but

[Shri K. G. Deshmukh]

a linguistic State, that too a smaller State than Maharashtra. If he says that the creation of Maharashtra is linguistic fanaticism and, at the same time, upholds the formation of Vidarbha, which he wants and for which he has also been fighting in Vidarbha.

Shri Goray: It is a smaller fanaticism.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: It is a bigger fanaticism, I would say. If in the creation of Maharashtra there is linguistic fanaticism, there is more linguistic fanaticism, I would say, in the creation of Vidarbha.

I shall now point out, Sir, that the case which he has made for Vidarbha is really a very weak case from all points of view. He said that the movement for the formation of Vidarbha is a very old movement. He also said that the people of Vidarbha also like that. At one time in his speech he said that there is no real popular opinion behind the formation of Maharashtra. I do not understand what he means by "real popular opinion". Dr. Aney also knows that in this House, except Dr. Aney, all other representatives have said that they want Maharashtra. All the Members of Parliament from Vidarbha have said so.

Shri Mahagaonkar (Kolhapur): He is not prepared to call you as a representative from Vidarbha.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: He may say that except Dr. Aney Vidarbha is not represented by anybody here. Also, the provincial Congress Committee and the other political parties passed resolutions in favour of the formation of Maharashtra. Those in Nagpur who were in favour of Vidarbha have also changed their opinion, when they were convinced that the formation of Maharashtra would be to the benefit of all the people. Those who were for Vidarbha have also changed their opinion and given their consent to the formation of Maharashtra. So, I do

not think that the point which he made about these opinions is right.

In the interests of Vidarbha also, I may say that it is also wrong that a separate State of Vidarbha should remain. I am saying this keeping in view the financial and other developmental expenditure.

There is one book brought out by Mr. S. G. Kazi who is a Minister in Bombay. I may take this is an authoritative book, being a Minister in Bombay State. If the figures are incorrect, my hon. friend Dr. Aney may correct me. In this book, the author has given some of the figures. I may quote those figures for the benefit of the House because the House may be under a wrong impression that the formation of Vidarbha would be really beneficial, as has been made out by my esteemed friend Dr. Aney who is a very eminent man and who is a big leader and has remained a leader for all the time. I shall quote the figures given in the book to which I have referred.

Some people think that Vidarbha would be a very big State. But I may tell you that Vidarbha consists of eight districts only. It has a population of 85 lakhs—not even one crore. I fail to understand one thing. There is not even one single State in the whole of India which has a population of below one crore. This Vidarbha State would have a population of below one crore; it has only 85 lakhs.

An Hon. Member: It may go up in future.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I have got the census figures with me. It is only 85 lakhs at present. Then, let us take the budget figures. Some of the Vidarbhites say that Vidarbha will be a surplus State. There are some figures which of course are favourable to the Vidarbhites but they are old figures, and those figures were quoted by the States Reorganisation Commission in 1956. In 1950-51, Vidarbha

had a budget of Rs. 7,79,52,000; that is, strictly speaking, the revenue of the State. The expenditure was Rs. 6,59,00,000. The surplus was Rs. 1,20,00,000. The next year, in 1951-52, the revenue went up to Rs. 8,86,00,000. The expenditure was Rs. 7,79,00,000. The surplus was Rs. 1,07,00,000. In 1952-53, the revenue went up to Rs. 9,18,00,000 and the expenditure came up to Rs. 7,17,00,000. The surplus was Rs. 2,01,00,000. These are the years prior to developmental activity. Of course, there were surpluses, and the average surplus for these three years was Rs. 1,45,00,000.

Now, I shall show the same State suffered a deficit after the developmental activities started. I shall quote from the figures given by Shri Brijlal Biyani.

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member. But he is discussing Vidarbha and referring to the question of Vidarbha being a very live issue or not, even though there is no amendment tabled about Vidarbha. He has spent all the time so far on the question of Vidarbha and has not touched upon the Bill in question. So, at the end he will find that he has not spoken on the Bill as such.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I wanted to clear the impression created in the House last time by the speech of my hon. friend Dr. Aney. There has not been even a single speech, after the speech of Dr. Aney, showing the real position of Vidarbha. So, I shall take a major period of my time on this point and say a few words only about the rest of the problem.

I was referring to the book of Shri Brijlal Biyani who was then the Finance Minister of Madhya Pradesh. Shri Brijlal Biyani is now the leader of the Vidarbha movement. According to him, in 1953-54, the revenue of Vidarbha was Rs. 10,08,00,000 and the expenditure was Rs. 10,29,00,000 the deficit being Rs. 21 lakhs. In 1954-

55,—this was the plan period—the revenue was Rs. 11,79,00,000 and the expenditure was Rs. 13 crores. That means a deficit of Rs. 129 lakhs. In 1955-56—this was the time of reorganisation when the Bill was passed—the revenue was Rs. 13,11,00,000 and the expenditure was Rs. 14,75,00,000, the deficit being Rs. 164 lakhs. So, it means that Vidarbha went into deficit after we came into the Plan period. That is after the developmental activities in the State, deficit has come in. So, there is a wrong belief that Vidarbha will be a surplus State and that the surplus has gone to Maharashtra. But, after 1953, Vidarbha went into a position of being a deficit State. I have no figures for 1955-56, but I am sure that after 1955-56, it must be a bigger deficit because the developmental activities have proceeded further.

Then I shall refer to some of the points raised by the Vidarbhites—that after the merger of Vidarbha in Maharashtra, there is injustice done to Vidarbha, because the Maharashtrians are very cunning people and they are a big majority and that is why they are doing injustice to Vidarbha especially with regard to developmental expenditure in Vidarbha. I shall show you what the position was in Vidarbha and Maharashtra then, and what is the position now. At that time, in 1956, when the Vidarbha area was linked with Maharashtra, the developmental budget for the second Five Year Plan, was Rs. 39 crores for Vidarbha. There was no provision for roads or irrigation, etc. We represented to the Government of Bombay and said that the provision was very inadequate and asked for more funds. Then, the Government of Bombay approached the Planning Commission and they secured Rs. 5 crores more for Vidarbha, and they added this amount of Rs. 5 crores to the State of Bombay which then included Vidarbha. So, the total provision came to Rs. 49 crores which meant Rs. 10 crores more. Since then, there have been

[Shri K. G. Deshmukh]

some activities. I have got with me a list of activities, regarding roads, irrigation, development of agriculture, veterinary, fishery, rural development, co-operation and so on. There is a long list detailing 12 items. All these schemes were given to Vidarbha and of course so much work was done thereafter.

I now come to the third point and that is about Nagpur city which was raised by some of my hon. friends. Of course, I have a very high regard for Nagpur. It was our capital for the last several years. We are very eager to see that the importance of this city should not be lost. Except that the capital was shifted from Nagpur to Bombay, I do not think that the importance of Nagpur has gone down since 1956.

There are some figures also about Nagpur city. What the Bombay Government has done for the city of Nagpur after its merger with Bombay State is also a long list. I shall read to you a few lines though I have no time to read the full list, and what I shall read will throw some light on what the Bombay Government have done for Nagpur city.

"The gap created by the shifting of the Secretariat from Nagpur to Bombay was sought to be filled by locating various other offices including regional offices of certain Departments and office of the Divisional Commissioner, the Directorate of Geology and Mining and the offices of the Deputy Accountant-General, the National Savings Commissioner, Indian Bureau of Mines, etc., at Nagpur. Special efforts were made to assist the Government of India in establishing the Central Public Health Engineering Institute at Nagpur which is the 22nd national laboratory in the chain of such laboratories in the country. The establishment of certain institutions like the veterinary college, engineering col-

lege at Nagpur and expansion of institutions like agricultural and medical colleges and the Vaccine Lymph Institute are other convincing examples of the State Government's efforts to maintain the importance of the city."

All these schemes have cost the Government of Bombay a sum which runs to the tune of Rs. 11 crores. With Rs. 10 crores more, it came afterwards to Rs. 21 crores. So, the House will note that there is no injustice shown to Vidarbha after its merger with Bombay State, though some people believe that injustice has been done to Vidarbha, because with just Rs. 10 crores or Rs. 11 crores, one might doubt as to how it is possible to run the Government and to have developmental activities.

The last point that I wish to refer to is about the Nagpur agreement. So much has been said about it. In the Nagpur agreement, there is a certain arrangement as to what should be done about Vidarbha. Of course, there is the statement of the Chief Minister of Bombay in the Assembly itself and there is also some arrangement in the Constitution which includes some provisions of the Nagpur agreement.

But after all, the article and the Statement are not obligatory. It is only enabling. That is way I say it should be included in the Bill itself, so that friends like Dr. Aney and others who are sincere—I do not charge them—will be satisfied by that. So, I would appeal to the House that this Nagpur agreement should be included in the Bill itself.

14 hrs.

Dr. Gohokar (Yeotmal): Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this Bill. Just now my friend, Shri Deshmukh, has put forth some forceful arguments for the merger of Vidarbha into Maharashtra. After

dealing with all the financial matters, hon. Members must have come to the conclusion that it is in the interest of Vidarbha to go with Maharashtra, instead of having a separate State of Vidarbha. We also know why Gujarat did not want a separate State for itself. They must have considered it very carefully and come to the conclusion that after separating from Bombay State, their State would be a deficit State and the surplus that they were getting from Bombay would not be available to them any more. So, naturally they did not want to separate from Bombay. They did not want to go out of Bombay just for this surplus.

I do not understand the argument of Dr. Aney for not joining with Maharashtra, when we are getting this surplus advantage, which is necessary for the development of Vidarbha. I think in the modern world, the most important think for any community or region is the economic development. From that point of view, it is most important for Vidarbha people to go with the surplus region. If we compare our Vidarbha with Gujarat, we stand in a much less advantageous position compared to them. Their population, when they have their State, would be 150 lakhs, i.e., about 1½ crores. If we form a separate State of Vidarbha we will be 85 lakhs; practically, we are half of the population of Gujarat.

The next point is they have got good ports, while we do not have any port at all. They have got so many textile mills in Ahmedabad and many other places, while Vidarbha has got only 10 or at the most 12 textile mills or may be less and some of them are even closed. So, the economic position of Vidarbha as compared to Gujarat is not very satisfactory. Even with this economic state of affairs, if Dr. Aney wants a separate Vidarbha State, I do not understand his argument.

14.06 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The next point I want to stress is this. When Dr. Aney was speaking about Vidarbha, he was trying to connote the meaning that Vidarbha means 8 districts—4 districts of Nagpur Division and 4 districts of Vidarbha. But that is not a fact. In fact, Vidarbha means the 4 districts of Vidarbha only and it does not include the 4 districts of the Nagpur Division. The 4 districts of Vidarbha are Amravati, Akola, Buldana and Yeotmal. They are contiguous to Bombay State and they are between the Nagpur Division and Maharashtra. The people of these 4 districts have so many times shown their willingness to merge with Maharashtra rather than go with the Nagpur Division. This can be seen from the different elections held in Vidarbha.

In 1955, there was a by-election which was caused because Shri Biyani was unseated after an appeal. Shri Biyani chose to contest the by-election. He has been known for his great support for the formation of Maha Vidarbha State. You will be surprised to know that Shri Biyani was defeated in the by-election and one who was a supporter of Samyukta Maharashtra was elected from that constituency. Later on, in the general elections in 1957, the Vidarbha Andolan Samiti did not take any part.

श्री लादीबाला: (इन्दौर) : बियाणी तो खड़े नहीं हुए थे ।

डा० गोहोकर : बियाणी खड़े हुए थे आपको मालूम नहीं है ।

If the Vidarbha Andolan Samiti thought that their demand was proper, they could have very well participated in the election and shown to the Members of Parliament that their demand was just, as the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti have shown

[Dr. Gohokar]

that the people of Maharashtra are behind them. We have agreed to the demand of the Samyukta Maharashtra and we are conceding it to them. But in the case of the Vidarbha Andolan Samiti, they had no courage to fight the general elections. Probably they might say, they did not fight because this issue was not there, as the bilingual State was already there. But later on, Shri Biyani was elected in the 1957 general election, but he resigned on this issue in 1959. He should have contested his old seat which he had resigned, but he did not have the courage to contest that seat, because he knew that he would be defeated. So, he allowed the Congress to win that seat. When some newspaper reporter asked why he did not contest, his reply was wonderful. He said: बियाणी जिस चीज को छोड़ता है,

उसको कभी हाथ नहीं लगाता है ।

That is not the way to meet an agrument. Again, there was one more by-election in Vidarbha. That was in the Amravati constituency. In that election, which was held last year, just a year back, the Congress lost and the seat was won by an independent candidate who supported the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra. In this election, the Vidarbha Andolan Samiti had set up a candidate and that candidate was defeated. He saved his deposit only by a margin of 200 votes. That shows quite clearly that this movement is not at all popular in those four districts of Vidarbha. They have expressed their willingness to join Maharashtra so many times. In 1955 the Vidarbha Pradesh Congress committee passed a resolution with an overwhelming majority demanding the merger of Vidarbha into Maharashtra. Again, last year, they have supported this move. So, it is beyond doubt that the people from these four districts want their merger with Maharashtra.

Having discussed this point, I will now refer to some more points.

These four districts of Vidarbha are following different Hindu laws. We are all governed by the Bombay school of Mitakshara law while in the four districts of Nagpur they are governed by the Banaras school. So, we are more closer to Bombay.

An Hon. Member: All of them are governed by the Mitakshara law.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This could not be settled in this manner.

Dr. Gohokar: We are governed by the same law which is prevailing in Bombay State, while the Nagpur people are governed by the law which is prevailing in Banaras.

Then, the revenue code that existed up till 1955 in Vidarbha in those four districts is practically the same, or based on the same principles on which the Bombay Revenue Code is based. So, socially and in many other ways these four districts are nearer to Bombay than to Nagpur division.

Shri Chandak (Chhindwara): What about those four districts of Nagpur?

Dr. Gohokar: These four districts of Vidarbha want merger with Maharashtra, because they are contiguous to Maharashtra. Their will should be respected and they should be allowed to join Maharashtra. If these four districts join Maharashtra, the remaining four districts of Nagpur division cannot be made into a separate State because then it would be a very small State. Such a small State cannot exist in our country because of its smallness and small income.

Then I come to the surplus of Bombay. Many people from Maharashtra think that Bombay has been built by them. Many people from Gujarat think they have built the Bombay city. They think that their capital is the cause for the progress of Bombay while the Maharashtrians think that their labour is the cause for the development of Bombay. I

feel that Vidarbha has also played its part in the prosperity of Bombay. Without the cotton crops of Berar there will be no cotton textile industry in Bombay, and the main industry of Bombay is the cotton textile industry. The prosperity of Bombay is intimately linked with the textile industry, whose raw material comes from Vidarbha. It is because of that that Bombay city has prospered and attained its present stage. So, to say that Vidarbha has no right over Bombay is quite wrong. I think the Vidarbha people have a share in the prosperity of Bombay city and they want their merger with Maharashtra. I think we are perfectly entitled to it, as we want to share the prosperity of Maharashtra. I hope Dr. Aney and some of his supporters from Vidarbha will also be convinced about this point and will accept our proposal.

Shri B. K. Galkwad (Nasik): I rise to offer my observations on the general discussion on the Bombay Reorganisation Bill, 1960. I welcome this Bill on two grounds. The first ground is that it is historically important and the second ground is that it is constitutionally important. Our leader the late revered Dr. Bala-saheb Ambedkar had taken a vow to break up the bilingual State of Bombay and include Bombay city in Maharashtra. The Samyukt Maharashtra Samiti had also taken the same vow. Hence, in order to fulfil our leader's vow, the Republican Party of India had co-operated with the Samyukt Maharashtra Samiti people to break up the bilingual State of Bombay and now, I am glad to say, that it is being broken today.

An Hon. Member: So, your vow has been broken?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should emphasize more on the formation than on the breaking of things.

Shri B. K. Galkwad: While doing so, I must show my regret and sorrow towards the policy adopted by the Government where in having the formation of Maharashtra with Bombay city we are charged with the heavy penalty of Rs. 50 crores and losing Dangs district, hundreds of villages from West Khandesh, Dharampur, from Surat district and Umbargaon along with other 16 villages from Thana district. The main principle behind the making of unilingual State in that language should be the basis. If it is so, then you will observe that principle has not been applied strictly while forming Maharashtra. Some part of Marathi-speaking area have been confiscated from Maharashtra and included in the Gujarat State, for some reason or the other.

I will first take the case of Dang district, because Dang district is my constituency. It is a well-known fact that Marathi is spoken by the Dang people. In the year 1946 Political Agent of Gujarat State Agency issued an office order on 27th June, 1946, which reads as follows:

"It is hereby directed that Marathi will be the court language in all courts in Dang with effect from 1st April 1946."

My hon. friend, Shri Nathwani, was pleased enough to quote certain instances showing that in certain schools certain number of boys have attended. In this case, I do not want to quote the instances of boys attending primary and private schools. I will quote certain important instances which go to prove that Dang district is a Marathi-speaking district and it was included in Maharashtra and so even today it should be included in Maharashtra.

There is another Government Resolution of the Political and Services Department.....

An Hon. Member: Was it after the formation of the Maharashtra Samiti?

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: It was passed in 1949 which reads as follows:

"The language of the people of Dangs District, whether it is Marathi or Gujarati, has been the subject of controversy for some time past. The controversy had become serious since last year when two non-official organisations working in the District for the uplift of the people started opening Marathi and Gujarathi schools according to their own ideas of the language of the people of the District. Government therefore felt it necessary to make careful enquires into the matter on the spot. Investigations recently made in regard to the language, culture, habits, customs etc., of the people of the Dangs District have revealed that they speak a dialect of which the base is essentially Marathi though in villages along the western border of the District the dialect is influenced to a considerable extent by the impact of the Gujarathi language. Government is accordingly pleased to direct in supersession of previous orders on the subject, that the official language of the Dangs District should be Marathi and that in order to avoid any future controversy, the responsibility for imparting primary education in the District should be undertaken by the Government and should be carried out either departmentally or through a Board to be appointed by Government."

This is by order of the Governor of Bombay and is signed by Shri M. D. Bhat. This is another proof.

Then, the Bulsar Taluka Congress Committee had resolved to form a new Bulsar District comprising of certain Talukas. In that connection also I will read out a part of a letter because there is very short time at

my disposal and so I will not read out the whole of it. There you will find that Congress Committee of that Taluka passed a resolution that Dangs should be included in Gujarat. At that time the Commissioner N. D. had written a letter to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Bombay. In conclusion he had said that—

"I am therefore of opinion that the consideration of the proposal may be postponed till the new provinces on linguistic basis are formed as it is proposed to include in the new District. Under such demarcation the three Marathi-speaking areas of Dahanu, Umbargaon and possibly also the Dangs would be included in the new Maharashtra province.

The copy of the resolution is returned herewith."

An Hon. Member: What is the date?

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: It is dated the 4th August, 1948. That has been signed by the Commissioner N.D.

Then you will find that the Bombay Government in their Government Gazette of the 14th September, 1950, published a tentative order to include Dangs in Nasik District forming a part of Maharashtra. The list of the voters of this area was pulished in Marathi and the village records are maintained in Marathi even today. The States Re-organisation Commission appointed by the Government of India in 1956 also suggested the inclusion of the Dangs in Maharashtra. The border question of the States arose after the Commission's report was published. The All India Congress Committee appointed a sub-committee consisting of Sarvashri Jawaharlal Nehru, Govind Ballabh Pant, Dhebar Bhai and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to consider the question of Dangs and submit their findings. This committee has given the decision that the Dangs should be included in

Maharashtra as it forms an integral part of Maharashtra. This decision has been given by a committee appointed by the All India Congress Committee which consisted of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, who is pleased enough to pilot this Bill and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who, of course, unfortunately is not here.

An Hon. Member: He cannot be.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: Then in the year 1956 the draft of the States' Re-organisation Bill and the Joint Committee's proposal had put the Dangs District in Maharashtra. My hon. friend, Shri Bharucha, was kind enough to mention the population of Dangs. So I need not mention that here.

Not only one but I can quote several instances from which you will find that Dangs district was found by several officials and non-officials as well as by the All India Congress committee as part and parcel of Maharashtra. In spite of that it has been included in Gujarat. It is very, very strange. While including Dangs District in Gujarat the lame excuse which has been put forward by our friends is that they won the local board elections. Most respectfully I submit that the local board elections in the Dangs District were not at all contested on the language issue. I have got so many handbills at my disposal—that were published to show that. A president who was elected and while thanking the voters he said, "I am very thankful to you for not making this a language issue when all you people have voted in the local Board election in my favour." So it means that at the time of elections language was not at all the basis. This question of language was not at all there. So that election argument is baseless. On our behalf I say that the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti did not participate in the elections. I further say that, if it is to be taken into consideration that a particular

election was won by a man of a particular community in Dangs district and so it should be included in Gujarat, then may I submit most respectfully that because our non-friend, Shri Assar, who is also a Gujarati, contested a Parliamentary seat from the Ratnagiri District and was elected, because a Gujarati contested the election in Ratnagiri District and got elected does not mean..

Shri P. R. Patel: His was mortgaged to the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: It is not a question of whether a candidate is put up by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti or by the Gujarat Mandal, but it is a question of whether he is a Gujarati or a Maharashtrian. In the case of Dangs you will find that in the elections the Gujaratis have won and so the argument is that it is part and parcel of Gujarat. Can you come forward and say that in Ratnagiri District as Shri Assar has won so it should also be included in Gujarat? That cannot be. Not only that. In several municipalities and gram panchayats you will find that several Gujaratis are elected as Presidents and as members. Then on the basis of those elections can anybody come forward and say that because the elections were won by the Gujaratis it should be included in Gujarat..... (*Interruption*). You will find that the Bombay Corporation Mayor and so many other people are Gujaratis. So no one can demand Bombay to be included in Gujarat.

My hon. friend, Shri Sugandhi, while writing his minute of dissent on this Bill, has said that certain parts of Kanarese-speaking areas which have been included in Maharashtra should be included in Mysore State. I tell this hon. House as well as my hon. friend, Shri Sugandhi, that we have no objection. But let there be some basis. Those parts of Maharashtra which are Kanarese-

[Shri B. K. Gaikwad]

speaking should be included in Mysore, but they should also be prepared to come forward and say that where Marathi is spoken and if that part has been included in Mysore State should be included in Maharashtra. But other hon. Members are not prepared to say that. That is a very unfortunate thing. So whether they say or they do not say, our request is that let there be some basis and some principles. Why did we have this re-organisation of States? The basis for the re-organisation of the States was language. Wherever one language is spoken by majority of the people then that part should be included in that State. So, the tehsils and districts where Marathi is spoken should be included in Maharashtra. Our Government has accepted this principle in respect of several such disputes which arose in the past. Nowhere has it done such injustice. I fail to understand why Government has not applied the same principles here also to Maharashtra.

Now I will turn to the financial arrangements proposed by the Government in this Bill. Much has been said about them. We have no objection to make good the deficit of Gujarat till 1962. Money has been demanded for the development of Saurashtra and Kutch, but Maharashtra State has also to develop areas like Marathwada and Vidarbha. So, we cannot say that because Bombay has a surplus, that should be transferred to Gujarat as if Maharashtra has no needs. That is not the case. Much has to be done in Maharashtra, and if we take that into consideration, you will find that there will be no excess Budget but actually a deficit Budget.

My last point is regarding the Buddhists. Lacks of people, particularly belonging to the Scheduled Castes, have accepted Buddha's faith, and because of that they do not get

certain facilities which they ought to get and which they were getting before when they were Scheduled Castes. We do not say that certain political facilities which were given to the Scheduled Castes, and so we should be given those facilities, but we say that those who have now embraced Buddhism have not ceased to be backward overnight. They are as backward educationally and poor economically as they were when they were Scheduled Caste people. Government always say that they cannot go beyond the scope of the Constitution, but the Constitution itself states that such concessions as are given to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes should also be given to the weaker sections of the country. Which are the weaker sections of the country? In my opinion, the Scheduled Caste people who have embraced Buddhism are the weaker sections of the country, and the concessions given to the Scheduled Caste people should be given to them also.

I must make it clear that we do not demand political reservations. I have said on the floor of the House, and I repeat, that those who have been converted to Buddha's faith do not say that they want reservation of seats in Parliament and the State Assemblies.

The problem of the Buddhists has not been included in the policy statement made by the Chief Minister of Bombay State. This question had not only the support of the Republican Party representatives in the Bombay Assembly, but also of Shri S. M. Joshi and other members of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. They all have agreed, and the Chief Minister also agreed to include it, as you will find from page 375 of the Bombay Legislative Assembly debates. I have no time to read it, otherwise I can quote it. However, it has not been actually included in the policy statement. So,

I request the Government, and particularly the hon. Home Minister who is very sympathetic towards the problems of the downtrodden people, to be kind enough to include it, if not in the Act itself, at least in the policy statement, as agreed to by the Chief Minister of Bombay State himself. I say this because when we demand something, they say that it is not provided for in the Constitution. So, that lame excuse should not be put forth, and this mention should be made somewhere in the Act itself or in the policy statement. So, I request Government to do something in the matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri V. N. Swami.

Shri P. R. Patel: I have submitted a Minute of Dissent. Will I be given a chance to explain my position?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No promise will be given from the Chair. I will keep that also in mind.

Shri P. R. Patel: New points have been made on behalf of Maharashtra. Three Members have spoken. I may also be given some time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are still discussing it. We are having the debate, it has not ended.

Shri V. N. Swami (Chanda): It is not my desire at all to rake up the vexed question of a separate Vidarbha State, but as stated by the hon. Member from Nagpur when the Bill was referred to the Joint Committee, there is strong resentment to the tacking of Vidarbha to Maharashtra. This is more so in the case of the four districts which are called the Nag districts.

As my hon. friend Shri Gohokar has just pointed out, the law in these four districts has always been Mitakshara of the Banaras school, whereas in the other four districts of Berar, called old Vidarbha, the law is Mitakshara

as controlled by the Mayukha of the Bombay school.

So, the position is that so far as these four districts are concerned, even formerly they were part of the old Central Provinces, whereas the other four districts constituting Vidarbha proper, were a part of Berar, and in fact they belonged to Hyderabad State and were only ruled by the British by virtue of an agreement with the Nizam.

So, at least so far as these four districts are concerned, there has been some resentment, and this cannot be gainsaid, but the question of Vidarbha is now neither here nor there. It is so clear that the question of Vidarbha was not mooted in the Joint Committee. There is no amendment at this stage. So, whether there should be Vidarbha or not is altogether a matter beyond the jurisdiction of this House at present.

I am only concerned with one thing. The Chief Minister of Bombay and the hon. Home Minister have been at pains to give us the assurance that the interests of Vidarbha will be perfectly safe in Maharashtra. Had they merely stated that, we would have been very happy to be with Maharashtra than have a separate Vidarbha, and we might have tried to argue with them, but they have also assured us that it is in the interests of the country that Vidarbha should merge itself with Maharashtra. It is in that spirit that we accepted it. I have therefore to appeal to them that the assurances which have been given should all be implemented, particularly in respect of these four districts.

As my hon. friend Shri K. G. Deshmukh has shown, at the time of the States reorganisation and before that the figures show that the eight districts were surplus, whereas my friends now say that the eight districts are deficit. How is it that after development, these eight districts which were surplus have developed

[Shri V. N. Swami]

into deficit districts? It is because, as has been justly complained by the eight districts in the context of the old Madhya Pradesh Government, the Hindi-speaking people were neglecting these eight Marathi districts. And later on having been joined to a bilingual State it has been the complaint of the four districts that they did not receive a fair share of development. That is why, as my hon. friend quoted from a pamphlet which Shri Kazi, one of the Ministers of the Bombay State has published, we find now that they are deficit. It is, therefore, my humble request both to the Chief Minister of Bombay and also to the hon. Home Minister that the interests of these people should be safeguarded.

Politically, the position has become like this. We who represent all those four districts are at a great disadvantage. We were returned to this Parliament after pledging our faith to the bilingual Bombay State and my hon. friends on the other side were freely abusing us saying that the bilingual State is going to fail and they were preaching for Samyukta Maharashtra. Now, we are facing the electorate. The people say, "Look, you have given us false promise." I, therefore, appeal on behalf of the representatives of these areas to the hon. Home Minister that our position may be taken into account and the assurances which were given are implemented at all possible levels. It is very easy to give assurances. Of course, I do not mean to say that these assurances were lightly given. They were given with good intention. But the difficulty always comes at the stage of implementation. The implementation takes place both at the secretariat level and also at the district level. If there is a feeling of any superiority complex among the officers who come from Bombay side and particularly from these four districts, naturally they come in the way of what is called emotional integration. I, therefore, appeal to the Government that particular steps should be taken to see that the fears in Vidarbha are allay-

ed particularly because we are denying to them what even the States Reorganisation Commission was pleased to concede to them.

Now, I will take up with your kind permission the question of the High Court. I have tabled some amendments in the matter of clause 41 of the Bill as amended. But it is not my purpose to press those amendments. It was only my intention to bring to the notice of the hon. Home Minister some difficulties about clause 41. What has happened all along is that we had a full-fledged High Court from 1930. For 25 years the High Court was functioning and before that there was a judicial commissioner's court for at least 15 years which also used to exercise full powers. There has, therefore, developed a very strong Bar in Nagpur which has produced many great jurists and judges also of great repute like Dr. Hari Singh Gour, Shri B. P. Sinha, Justice Hidayatalla and Justice Vivian Bose who have adorned the Bench of the Supreme Court. Even my hon. friend Shri Hajarnavis, the Deputy Law Minister comes from Nagpur. So, it has produced very good lawyers and judges. There has been a High Court all these days. As against this background before the clause 41 was introduced in this Bill, the position was that there was no permanent Bench at Nagpur. We had, therefore, by compulsion to go to Bombay. The difficulty at Bombay is that there is a dual system. The dual system of solicitors and advocates prevailing in Bombay is so costly that—I have been at the Bar for the last about 30 years and I have got an experience that out of the cases which have gone to Bombay there have been at least half the litigants from our area—that they had to abandon the cases owing to the extravagant cost, the bills which the solicitors always want to put. This is the position in Bombay. We had always clamoured for a permanent Bench at Nagpur and I am very thankful to the hon. the Chief Minister of the Bombay State and also the

hon. Home Minister for kindly providing for a permanent Bench at Nagpur. For the last three years I may tell the hon. Minister—and I say with good authority—how the Bench at Nagpur has been functioning. The judges who used to come for two or three months were always very anxious to get away as they could not bear with the inclement climate of Nagpur. They always wanted to get back to Bombay as early as possible. Scare has been created into the mind of the litigant public by too many dismissals at the admission stage. There were no doubt four judges, but on the admission date there used to be too many cases of admissions. The result was that both the litigants and the lawyers began to feel that this Bench was going to be abolished. That is why the pressure was brought upon the Joint Committee to accept the position of statutorily providing a permanent Bench at Nagpur.

But I beg the hon. Minister to bear with me when I wish to point out, as the clause now stands, that there is a likelihood of there being some misunderstanding or misapplication and I would request him to kindly make the position clear in the application of clause 41. The clause 41, as it stands, reads:

“Without prejudice to the provisions of section 51 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, such Judges of the High Court at Bombay, being not less than three in number, as the Chief Justice may, from time to time nominate, shall sit at Nagpur in order to exercise the jurisdiction and power for the time being vested in that High Court in respect of cases arising in the districts of Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara, Chanda and Rajpura:

Provided that the Chief Justice may, in his discretion, order that any case arising in any

such district shall be heard at Bombay.”

Sir, the first thing is that there should be the minimum of three Judges. Though I have given an amendment that the number of Judges should be increased to four, on further considerations I have come to see that it is a case of the minimum which will be good not only in the interests of the High Court but also of the State. The minimum should be prescribed so that there may not be any wasteful expenditure when the quantity of work does not justify. But the position is this. I am unable to appreciate the opening sentence of the clause 41. It says: “Without prejudice to provisions of section 51 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.” A perusal of section 51 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 will show that the legislature has conferred powers on the President, that is, the Executive to establish a Bench. So, if the legislature has conferred powers on the Executive to constitute a Bench, by virtue of the well-known interpretation of the Act, it is open to the Executive to revoke the Bench also at any time. So, under clause 41 if really the legislature wants to have a permanent Bench and wants to allay the fears of the litigant public, then I would humbly appeal to the hon. Home Minister to consider whether it would be proper to say: “Without prejudice to the provisions of section 51 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956”, or whether it would be more appropriate to say: “Notwithstanding the provisions of section 51 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956.”

Actually I have given an amendment in respect of this clause in three respects. But the Order Paper as printed does not do justice to the proposal which I have made. It only mentions that I have asked for an amendment in respect of an increase in the number of Judges from three to four, whereas about this aspect of the matter also I have specifically

[Shri V. N. Swami]

made a mention. I would request the hon. Home Minister to clarify this point.

Then, there is a proviso to this clause 41 which says: "Provided that the Chief Justice may, in his discretion, order that any case arising in any such district shall be heard at Bombay." Sir, the Chief Justice has undoubtedly that power even now. By having this proviso here, I would only ask the hon. Minister as to whether it is the intention that the income tax cases are not to be heard at Nagpur. Actually, litigants are from Nagpur, the assessment takes place at Nagpur, the records in respect of the assessments are at Nagpur and the Advocate General's office is also at Nagpur. It is merely for the sake of hearing the cases that the litigants have to face the ordeal of going to Bombay. This is what the learned Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court has been doing. I would, therefore, ask the hon. Minister whether by providing this proviso, an unfettered power to the Chief Justice, it is meant that only in the cases of constitutional importance such as cannot be disposed of by three or four Judges who may be functioning at Nagpur it may be necessary to constitute a full Bench of five or seven Judges. In that case certainly it will not be possible to have a hearing at Nagpur. I would only request the hon. Home Minister to enlighten us whether it is not the intention that ordinarily all types of cases which arise from these districts shall be heard at Nagpur and it is only those cases which are of exceptional importance that require the attention of a larger Bench will be heard at Bombay. This is another request, and it is for that purpose that I have also said that should be an amendment to the effect that all cases shall be heard there.

Of course, the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee is certainly a very great improvement. This Bill has tried to compromise so many conflicting claims. In a case of

linguistic reorganisation, it is impossible to come to any definite boundary where one language ends and another language begins. Even in the so-called Vidarbha areas, we have got certain areas where Telugu is spoken, but it is impossible for them to go to a Telugu State, they have to be here. So, when delimiting a new place, naturally, some areas will have to be in one State or the other, and, therefore, some kind of agreement is necessary.

As we are embarking on these new States, and we hope, and we want, to part as very good friends, I feel that this controversy about the ordinary small matters of State adjustments should not mar the spirit of the partition which is now being made. Therefore, I appeal to my hon. friends that these questions need not take us long. The only point is that two States are to come. It is now expected that these States will function very happily. Let us, therefore, request Government to see that these two States live happily and there will not be further bickerings which would mean that these matters would be reopened once again and people would be uncertain as to where they stand. It is because of these things that the linguistic position has proved to be very doubtful. At the time the Act of 1956 was passed, when Bombay was made a bilingual State, we hoped that we would be forming more multilingual and bilingual States. But, now, we find that that hope has been belied, so far the people are concerned, and there have been fissiparous tendencies. Those fissiparous tendencies should, therefore, be checked.

I, therefore, appeal to the Home Minister that apart from whatever may be actually enacted, the whole thing should be done in such a way that no injustice is done to any of the conflicting claims of the people who are involved in this historic legislation.

Shri P. R. Patel: I feel that the major feature of this Bill is the mand-

festation or the acceptance of the victory of the people and of democracy. In 1956, Maharashtra as well as Gujarat were to have two separate States, but because something happened in August, 1956, the bilingual State of Bombay came into being. That was the decision of Parliament, and, thereafter, the people continuously demanded two separate States. By this Bill, we are accepting that demand, and I think, it is, therefore, a success of democracy; and we are revising a decision of Parliament.

If at the time of the division of the bilingual State, the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis separate as brothers with goodwill, it would be a very good thing. The nine-man committee has devoted its labours to that end. The Congress Working Committee also made efforts in that direction. The Chief Minister of Bombay and the would be Chief Minister of Gujarat also put their heads together to come to an agreement. After all, it is a happy thing that these disputed matters have been agreed upon by the different parties.

Shri Balasaheb Patil (Miraj): Different parties? It went to one party only.

Shri P. R. Patel: It went to the Bombay Assembly and the Bombay Council; it seems they unanimously accepted the agreement between the two groups.

Now, certain questions are raised, naturally. If my hon. friends of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti did not raise the questions they have raised today, I think they would be jeopardising their very existence.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: What about the hon. Member?

Shri P. R. Patel: We have to do it, but in the interests of the country, I, for one, would desire that there should be the least bitterness on the point.

I am obliged to answer certain questions raised by my hon. friends.

The first question that was raised was this. Why should Maharashtra give any amount at all to meet the deficit of the Gujarat State? I am rather astonished to find these questions being raised by my Maharashtrian friends of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti.

On the 5th November, 1957, there was an agreement after a talk between the leaders of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and the Janta Parishad. The first clause of that agreement reads:

"In the perspective of development of both the States, the problem of viability will be studied. It is suggested by some people that Maha Gujarat State might find it difficult to balance its budget when the Bombay city is included in Samyukta Maharashtra. Therefore, it is proposed that the leadership of both the States will jointly study the problem in the new set-up and the Maharashtra State will find resources to help the sister State of Maha Gujarat to balance its budget during the initial budgetary difficulties."

When this agreement has been arrived at, is it proper for the Maharashtrian friends on this side of the House to say that no help be given to the Gujarat State by the Maharashtra State?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Who said that?

Shri P. R. Patel: They cannot positively say that they do not want to give. But what they say is that it was only for two years that it was to be given. There is no mention of two years or ten years or 20 years in this agreement, and no amount is fixed either. Naturally, this point was referred to.....

Shri Balasaheb Patil: To Shri G. B. Pant.

Shri P. R. Patel:the expert committee of Shri Raghavachari, and

[Shri P. R. Patel]

the committee came to certain conclusions.

Shri Goray: Not Shri Raghavachari, but Shri Rangachari.

Shri P. R. Patel: Then, it was referred to Shri Bhattacharya and Shri Rangachari.

Shri Goray: Anyway, Shri Raghavachari was not there.

Shri P. R. Patel: They came to this conclusion. The expert opinion is, therefore, there. In the light of this, if the Ministers and prominent persons of the two States came to certain conclusions, why should that be grugged? I do not understand.

My hon. friend here asks why Rs. 10 crores should be given to the Gujarat State for its new capital. I think my Maharashtra friends of the Samukta Maharashtra Samiti do not read properly. If they have gone through the report of the Wanchoo Committee, they will find these things there. At the time of the bifurcation of the Madras and Andhra States, the Wanchoo Committee had been appointed, and that committee decided to give about Rs. 2 to 3 crores for the construction of a new capital.....

Shri Balasheeb Patil: From what?

15 hrs.

Shri P. R. Patel: They decided to give Rs. 230.4 lakhs from the treasury of the Madras State to the Andhra State after bifurcation. But today the amount of Rs. 10 crores is to come from the assets of the present Bombay State. Maharashtra has to contribute between Rs. 6-7 crores. So the amount is not much. We have got the experience of Bhopal and Chandigarh, as to how much money is required for building a capital. We are not going to spend to that extent. We shall just see that we accommodate ourselves with Rs. 10 crores. We may have to spend Rs. 2 crores or

Rs. 5 crores more. But I do not understand why this should be objected to when the promise was given by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti that whatever be the deficit in the initial stages would be met by them. I would like to know from them whether the building of the capital is a necessity or not, and to that extent there would be a deficit in the revenue account or not. Wherefrom is Gujarat to find this money for the construction of the capital? It must be from revenue, and whatever be the deficit in the revenue account was to be paid by the Government of Maharashtra according to the promise that was given. Why should they object to this? Yes, they have to object because they have to go to the people in Maharashtra. It is not for any other purpose that they are objecting. When they go to the people, they will say, 'We tried our level best. But what can we do? We opposed this. But after all, the majority of opinion was against us. What can we do?'

Then certain observations have been made regarding the boundaries. I would not have referred to the boundaries question. But they said that some villages of Umbergaon taluk are given to Gujarat. Let us see what is the reality. I would request the hon. House to see certain figures. In 1941.....

Shri Parulekar: What about 1951?

Shri P. R. Patel: I will come to 1951 also. Let my hon. friend not be in a hurry.

In 1941, the population of the Umbergaon taluk was 92,164. Out of this total population, the Gujaratis were 48,009, Warlis 38,170 and Marathis 3,497.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: Come to Dangs also.

Shri P. R. Patel: I will come to Dangs. Let my hon. friend not be in haste.

In that taluk, out of a total population of 92,000 persons, the Marathi-speaking people were only 3,400. On this basis, how could they claim the Umbergaon taluk for themselves? In reality, if justice is to be done to Gujarat, the whole of Umbergaon taluk should be given to Gujarat. But only some villages are given. My Maharashtrian friends should not have grudged on that score. But, after all, they have to grudge it. In order to establish their claims to Umbergaon, they are talking of Bansda and Dharampur. Bansda and Dharampur had been for centuries—not 100 or 200 years—in Gujarat. It had nothing to do with Maharashtra.

Shri Assar: The same thing about Umbergaon also.

Shri P. R. Patel: They are talking of Bansda to establish their claim on Umbergaon.

Regarding Umbergaon, let me remind my hon. friends about one thing. I have learnt geography. When I was in primary school, the geography of Gujarat was taught to me. The Thana district was in Gujarat. It was only recently for administrative purposes that it was put in a certain region.

Shri Parulekar: Wrong geography has been taught.

Shri P. R. Patel: Everything is wrong to my Maharashtrian friends to my right.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It must be like the Chinese maps.

Shri P. R. Patel: The authority of opinions expressed by linguistic experts like Save and others, even Grierson, is, discounted. My hon. friend, Shri Parulekar, was pleased to discard the opinion given by others and to say, 'Mine is the best opinion'.

If that is the authority, then we have to discard the opinion of Grierson!

Years ago, before the movement for Samyukta Maharashtra started, Grierson wrote that the Warli language, the Dangi language and the Ahirani language of West Khandesh are all Gujarati. Maharashtrian scholars also supported this. Now, these friends have woken up. It was a most unfortunate day for the country in 1946 when they established some organisation like Samyukta Parishad or Samyukta Samiti or Samyukta Maharashtra—I do not remember it well—wherein great nationalists of the country, even men like Deo, put their heads together. The disease permeated them to such an extent that the great sons of Maharashtra, for whom we have respect, were forgetting everything when the question of Maharashtra came up. Let us be fair. I would submit that in fairness, not only Umbergaon, but, according to the opinion expressed by Shri Save, who has worked as a *prant* officer in that area for more than 8 years, Dahanu also should be included in Gujarat.

An Hon. Member: Why not Poona also?

Shri P. R. Patel: I will have Poona, but without Shri Khadiilkar.

My hon. friends are talking of some villages which would be submerged because of the Ukai project. It is a small area. Naturally, we must have some projects here and there. It is for the development of the country that Gujarat is going to spend some Rs. 60 crores on the project. If they cannot take advantage of this project, would they, the Gujaratis specially, waste money?

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: We have got the experience of Kakrapara. From Rs. 6 crores, it had gone to Rs. 13 crores and now to Rs. 29 crores.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shall I allow speeches to be delivered simultaneously here?

Shri P. R. Patel: When there is no reasoning, naturally heat comes. I find heat on this side because they see that arguments are against them and reason is against them.

15.09 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

I will give some figures regarding West Khandesh. Of the total population of the six talukas, Navapur, Nandarbar, Akkalkuva, Akrani, Shahada and Taloda, which comes to 5,41,088, the Bhili population is 3,20,980 and the Marathi population is 1,38,869, less than 25 per cent. So the question is only about the Bhili language. All experts have unanimously come to the conclusion that the Bhili language is a Gujarati language. Even Grierson and others, one and all, have opined that the Bhili language is a Gujarati language.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: It is a dialect and not a language.

Shri P. R. Patel: It is a language akin to Gujarati.

Sir, the Maharashtra Parishad appointed one Shri Kulkarni to enquire into this language question and he gave his report in 1938. He said:

"Dr. Grierson, a linguist was appointed to undertake the linguistic survey. The work done by this officer reveals that he carried out the duties efficiently.....The linguist critically analysed the differences between the dialects of Marathi.....The dialect spoken in West and East Khadesh, North Nasik, Southern part of the basin of Tapti etc., particularly the dialect spoken by illiterate villagers of these areas, contains many elements of Gujarati. Dr. Grierson, therefore, came to the conclusion that the particular dialect was a species of Gujarati and not Marathi; and he included them in his volume not under Marathi but under Gujarati. This dialect is known as *Ahirani*.

People speaking this dialect have been enumerated as Gujaratis. The Census of 1911, 1921 and 1931 counted the *Ahirani* speaking people as Gujaratis and the number of Marathi speaking people was proportionately reduced. This matter therefore, needs reconsideration."

This was the report of the Marathi scholar in 1938. So, naturally, these people, whatever dialects were spoken, were Gujaratis. It is admitted by Grierson also; it is supported by the Census reports also.

As I said earlier, the unfortunate thing in the country was that in 1946 the Sanyukta Maharashtra movement started and they wanted to have everything, to gulp everything all borders whether they be Gujarati borders or Mysorean borders. They wanted everything (*Interruptions*). And, if this tendency goes on, it is not good for the country. And, I think rightly, there had been an agreement by the two prominent persons, one of Bombay Shri Chavan and the other of Gujarat Shri Jivaraj and also the nine-men committee. They have laboured and have come to a decision. In fairness we must accept it. I would desire that we must accept the Bill without any opposition. But when arguments have come from the other side I have to reply.

Much has been made of Dangs. I would refer to some lines from the memorandum.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude.

Shri P. R. Patel: Two minutes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I will give him one minute.

Shri P. R. Patel: I am the only man from the Gujarat side.

Shri Khadilkar: From that side so many have spoken.

Shri P. R. Patel: I have to reply to 4 friends.

Mr. Speaker: I have agreed to call the hon. Minister to reply at 3.15.

Shri P. R. Patel: I will finish within 2 minutes, Sir. As far as Dangs is concerned I need not go to details of all these things because I have said in my note of dissent. But I will read only some lines regarding the language and all these things from the memorandum. In paragraph 189 of the memorandum submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission by the Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee, it is said:

"Khandeshi has hitherto been classed as a form of Marathi. The ensuing pages will, however, show, on the one side, that the so-called Bhili dialect gradually merges into the language of Khandeshi, on the other hand, that Khandeshi itself is not a Marathi dialect. Several suffixes are identical with those used in Marathi. But most of the suffixes, which are inner form of the language, closely agree with Gujarati and Rajasthani. The same statement applies to Dangi also."

Then, in paragraph 190, it is said:

"Selections from the records of the Bombay Government, New Series, Vol. No. XXVI mention about the language of Dangs as follows: "The language a mixture of Guzerathee and Hindustani (Dang Garvee), the language a mixture of Guzerathee and Hindustani (Dang-Wassoorna, Amellee)".

So, these are the opinions. Now when the thing is clear that Dangi is Gujarati and when it is agreed that 96 per cent. of the people living there are Dangs, what right have my friends to say that they are Marathi-speaking? (*Interruptions*). My friend Shri Bharucha says that 96 per cent. there are now Dangi-speaking people.

Much has been made of the delimitation of constituencies. It was only for election purposes. And, that is very clear, from Government records. At the time of the delimitation of constituencies for the last General Election, the Bombay Government proposed that the Dangs should be placed with Surat district. The Election Commissioner also held on merits that it should form part of a Gujarat constituency; the Government of India supported it. In view of the insistence of the representatives from Maharashtra in Parliament, however, the matter was referred to a committee of three Members of Parliament which held that, only for the purpose of election and without prejudice to the question of its ultimate merger in one or the other State when the Bombay State is reorganised, Dangs should be associated with the constituency of Surgana-Peinth-Dindori. It was only for this purpose.

So, to make most of this delimitation is too much. You will see from this that in reality, if at all any justice is to be done to Gujarat, I would submit West Khandesh as a whole, without a village here or there—I say the 6 talukas, Umergaon and Dangs should, naturally, go to Gujarat. (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: Take the whole of it.

Shri P. R. Patel: I would have said much but as you have reduced my time to two minutes I will sit down.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who took part in the debate from both sides. I am also happy that all of them, as also those who wrote the dissenting minutes to the Joint Committee's report, have accepted the position that a great event is happening in the life of the Bombay State and that two brothers, the illustrious brothers, the Gujarati people and the Marathi people, have to part in the best of spirits, with the greatest of goodwill. It is under these circum-

[Shri Datar]

stances that this Bill has been brought forward.

Some hon. Members suggested that it was a vindication of what they call a certain agitation. I may point out here, as the Home Minister has already made it clear, that this House was anxious that there ought to be a bilingual State. And, the Government gracefully yielded to the desire of a large number of Members of this House and the other for having a bilingual State in the hope that thereby the best of relations would be continued and the great tradition of Bombay enhanced to the fullest extent. But, when it was found that it was not possible, then, naturally, the realistic course that had to be taken was the one on which the present Bill has been based.

You are aware that the Chief Minister of Bombay and the Finance Minister of Bombay came to the conclusion that it was inevitable to separate, though this separation was to be with best of spirit and by maintaining the highest of good will. In these circumstances, preliminaries were gone through. I would not like to mention the various stages through which the preliminaries were taken. But I would like to mention here the fact that the Chief Minister of the Bombay State and Dr. Jivraj Mehta did their best and with the goodwill of certain organisations and naturally the Home Minister and others this particular Bill was properly framed and sent to the Bombay Legislature. Eleven amendments were suggested there and we have accepted all those amendments. At present, we have got the happy position of the complete unanimity of the Bombay Legislature behind the present Bill and we have also the largest measure of support from the Joint Committee. It was true that they had to finish this work as early as possible but still as the hon. Home Minister has pointed out, fullest attention was given to the principle as also the details of this Bill. We have, as I said, the largest

measure of support from the hon. Members of the Joint Committee of the two Houses. In these circumstances, here we have a Bill which has almost the unanimous support, except that of a few hon. Members here and there, so far as the principles and the details of the Bill are concerned. When we have such a large measure of agreement, it bodes very well so far as the two future States of Maharashtra and Gujarat are concerned. So, all of us have to see to it that the two States are ushered into existence in an atmosphere of cordiality and goodwill. In these circumstances, it may not be necessary for me to make a reference to some of the points that the hon. Members have raised. All the same, I should like to touch upon them only to the extent possible without desiring to raise any controversies.

Shri Nathwani expressed a very important view that on the eve of the formation of the two States, we must strive to do it with the utmost goodwill. Let us not stir the dying embers of controversy that were before us for some years past. Small differences or points of disagreement between certain members of one group and the other ought not to be magnified. We are all anxious that these two new States which have a great and brilliant past ought to be formed with the greatest of goodwill. Let us not look at these minor points for the purpose, as he stated, of keeping alive the agitation for the next general elections. I am confident that it is not the view of any person. All of us have to work for the good of the whole country including such great parts as Maharashtra and Gujarat. In these circumstances, as Shri Nathwani rightly pointed out, all of us have to be not merely statesmen but have to be patriots for the purpose of the next generation, which requires all our efforts. Therefore, the two States have to be developed to the fullest extent because both are sister States and both are the proud parts of the great Indian nation to which all of us belong. In these circumstances, I

would request all the hon. Members not to lay too great an emphasis on the points of difference that might be made here. These are human attempts and they are bound to be imperfect to a certain extent. But the principle behind them is agreement—unanimous agreement of the Bombay Assembly and also the almost unanimous agreement of the hon. Members of the Joint Committee. These two great factors have to be weighed against the few inconveniences and disadvantages here and there. Therefore, all the hon. Members and the country outside would be happy if the two States come into existence and carry on their work as sister States with the fullest co-operation and help, with the fullest moral help in particular.

Two or three points were urged very strongly. One was regarding the boundaries. As the hon. Home Minister has pointed out on more than one occasion, after the re-formation of the States under the States Reorganisation Act, what is essential is the creation or fostering of goodwill and the arriving at of agreements under the influence of the goodwill. For this reason, in this case, if certain criteria have to be followed, it is quite likely that they may not satisfy the rigid or technical basis of certain criteria. The criteria were laid down by the S.R.C. The Parliament discussed the whole matter and all the States in India, to the largest extent possible, were re-organised on certain principles subject to certain agreements found therein. Here in this case, we have the instance, a very glorious instance of what can be called an agreement. That agreement should not be made referable or made to depend upon certain principles. The principle was the principle of proceeding with the greatest goodwill. So, the whole question has to be approached in this spirit. About Dangs also, it applies. I would not like to go into the controversy. The two bodies which were trying to bring about an agreement—non-official bodies also—felt that the question of Dangs ought to be re-examined. Some reference was made to certain deci-

sions but the two bodies to which a number of hon. Members belong felt that the question of Dangs ought to be re-examined. If it requires re-examination, naturally other results have to follow, the implication being that after re-examination some arrangement of an acceptable nature to both parties should be arrived at. From the resolutions passed at their meetings, it becomes clear that Dangs stood by itself and had to be examined on its own merits. It was further said that in respect of the other areas, what was popularly called the Pataskar formula was to be applied. But in substance, it is agreement between the two States of Madras and Andhra. They agreed upon certain criteria or principles. Those principles were ultimately left to Shri Pataskar to work out. It is for this purpose that they made a distinction. The Samiti and the Parishad—the two bodies—felt that the question of Dangs was a separate question by itself and in respect of the other areas, what is called the Pataskar formula was to be followed. These were the normal principles that have to be followed. But when we have to come to a general agreement, not necessarily referable to certain principles, they have a greater sanctity. Those of the hon. Members who are lawyers will be aware of, what is known as, the family arrangement or family agreement. A family agreement is one which is come to by the members of a joint family after complete agreement. That agreement need not be made referable to certain principles of law, in this case, certain criteria. It is under such circumstances that the whole question was considered and the two leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat came to a conclusion that certain areas should be transferred to Gujarat and certain areas should remain in Maharashtra. This is so far as Dangs is concerned.

In respect of Ukai also, may I point out, the question of Ukai Project has been before the country from 1948 onwards. Therefore, it would not be proper to say, in the first instance, that it would not be a feasible pro-

[Shri Datar]

position, that there are technical difficulties in the way and that, therefore, it should not be taken as the basis for any agreement. Ukai is a great project and there is no reason why that project should not be implemented, should not be executed as early as possible. It was common ground that Gujarat was going to be a deficit State. If we read the correspondence or the resolutions passed by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Parishad, we will find that they also assumed that the new State of Gujarat is bound to be a deficit State. Taking all these things into consideration, therefore, they came to the conclusion that Ukai was a project which had got to be developed.

Incidentally, it was suggested by certain hon. Members that oil was likely to be found to a certain extent and on that account, they said, this particular project should not be executed and it would not be required by Gujarat. That is not a correct position at all.

Therefore, if under an *ad hoc* arrangement it was considered that a certain batch of villages should be transferred because they were likely to be submerged in the irrigation scheme and it was necessary to create a two-mile belt—we know that such belts are necessary because of the natural difficulties—that is no reason why we should call in question the principle on which these villages were transferred.

So far as Umbergaon is concerned, we need not enter into the question very meticulously as my hon. friend, Shri Patel has done, whether the tribal language of the Warlis or other tribal people was allied more to Gujarati or to Marathi. Naturally, in all these border areas, especially amongst the tribals, it may be found that there are affinities in the languages that are spoken in a particular locality. Therefore, without going into the question with a view to decide

whether the Warli language or other tribal language is allied more to Gujarati or Marathi, it was considered that in respect of Umbergaon Taluka certain villages should be retained in Maharashtra and others should be handed over to Gujarat. Therefore, in respect of all these three points it was considered that an arrangement based on agreement should be accepted by all.

Then, some hon. Members brought in the question of financial re-adjustments, and one hon. Member suggested that so far as Bombay was concerned,—Bombay town is naturally a surplus area and Gujarat is bound to be a deficit area—it was suggested rather uncharitably, that Bombay was to be purchased by Maharashtra by paying a large amount in terms of cost. That is not a proper approach. So far as Bombay City is concerned the fact remains that had this bilingual State continued as it is, the surplus of Bombay would have been available not only for Maharashtra but Gujarat as well.

Now, I will not go into the population figures, roughly it will be about two-third belonging to Maharashtra and one-third to Gujarat. But in all these cases, as the House is aware, the amounts are only spent by the Centre or by the State on areas which are less developed, which are more backward. Therefore, had the bilingual State continued Gujarat would have been in a position to derive greater benefit from Bombay City's surplus as well. This factor has to be taken into account. And, as we know, whenever there is a separation in a joint family then, naturally, we have to take into account not only the things as they are but we have to take into account the future contingencies also. Here, by the formation of the two States, let us take into account this circumstance, when Gujarat State is formed it will require money for its capital and it will require money for meeting its deficit. Therefore, it is against the overall view of the whole affair that certain

monies were allotted from the Maharashtra State to the Gujarat State.

I may also point out, Sir, that ten years cannot be called a long period at all. A State which starts with a deficit cannot be developed only in two years. The Samiti and the Parishad did not mention the number of years. It was contended on the floor of this House that it ought to be only for two years. I am afraid, Sir, two years would be too inadequate a period for bringing a normal development to a new State which, it is admitted, will be a deficit State. It was under these circumstances that experts advised and both the leaders and the nine-man committee, and now the Bombay Legislature have come to the view that certain financial arrangements ought to be accepted.

Then, it was uncharitably suggested that the deficit of Saurashtra and Kutch was being transferred to Bombay or Maharashtra. That is not correct at all. When the various States in the present Saurashtra area came to be formed into a union under the Centre, naturally, certain agreements had been entered into. Therefore, for certain years a certain amount was being given to Saurashtra. But that amount also has now been stopped. It should be clearly understood that nothing is to be given either to Gujarat or to Bombay because that *ad hoc* arrangement has already come to an end.

So far as Kutch is concerned, you are aware that Kutch was a Part C State. When it was a Part C State, naturally, the Government of India had to bear all the expenditure wherever it was necessary for its development. The Centre had to meet even the deficit. That arrangement also has stopped in 1956 under the States Reorganisation Act when Kutch was transferred to or merged in the Bombay State. After that the Centre ceased to give anything because it did not become a territory like the other territories but became an organic part of the Bombay State.

Therefore, these two analogies, I may point out, are not proper, they are not relevant in this case. I am, therefore, of the view that let us forget all these things, whatever has happened. After all, what is most important is the treasure of goodwill, and I am looking forward to these two great peoples of India, the Gujaratis as also the Maharashtrians, who have a great history, who have a name in Indian History—they were together for a number of years, now they are separated but still they are neighbours and they belong to sister States—to serve the Indian nation by developing their respective States to the fullest extent possible by maintaining the all-India attitude of complete nationalism. We have a common citizenship. It is only for the purpose of development, in the interest of the whole of India, that these States have been formed or are going to be formed into separate administrations. They do not in any way separate from the other organically. All of us have to develop and all of us have to serve the poorest of the poor and the lowliest of the low. That is the ideal for the fulfilment of which we are trying our best, and we are trying to do everything for a proper development of the country. Under these circumstances, I am confident that the whole House will agree in accepting the motion for consideration of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration”.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: There are nearly 100 clauses in the Bill and amendments have been tabled by 19 Members. Some of the Members have

[Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav]

spoken at the time when the motion for consideration was taken. It will be better if you kindly allow hon. Members to make their observations on all the amendments at a time so that the Member concerned will get an opportunity to speak on the Bill as a whole.

Shri Khadilkar: It will save time if we are allowed to make our observations on all the amendments put together. Then, later on, the hon. Home Minister may reply to them.

Mr. Speaker: What I find is, there are a few amendments to clause 2. Most of the other amendments are concentrated on clause 3. Taking up all the amendments together will not mean anything. Let us follow the old procedure.

Clause 2.—(Definitions).

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 7, for "1st day of May, 1960" substitute "27th day of April, 1960." (1)

Page 2, line 2 and wherever it occurs in the Bill—

for "Gujarat" substitute "Maharashtra." (76)

Shri Sugandhi (Bijapur North): I beg to move:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2 and wherever it occurs in the Bill—

for "State of Maharashtra" substitute "State of Maratha." (17)

Shri M. B. Thakore (Patan): I beg to move:

Page 2, line 2 and wherever it occurs in the Bill—

for "Gujarat" substitute "Gurjar Desh." (96)

Mr. Speaker: Amendment Nos. 1 and 19 are the same, and amendments Nos. 76 and 95 are the same.

Shri Datar: Which are the amendments to clause 2, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: The amendments are 1, 17, 76 and 96. Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav.

श्री यादव नारायण जाधव : जो मैंने एमेंडमट्स आपके सामने रखी हैं, उनके बारे में मैं कुछ अपने विचार भी रखना चाहता हूँ। जब यह बिल बम्बई प्रसिम्बली के सामने पेश हुआ तो कहा गया था कि पहली अप्रैल को गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र की दो नई स्टेट्स बनें। यही नहीं वहाँ यह भी कहा गया है कि २७ मार्च को जिस दिन कि हिन्दू मजहब का नया साल आता है, वर्ष प्रतिपदा जिसको हम कहते हैं, उस दिन नये राज्य बनें, ऐसी भावना भी वहाँ व्यक्त की गई। उसके बाद जब कुछ मुश्किलों के सामने आईं तो यह कहा गया कि पहली मई को ये दो नये राज्य अस्तित्व में आयें। लेकिन बम्बई प्रसिम्बली में बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों का यह मांग थी कि २७ अप्रैल को ये राज्य बनें क्योंकि महाराष्ट्र के एक बहुत बड़े लीडर छत्रपति शिवाजी महाराज का वह जन्म दिन है। शिवाजी महाराज को तो युग पुरुष कहा जाना चाहिये क्योंकि उन्होंने महाराष्ट्र को इज्जत बखशी है। इस वास्ते २७ अप्रैल को महाराष्ट्र का नया राज्य बन सकता है, तो बहुत अच्छा होगा। इस भावना को बम्बई के जो चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं, उन्होंने भी माना है। मैं आपको यह भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि २७ अप्रैल को बम्बई की तरफ से महाराष्ट्र में यह उत्सव भी मनाया जाने वाला है और यह उत्सव नया महाराष्ट्र राज्य जो बन रहा है, उसी के मिलमिले में है। इस वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि अच्छा होता कि २७ अप्रैल को ही ये जो राज्य बनने वाले हैं, बनते और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस पर विचार किया जायेगा और कोशिश की जायेगी कि इस तारीख को ये राज्य अस्तित्व में आयें।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरे राज्य का नाम जो गुजरात राज्य र स

जायेगा, उसको न रख कर महा-गुजरात रखा जाये। इसके पीछे बहुत बड़ी भावना है। आप को मालूम होगा कि सौराष्ट्र की जब अलग अलग स्टेट्स थीं और १९४८ में जब उन सबको इकट्ठा किया गया, तो सौराष्ट्र का उद्घाटन करते हुये हमारे देश के एक महान् नेता सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल ने, जिन का देश को आजाद कराने में बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा था, कहा था कि सौराष्ट्र के बन जाने से एक जो स्वप्न था, वह तो पूरा हुआ लेकिन जो मेरा दूसरा स्वप्न है कि महा-गुजरात बनना चाहिये, वह अभी पूरा नहीं हुआ है और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि वह भी पूरा होगा। अभी भी कुछ लोग हैं जो कि कहते हैं कि ये दो राज्य अलग नहीं होने चाहियें। जो इस तरह की बात कहते हैं, उनके प्रति मेरे दिल में इज्जत है। श्री जावाहर जी मेहता जो कि गुजरात राज्य के चीफ मिनिस्टर बनने वाले हैं, उनका कहना है कि हम तो नहीं चाहते थे कि गुजरात और बबई अलग हों लेकिन अब चूँकि दो हो रहे हैं, इस वास्ते हमें इसको मंजूर करना पड़ रहा है। जब कोई इस तरह की बात कहता है तो मुझे एक कहानी याद आती है। असल में चाहते तो हैं कि गुजरात का नया राज्य बने लेकिन ऊपर से ही यह कहते हैं कि न बने। जो कहानी है वह इस प्रकार से है। एक आदमी झगड़ा करके घर से बाहर निकल गया। उसने बीवी से झगड़ा किया, बच्चों से झगड़ा किया.....

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member's time is short. What is the meaning of his bringing in *Kahaniyan*?

Shri Amjad Ali (Dhubri): He is illustrating.

श्री यादव नारायण जाधव : बहुत ही छोटी सी कहानी है। वह गुस्सा करके घर से बाहर निकल तो गया लेकिन उसके दिल में यह ख्याल आया कि गुस्सा करके मैं निकल तो गया हूँ लेकिन यह मैंने अच्छा नहीं किया है और न ही यह अच्छी बात हुई है। उसने सोचा

कि उसे फिर वापिस घर चले जाना चाहिये। अब वह घर जाये तो कैसे जाये? रास्ते में उसको मवेशी मिले और वे घर की तरफ जा रहे थे। उसने सोचा कि यह ठीक है, मवेशी की दुम पकड़ कर मैं घर जा सकता हूँ और वह मुझे घर पहुँचा देगा। वह मवेशी की दुम पकड़ कर घर चला गया। इसी तरह से जो कहते हैं कि गुजरात का अलग से राज्य नहीं बनना चाहिये उनके दिल में यह भावना तो है, यह उमंग तो है कि गुजरात राज्य बने लेकिन ऊपर से वे कहते हैं कि वह न बने।

तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि नये गुजरात राज्य का नाम भी महा-गुजरात रखा जाये और अगर ऐसा किया गया तो सरदार पटेल की जो इच्छा थी, वह पूरी हो सकती है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि ये जो दो मेरी एमेंडमेंट्स हैं कि २७ तारीख से दोनों राज्य अस्तित्व में आयें और नये गुजरात राज्य का नाम महा-गुजरात राज्य रखा जाये इनको मंजूर कर लिया जाये।

श्री आसर : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एप्वाइंटिड डे की व्याख्या १ मई की गई है और कहा गया है कि इस तारीख को ये दोनों राज्य बनें। लेकिन महाराष्ट्र की जनता की भावनाओं का विचार करना आवश्यक है, आदर करना आवश्यक है। महाराष्ट्र की जनता की भावना को ध्यान में रखते हुये ही मैं यह सुझाव आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि २७ अप्रैल को ये राज्य अस्तित्व में आयें। २७ अप्रैल का दिन भारत वर्ष की जनता के लिये और खास तौर पर महाराष्ट्र की जनता के लिये परम-श्रेष्ठ और सदा से अधिक आनन्द का दिन माना गया है और इस दिन को खूब धूम धाम से मनाया जाता है। छत्रपति शिवाजी महाराज का वह जन्म दिवस है और इसी शुभ दिन और शुभ अवसर पर महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात इन दो राज्यों की रचापना होनी चाहिये। यदि ऐसा किया गया तो यह बहुत आनन्दायक होगा।

[श्री आसकर]

इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है कि २७ अप्रैल को ही एन्वाइटिड डे माना जाये ।

Shri M. B. Thakore: Sir, I want to speak on amendments Nos. 95 and 96. At the outset, I congratulate the people of Mahagujarat and Maharashtra who fought for the unilingual States and achieved them. It is a success of the people, a success and triumph of their aspirations, feelings, sentiments and sacrifices. It is the martyrs' memorandum. The people have the sentiment that Gujarat State should be called Mahagujarat. For that, they have fought since three years now and they have achieved it. Sardar Vallabhai Patel also wanted that if in future the Gujarat State is formed, it should be named as Mahagujarat. The Gujarat Pradesh Congress Committee also in their resolution mentioned that if the Gujarat State is formed, it should be named as Mahagujarat. So, my appeal to the House is that the State of Gujarat should be named as Mahagujarat and I appeal to the Home Minister, who is very sympathetic, to agree to this submission.

I am really very sorry that in the Bombay Assembly, Shri Chavan, the Chief Minister, did not agree to this submission of some of the Members of that Assembly. I support fully what Shri Jadhav said in this regard.

Regarding amendment No. 96, if the Home Minister is not agreeable to name this new State as Mahagujarat, then the name should be substituted as 'Gujar Desh'. I hope this august House will consider this matter.

Shri Sugandhi: Sir, I speak on amendment No. 17. My Maharashtra friends are stressing for a unilingual State. So, to include certain Kannada areas in this unilingual State which is to be called Maharashtra is not correct. So, I am suggesting that the name should be changed as

"Maratha State". Another objection is 'Maharashtra' means a big nation. How can a big nation be a part of the the Indian Union? The Indian Union itself is a nation. So, I am suggesting that it should be named as Maratha State.

During the general debate, my friend, Shri Gaikwad, made an offer to cede all the Kannada areas from the proposed State, but at the same time, he demanded certain parts from Karnatak. As far as Belgaum and adjacent areas are concerned, they were never Maratha; since the last 1,500 years, they were part and parcel of the Karnatak area, and they will remain so in future. But as far as Shri Gaikwad's offer is concerned, he does not know the areas which he is demanding that they should be merged with Maharashtra.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I have never mentioned any area.

Shri Sugandhi: He does not know those areas. My Maharashtra friends are in a hurry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members must wait for a separate Bill for that.

Shri Sugandhi: As far as the name is concerned, let it be Maratha State. That is my request.

Shri Khadilkar: I oppose the suggestions contained in these amendments. I am entirely in agreement that whatever Kannada area is incorporated in the new Maharashtra State should be immediately given over to Mysore. I have no objection that, but from the new Bill, it is clear that there is a new arrangement regarding the zonal council. Formerly Mysore formed part of the western zonal council. At that time, the Home Minister said that it would facilitate the solution of the border trouble between Mysore and Bombay. But now Mysore has been taken away from the western zonal council. I presume all the responsibility of solving this problem has been taken over by the

Home Minister. Therefore, the former approach of trying to bring the two parties together is completely abandoned. So, sooner he discharges this responsibility or obligation to the people on the border, the better it will be.

So far as the name Maharashtra is concerned, fortunately or unfortunately, we have a history. In India, we are the people who had the first national consciousness and we are proud of it. (*Interruptions.*) As a social unit, we had that advantage; we had somehow that social cohesion, social integration and social consciousness which was not found in the rest of the country. It came in course of time. I would say that, without being chauvinistic, we are a multi-lingual nation; our nationalism is multi-lingual. So, in this multi-lingual nationalism, when a proper place is to be carved out to a region, in order to strengthen the central concept of unity, there is nothing wrong if that State is called Maharashtra.

Shri P. R. Patel: Is the country composed of different nations?

Shri Khadilkar: You do not understand my phraseology.

As I said in the beginning, I do not want hon. Members to get the impression that we are thinking in terms of exclusiveness. We want to remain part of the Indian Union, but at the same time, no part of the Indian Union should try to forget certain obligations laid on a particular part and to forge past history. I do not think that would be right or in any way helpful to strengthen the national unity. Therefore, the right thing has been done by making a new provision whereby a certain character of that region has been defined as Maharashtra. So, I welcome the change introduced by the Government at the final stage of the Bill and I oppose the amendment just now moved. At the same time, I want to make an appeal to the Home Minister that he has taken a new responsibility, so far as the border region is concerned.

16 hrs.

Shri G. B. Pant: Three or four amendments have been bundled together. One was about inaugurating these two new States on the 27th of April instead of on the 1st of May. If it was feasible, I would have readily welcomed it but I find that it is not feasible. So, we have to fix the 1st of May for that. The 1st of May, according to Shri Dange, has a special significance and is a day of international importance. So, let us stick to that.

The other amendments relate to the names. Well, so far as Maharashtra and Gujarat go, both have a long history and glorious traditions. So, when we use the names Maharashtra and Gujarat, we remind ourselves of the ancient history of these two great States and of the place they occupied in the Indian Union or in giving to India the characteristics which have led to the strength of the country and the richness of its culture. So, these two names are sweet and we better stick to them.

Then, one hon. Member said that if we do not have Maha Gujarat, we must have Gurjardesh, so that he is interested somehow or other in getting Gujarat out of the way by having one name or the other. I do not think that strengthens his argument very much.

Shri Khadilkar referred to my responsibility about solving the border problem. Well, I consider myself responsible for solving all problems and whenever a problem remains unsolved I consider that I have been deficient and to that extent, I have failed in achieving what should have been done. But, so far as the adjustment between Bombay and Mysore is concerned, we have for the last few years tried to bring about some sort of arrangement within the zone so as to settle this problem. We did not succeed. So, the continuance of Mysore with Maharashtra would not have, I think, brought us nearer to the solution of the problem. So, while I readily admit and recognize

[Shri G. B. Pant]

that I have my responsibility for trying to find out solutions, satisfactory solutions for all problems, I would humbly remind Shri Khadilkar that it is also his responsibility, and everyone, whether belonging to Mysore or to Maharashtra, has to see that by mutual goodwill they succeed in bringing about an arrangement which will be equally hailed by all. So, I will join them in this effort unreservedly.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Member pressing his amendment No. 17?

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: No.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 76 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Member pressing his amendment No. 96?

Shri M. B. Thakore: I do not press my amendment.

The amendment No. 96 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2 stands part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.— (*Formation of Gujarat State*)

Mr. Speaker: Those hon. Members who want to move their amendments to clause 3 may now do so.

Shri Goray: I beg to move:

Page 2,—

(i) for lines 24 to 28, substitute—

"(b) the villages in Umbergaon taluka of Thana district, specified in Part I of the First Schedule."

(ii) omit lines 32 to 38. (41)

Shri Khadilkar: I beg to move:

Page 2, lines 24 to 27,—

Omit "the villages in Nawapur and Nandurbar talukas of West Khandesh district and the villages in Akkalkuwa and Taloda talukas of West Khandesh district, respectively". (55)

Page 2, lines 27 and 28,—

for "Parts I, II and III" substitute—"Part I". (56).

Shri Mahagaonkar: I beg to move:

Page 2,—

Omit lines 32 to 38. (38).

Page 2, line 30,—

after "the residuary State of Bombay" insert—

"and the Marathi speaking villages and towns in Belgaum, Khanapur, Chikkudi, Athani, Hukkeri Talukas of Belgaum district, Karwar, Halyal and Supa talukas of Karwar district, Bhalki and Santpur talukas of Bidar district, Atand taluka of Gulburga district, shall form a new State and". (35)

Page 2,—

Omit lines 32 to 38. (36).

Shri Parulekar: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 21,—

omit "Surat, Dangs". (77)

Page 2,—

for lines 24 to 28, substitute—

"(b) the villages of Umbergaon taluka, the villages of Dharampur and Basada talukas along with the rest of the talukas of Surat District and the villages of the Dangs District to be decided by a Boundary Commission on the basis of village as a unit, language and territorial contiguity." (78)

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 21,—

after "Surat" insert—

"except Dharampur Taluka and such of the major Marathi speaking contiguous villages of Bansda Taluka". (2)

Page 2, line 21,—

omit "Dangs". (3)

Page 2,—for lines 24 to 28, substitute—

"(b) the villages in Umbergaon taluka of Thana district, specified in Part I of the First Schedule." (4)

Page 2, lines 36 to 38,—

omit "and the villages specified in Parts II and III of the First Schedule shall respectively be included in, and form part of, Songadh taluka of Surat district and Sagbara taluka of Broach district." (5)

Shri Fatesinh Ghodasar (Khaira): I beg to move:

Page 2,—

(i) in line 21,—

after "Dangs" insert—"Dangs with Baragam Dangs".

(ii) in line 22,—omit "and".

(iii) in line 22,—after "Kutch" insert—"West Khandesh".

(iv) In line 23, add at the end—

"Umargaon and Dahanu talukas of Thana district and thereupon, the said territories shall cease to form part of the State of Maharashtra". (97)

Page 2,—

(i) omit lines 24 to 28.

(ii) omit lines 32 to 38. (98)

Page 2,—

for lines 24 to 38, substitute—

"(b) Umbergaon taluka of Thana district, Navapura Nandarbar, Akkalkuva, Akrani, Taloda, Sahada Talukas of West Khandesh and Baragam Dangs and thereupon, the said territories shall cease to form part of the State of Maharashtra." (99)

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 21,—after "Surat" insert—"excluding Dharampur taluka". (106)

Page 2,—for lines 24 to 31, substitute—

"the residuary State of Bombay shall be known as the State of Maharashtra." (108)

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I want to move amendment Nos. 40 and 41.

Mr. Speaker: They have already been moved.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug): Sir, according to your own ruling, amendment No. 35 is not relevant and so not admissible.

Mr. Speaker: I will consider that.

Shri M. B. Thakore: I want to move my amendment Nos. 97, 98 and 99.

Mr. Speaker: They have already been moved.

श्री यादव नारायण जाधव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने अमेंडमेंट नं० २, ३, ४ और ५ प्रस्तुत किये हैं। अमेंडमेंट नं० २ के बारे में मैं खास तौर पर घर्मपुर तालुका और वासड़ा तालुका के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर जो मराठी स्पीकिंग लोग हैं उन में प्रादिवासी लोगों की जमात है। आज हमारे सामने भाषा की बुनियाद पर अलग अलग राज्यों के बनाने का जो बिल आया है, उस के पीछे एक खास मकसद था। वह मकसद हम ने कांस्टिट्यूशन का जो नं० ३ का आर्टिकल

[श्री यादव नारायण जाधव]

है उस में कबूल किया है। उस वक्त भाषावार राज्य बनाने का भवकाश नहीं था, लेकिन बाद में हम ने यह बात कबूल की, भाषावार राज्य बनाये जायें। उन को बनाते वक्त हमारे नेताओं ने यह भी माना था कि भाषावार राज्य बनाते वक्त जो भी राज्य बनाये जायेंगे उन की जो सरहदें होनी चाहियें उन को निश्चित रूप से तय करना नामुमकिन है। यह बात हम ने भी समझी थी। मद्रास और आंध्र के बारे में जो झगड़ा पैदा हुआ उस के लिए हमें एक खास बिल इस सदन में लाना पड़ा। जिस समय वह बिल हाउस के सामने था तो कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा था जब भाषा की बुनियाद पर राज्य बनाये जा रहे हैं तब उन राज्यों को बनाते वक्त बाउंड्रीज के जो झगड़े होते हैं उन के बारे में अगर एक ही बिल बनाया जाता और एक ही प्रिंसिपल सामने रखा जाता तो बेहतर होता। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जो राज्य बनाये गये हैं, उन में काफी प्रदेश ऐसे हैं जिन के बारे में कांग्रेस के लोगों के दिल में, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के लोगों के दिल में और महागुजरात जनता परिषद् के लोगों के दिल में कुछ सन्देह है क्योंकि यहां पर अलग अलग बातें कही जाती हैं। इसलिए इस बात को आखिर के लिए छोड़ देना मैं अच्छा नहीं समझता हूँ। सूरत डिस्ट्रिक्ट में जो धर्मपुर तालुका है और वासड़ा तालुका है, उन में बहुमत आदिवासी लोगों का है। पूरे हिन्दुस्तान की प्रगति के लिए हमें एक बात करनी पड़ेगी। हम चाहते हैं कि भारत आगे आये, पनपे। उस के विकास के लिए हमें लोगों के पास जाना होगा।

16.13 hrs.

[SHRI MULCHAND DUBE in the Chair]

एक बात मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। जब कांग्रेस की तहरीक हमारे देश में शुरू हुई, तो उस तहरीक में हमें आम लोगों के पास जाना चाहिए इस के लिए महाराष्ट्र के एक

बड़े नेता महात्मा ज्योति राव फूले ने कांग्रेस के सदन के सामने एक बड़ा भारी पुतला किसान का रखा था और उन्होंने कहा था कि जब तक कांग्रेस देहात में नहीं जायेगी, तब तक आजादी की जंग पूरी नहीं हो सकती है, उसी तरह से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक विकास की योजनायें देहात तक नहीं जायेंगी तब तक हमारे विकास का काम यशस्वी नहीं हो सकता है। अगर विकास के काम को हमें यशस्वी करना है तो हम को जो लोगों की जबान हो, उसी में उन को समझाना होगा कि किस तरह से उन का विकास होगा। अगर यह हमें करना है तो हम ने जो बुनियाद रखी है भाषावार राज्य बनाने की उस के साथ यह भी करना होगा कि हर एक हिस्से को, उस में रहने वाले जिस खाम जबान को बोलते हैं, उस जबान के राज्य में ही मिलाना होगा। तभी हम उन से ठीक से अपील कर सकते हैं।

हमारे देश के सामने कई मुसीबतें हैं। हम नहीं चाहते कि हम को छोटी छोटी बातों को ले कर झगड़ा करना पड़े, सत्याग्रह करना पड़े। इस चीज को ले कर हमारे बहुत से लोगों को मरना पड़ा। १०५ लोगों को महाराष्ट्र राज्य की तहरीक में मरना पड़ा, २१, २२ लोगों को मरना पड़ा जब गुजरात की तहरीक चली तब। इस चीज को हमेशा चलते रहना हमें पसन्द नहीं है। लेकिन अगर इस को समाप्त करना है तो इस के लिए हम को एक बुनियाद बनानी पड़ेगी कि बाईंस के वास्ते एक राष्ट्रीय नीति कायम की जाय यानी आंध्र और मद्रास राज्यों के बाईंस के बारे में जो पाटस्कर फार्मूला था वही सब के लिए रखा जाय। यह चीज मैं पंत जी से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, जिन्होंने इस देश को एक बनाने के वास्ते कोशिश की और खुद अपने जिस्म पर धाव लिये।

हमारे देश भारत को बचाने के लिए, भारत को सीना तान कर खड़ा करने के लिए ताकि चीन को हौसला न हो कि वह

हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करे, हम सब लोगों को उन को विकास के मामले में यह दूसरी बातों के बारे में आगे लाना होगा। महात्मा गांधी ने कबूल किया था कि लिग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स बनाने से जबान की तरक्की होगी, लोगों को तरक्की होगी, संस्कृति की तरक्की होगी, और इतना ही नहीं, विकास की भी तरक्की होगी। अगर हमें महात्मा गांधी को याद रखना है, उन्होंने हमारे सामने जो काम किया उस को याद रखना है तो जैसे महात्मा ज्योतिराव फूले ने कहा था कि कांग्रेस को देहातों में ले जाना होगा वैसे ही मैं कहता हूँ कि विकास को देहातों में ले जाना होगा, इस में थोड़ा भी शक नहीं रहना चाहिए।

फैक्ट्स ऐंड फिगरर्स हमारे सामने आये हैं कि धर्मपुर और वासड़ा ताल्लुकों के लोग मराठी बोलने वाले हैं। डांग के बारे में भी ऐसा ही है। मैं मार्च के महीने की १० और ११ तारीख को डांग में गया था जब कि बम्बई एसेम्बली में यह बिल आने वाला था। जहाँ जहाँ स्टेट ट्रान्सपोर्ट की मोटर रूकी, मैं वहाँ उतरा और लोगों से पूछा कि उन की क्या भावना है। एक छोटा बच्चा नन्हा सा था १०, ११ साल का। उस के दिमाग में न सियासत थी और न दूसरी बातें थी। मैं ने उस से मराठी जबान में पूछा कि वच्चे तू क्या करता है? उस ने कहा कि मैं स्कूल जाता हूँ इस वर्ग में पढ़ता हूँ। मैं ने उस से पूछा कि भाई तू कौन सी जबान में बोल रहा है? हमारे माननीय सदस्य पटेल साहब ने कहा कि डांग डांगी जबान में है, मैं ने उस से पूछा कि मैं जिस जबान में बोल रहा हूँ वह आप की समझ में आती है? उन्होंने कहा कि मैं उस जबान को समझता हूँ, वही जबान तो मैं बोल रहा हूँ। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि डांगी मराठी की ही एक डाइलेक्ट है, जिसे प्राकृत कहते हैं संस्कृत में। जिस प्रकार से संस्कृत भाषा की अलग अलग जबानें प्राकृत बनीं, वैसे ही मराठी की प्राकृत है डांगी। डांगी के ज्यादातर लफ्ज जो हैं वह मराठी के

ह। जब मैं नन्हें से बच्चे से बात कर रहा था तो वह उसे समझता था। इतना ही नहीं, बल्लभ भाई पटेल ने, जिन के बारे में हर एक दिल में इज्जत है और हमारे गुजराती भाइयों के दिल में तो होगी ही होगी, जिन को सन्त कहा जा सकता है, उन्होंने भी कहा था मैं सन्त जैसा हूँ, ज्यादा गलतियाँ नहीं कर सकता हूँ। वैसे ही हमारे सन्त मोरारजी देसाई जानें, वैसे ही सन्त बाला साहब खेर थे, उन सभी लोगों ने कहा था कि यहाँ की जबान मराठी है। तो यह बात लोगों के सामने रख देनी चाहिए। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के लोगों ने भी इस बात को कबूल किया था। जो कांग्रेस समिति की रिपोर्ट है, कांग्रेस ने जो रेजोल्यूशन पास किया था, वह जो हमारी सन् १९६० की रिपोर्ट आफ दि फाइनेन्स कमेटी है उस में दर्ज है, उस में लिखा गया है, मैं पेज ४२ पर जो अनेक्शर १ है उस की कुछ लाइन्स को पढ़ कर मुनाना चाहता हूँ, उस में लिखा गया है

“.....the largest measure of agreement and to recommend a scheme which would be beneficial to the States and people concerned and desirable in the larger interests of the Nation. With these objectives in view the committee conferred with a large number of individuals concerned and representatives of organisations.....”.

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह आर्गोनाइजेशन कौन सा है? यह इंडिविजुअल्स कौन-से हैं जिन्होंने संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के वास्ते, महा-गुजरात के वास्ते कुर्बानी की? कितने ही लोग मर गये, ७५ हजार से ज्यादा लोग जेल गये, उन के रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव्स से पूछा? यह इंडिविजुअल्स कौन से हैं? संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति की डांग के बारे में क्या राय है यह एस० एम० जोशी जैसे आदमी से पूछा गया। याज्ञिक जैसे आदमी से पूछा गया। क्या उन्होंने देश के वास्ते कुर्बानी नहीं की? जो बार क्वालिटी के देश भक्त हैं, वह शायद

[श्री यादव नारायण जाधव]

उन की इज्जत न कर सकते हों श्री एस० एम० जोशी, याज्ञिक जी, गोरे साहब और हमारे डांगे साहब को नहीं पूछा गया। क्यों उन लोगों की कुर्बानी देश के वास्ते कुछ नहीं थी या उनकी भारगेनाइजेशन नहीं थी या एक इंडिविजुअल की हैसियत से वह महाराष्ट्र में कुछ इज्जत नहीं रखते थे? लेकिन कांग्रेस तो एक बड़ी जमात है और वह किसी से भी राय लेने की जरूरत नहीं समझती और उसने बम्बई के रिभारगेनाइजेशन के सम्बन्ध में रेजोलूशन पास कर दिया। अब चूंकि आज वह देश में काफी बड़ी शक्तिशाली राजनैतिक पार्टी है तो वह जो चाहे प्रस्ताव पास कर देती है लेकिन उसके बारे में दूसरे लोगों और पार्टियों की जो भावना थी उसको उस ने अपने सामने नहीं रखा। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन ऐरियाज के बारे में विवाद है उन को इस तरह से बगैर उनसे राय और मशविरा किये एक रेजोलूशन पास करके किसी प्रदेश में शामिल कर देना कुछ मुनासिब नहीं है और मेरा तो इस बारे में यह कहना है कि जिन प्रदेशों और ऐरियाज के बारे में शक हो, सन्देह हो तो मैं अबदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसके लिए होम मिनिस्टर साहब की जिम्मेदारी है कि वे सब पक्षों से सलाह मशविरा करके और एक ऐसा फारमूला सामने रखें ताकि देश में जितने इस प्रकार के झगड़े हैं चाहे वे उत्तर प्रदेश के हों, पंजाब के हों या उड़ीसा के बारे में हों, जितने भी यह बाँबर के मसले हैं उस एक फारमूला के आधार पर तय किये जायें।

अब थाना जिले के अम्बरगांव ताल्लुका के उन गांवों की बाबत जो कि उधर शामिल किये जा रहे हैं कहना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन इसके पहले डांग्स के बारे में मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि डांग्स के प्रतिनिधि जो कि इस मिलसिले में मान्यवर गृह मंत्री से मिलने गये थे तो उनको गृह मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा था, कम से कम मुझे यह मालूम हुआ है

कि मंत्री महोदय यह कबूल करते हैं कि डांग्स की जबान मराठी है लेकिन चूंकि यह तुम्हारे राज्य के मुख्य मंत्री और दूसरे राज्य के होने वाले मुख्य मंत्री ने आपस में यह फैसला कर लिया है तो फिर मैं क्या कर सकता हूँ। अब गृह मंत्री महोदय ने जो डांग्स के प्रतिनिधियों को इस तरह कहा तो उन्होंने गलत नहीं कहा। उन्होंने ठीक ही कहा। लेकिन यह जो दोनों ने आपस में बातचीत की और एक फैसला कर लिया तो क्या उन्होंने यह समझ कर दो राज्यों का बंटवारा किया है कि वहां के लोग जो गुलाम हैं और इतने गुलाम तुम ले लो और थोड़े से गुलाम हम ले लेंगे? क्या इस प्रकार की भावना उन के दिल में रही है? मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि डांग्स के बारे में जो कुछ आप का फैसला हुआ था और जो आप भी कहते हैं और एक खास बात मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कांग्रेस के रेजोल्यूशन में ऐसा जिक्र है कि विदर्भ के लोगों में यह जबर्दस्त भावना पाई जाती है कि उन की विदर्भ की एक अलग स्टेट रहे। वहां के लोग चाहते हैं कि वे अलग रहें और यह नोट में इस तरह दर्ज है :—

"A strong feeling is there of the Vidarbha people to have a separate State."

डांग्स में मराठी पेपर्स और दूसरे पेपर्स में में यह समाचार छपा है कि २७०० लोगों हैं ने वहां पर सत्याग्रह किया और कई लोगों ने भूख हड़ताल की और इतना ही नहीं बल्कि जो वहां पर २१ साल से ऊपर के उम्र के २० हजार बोटर्स हैं उन में से १६ हजार लोगों ने एक हस्ताक्षरयुक्त ज्ञापन राष्ट्रपति जी को दिया है और उन से हस्तक्षेप करने की मांग की है और कहा है कि हम को महागुजरात में न धकेला जाय। अब लोगों में इस के विरुद्ध जबर्दस्त भावना मौजूद है इस के लिये और क्या सबूत हो सकता है?

इसी तरह उम्बरगांव का सवाल आता है। अभी कुछ लोग बाहर उपवास कर रहे हैं, आज उपवास की कीमत नहीं रह गई है, ऐसा मालूम देता है। हकीकत यह है कि सोते हुए लोगों को तो जगाया जा सकता है लेकिन जिन्होंने ने कि केवल सोने का स्वांग बनाया हुआ हो लेकिन सो न रहे हों उन्हें कोई नहीं जगा सकता। अब वैसे मेरे दिना में पटेल साहब की उन के लिये बहुत इज्जत है लेकिन मुझे यह कहने के लिये माफ किया जाय कि जो गुरु अंग्रेज डिवाइड एंड रूल की पालिसी की लोगो यहां पर छोड़ गये हैं उसो डिवाइड एंड रूल की पालिसी इन्होंने अपनायी है जोकि अनुचित है और इंसान का तकाजा तो यह है कि उम्बरगांव ताल्लुका चूक मराठी स्पीकिंग एरिया है इसलिये वह महाराष्ट्र में जाना चाहिये। अब उन्होंने ने जो यह कहा कि डांग्स में डांगी भाषा है और वैस्ट खानदेश में भिल्ली भाषा है तो यह कहना उन का गलत है क्योंकि यह मराठी का डाइलेक्ट है और इन में मराठी शब्दो की बहुतायत रहती है और यह तो उर्सा तरह हो गया कि पटेल साहब की जबान पटेली कही जाय। वे उस बारे में फीगर्स मंगवा कर अपने को चाहें तो सैसफाई कर सकते हैं कि वहां के देहातों की बोली मराठी है और अगर आप ने इन प्रदेशों का बंटवारा करने के लिये जबान को आधार माना है तो वह एरिया मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूं कि मराठी जबान बोलने वाला है तो फिर उन को गुजरात में रखना कहां तक न्यायसंगत है। अब अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि हम ने ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव बेमिस पर यह डिबिजन किया है तो आज जो डिवाइडिंग लाइन है उस को स्ट्रेट लाइन किया जाय। अब अकलमंदो तो इसी में है कि समय रहते भूल को सुधार लिया जाय जैसेकि वक्त पर हम ने देखा कि भाखड़ा नांगल डैम में जो थोड़ी सी होआएस्ट चैम्बर में गड़बड़ी आ गयी थी और गैलरी गिर गयी थी तो उस को सरकार ने सुधार लिया

और इस तरह देश को बड़ी भारी क्षति से बचा लिया और यह ठीक ही कहा गया है कि ए म्पिच इन टाइम सेव्ज नाईन। अगर तात्कालिक सुधार न किया जाता तो सारा बांध हो टूट जाता। ठीक वही बात यहां भी लागू होती है और इस रिआरगेनाइजेशन के सम्बन्ध में थोड़ी सी भी गलती और नक्स कायम रहने देना अच्छा नहीं होगा और उस को फौरन दुरुस्त कर लेना बेहतर होगा। मैं आशा करता हूं कि मैं ने अपने जो संशोधन मूव किये हैं उन को गृह मंत्री महोदय स्वीकार कर लेंगे।

श्री आसार : सभापति महोदय, मैं क्लाज ३ पर अपने अमेंडमेंटस नम्बर २०, २१, २२, २३ और २४ को मूव करते हुए कहना चाहता हूं कि यह जो बम्बई के रिआरगेनाइजेशन का निर्णय लिया गया तो यह निर्णय केवल एक पार्टी का प्रश्न समझ कर लिया गया। सच बात तो यह है कि कांग्रेस ने पहले बम्बई के वास्ते द्विभाषी राज्य का सिद्धान्त माना था और द्विभाषी राज्य के आधार पर ही चुनाव हुए थे लेकिन चुनावों के फलस्वरूप यह प्रतीत हुआ कि जनता की राय बम्बई को एक भाषी राज्य बनाने के पक्ष में है। बम्बई राज्य के दो राज्य होने के लिये संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति और महा-गुजरात समिति ने बड़ा आंदोलन किया और जनता की भावनाओं को व्यक्त किया और उस के परिणामस्वरूप आज यह बिल आया है। मैं बिल का स्वागत करता हूं लेकिन बिल में कई ऐसे सिद्धान्त हैं जिन के कि साथ मैं सहमत नहीं हूं और उन के बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। मेरा यह कहना है कि जब यह निर्णय लिया गया तब सरकार का कर्तव्य था कि यह एक पार्टी का विषय न बने और ऐसे सब लोगों को साथ में ले कर निर्णय लेना आवश्यक था और आज जो उस को ले कर विवाद और झगड़े उठ रहे हैं उन को निर्णय लेने से पहले निबटा लेना आवश्यक था। जिन लोगों ने इस बारे में

[श्री आसार]

प्रयत्न किया उन लोगों को अपने साथ में ले कर काम करना था लेकिन बम्बई स्टेट के विभाजन का श्रेय तो कांग्रेस को स्वयं ही लेना था। जनता को बताने के लिये केवल कांग्रेस पार्टी के स्तर पर यह रिक्रान्-गेनाइजेशन का निर्णय लिया गया जोकि मेरी समझ में कुछ उचित नहीं था। एक सिद्धान्त रख कर हम ने कारोबार चलाया नहीं और जहाँ जैसे चाहा मनमानी कारोबार चलाया और जिस के कि फलस्वरूप हर स्थान में उस के सम्बन्ध में असन्तोष है। मैं ऐसा कहूँ तो गलत नहीं होगा कि आज तक भारतीय राजनीति में जितनी ऐडजस्ट-मेंट्स की गई हैं वे केवल सिद्धान्त का बलिदान दे कर ही की गई हैं भले ही वह चाहे पाकिस्तान के साथ ऐडजस्टमेंट हो या आऊएन लाई के साथ हो अथवा अन्य बांडर ट्रबुल्स के सम्बन्ध में हो और उस का परिणाम हम को भोगना पड़ता है। तत्पश्चात् सिद्धान्तों पर स्थिर रह कर चलना यह हमारी सरकार की प्रकृति और स्वभाव में नहीं है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने कौन से सिद्धान्तों को सामने रख कर महाराष्ट्र के कई गांव जोकि मराठी स्पीकिंग एरियाज हैं और आज महाराष्ट्र में हैं उन को गुजरात में क्यों धकेल रहे हैं? थाना जिले के अम्बरगांव ताल्लुका के बह तमाम गांव और पश्चिमी खानदेश के कई गांव मराठी स्पीकिंग एरियाज हैं और वे महाराष्ट्र में ही रहने चाहिये। अब डांगा के बारे में जो दो तीन बार निर्णय हो गया था कि यह महाराष्ट्र का अंग है और इतना ही नहीं बल्कि आज के भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्री और बम्बई के भूतपूर्व चीफ मिनिस्टर श्री मुरारजी देसाई ने और खेर साहब की कमेटी ने स्पष्ट निर्णय दिया था कि यह महाराष्ट्र का अंग है लेकिन यह सब होते हुए भी आज हम ने यह निर्णय लिया है कि डांग गुजरात में धकेला जाये। अब इस के लिये बताया जाता है कि लोकल बोर्ड के चुनाव में गुजराती

जीत गया तो इसे गुजरात में केवल इस कारण दिया जा रहा है? मेरी समझ में यह क्राइ-टैरिया ठीक नहीं है। अब इस तरह तो मैं कहूँगा कि बेलगांव के आम चुनाव में महाराष्ट्र के पक्ष वाले जीते थे तो फिर उस सिद्धान्त पर बेलगांव के बारे में क्यों निर्णय नहीं लिया गया? मेरा यह कहना है कि इस सिद्धान्त के बारे में हमें कुछ विचार करना आवश्यक है। हम तो चाहते हैं कि हर एक स्थान के बारे में सब से प्रेम से परामर्श कर के कोई निर्णय लिया जाना चाहिये। मेरा तो कहना है कि कोई भी एक सिद्धान्त सामने रख कर सभी बांडर प्राबलमस को निबटाना चाहिये। सर्वमान्य पाटस्कर फार-मूला विलेज इज ए यूनिट के सिद्धान्त पर जैसे निर्धारित है तो उस सिद्धान्त के अनुसार यह दो राज्यों के बांडर प्राबलम निबटाना आवश्यक है और मेरा मुझाव है कि इस लिये एक बाउंडरी कमिशन नियुक्त किया जाय और इस तरह यदि एक सिद्धान्त और सर्वमान्य सिद्धान्त को आधार मान कर निर्णय करेंगे तो इस से झगड़े ज्यादा नहीं बढ़ेंगे।

Mr. Chairman: Amendment Nos 20, 21, 22 and 23 are only repetition of Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Shri P. R. Patel: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I oppose the Amendments moved by my hon. friends Shri Assar and Shri Yadav. I would submit that they are putting more reliance on Morarji-Kher understanding. But they must note that on 5th November, 1957 it was contested between the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and the Mahagujarat Janata Parishad that whatever settlement was arrived at by Morarji-Kher talks was not proper and that this matter should be reopened.

Shri Datar: No, no. Not at all.

Shri P. R. Patel: I would read the words:

"In respect of Dangs it is contested by Mahagujarat Janata Parishad that the Kher-Morarji agreement was, more or less, arbitrary and the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti agreed to examine the problem."

The Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti agreed to examine the problem. That means whatever was said at the Kher-Morarji talks should be examined. So, we should not put reliance on what was done before 1948. Before the starting of the Samyukta Maharashtra movement, there was no question of Dangs. There was Gujarati language for official purposes and it was only in 1950 that the official language was changed and that too because of the agitation by the Samyukta Maharashtra movement. So, my submission is that relying on something that happened before 1948 does not hold good.

Then, Sir, I come to Pataskar formula. The first principle of Pataskar formula is the agreement by both the States. So, if there be an agreement between the two States, then the question of Pataskar formula comes in. So far as the Pataskar formula is concerned, there is also a question of dialects other than the two contesting regional languages. That question also is there. Here, the problem is quite important. All the linguistic experts have held that Dangi, Warli, Khandeshi and Bhili are Gujarati languages. So, the question of Pataskar formula does not arise in this case.

Then, my hon. friend also said that Bhamsa and Dharampur are some places where Marathi-speaking people are staying. There may be Marathi-speaking people staying there. Even in my place Mehsana there are Marathi families and if my hon. friend happens to go to Mehsana and talk to some Marathi gentlemen and come to a conclusion that they are Marathi-speaking people, I think that is not a proper way. My hon. friend Shri Yadav must have gone to

Dangs and must talked to some boy without enquiring whether the boy was born Marathi or Dangi. After all, these things do not help in the matter. So I oppose these amendments.

Shri Parulekar: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to say a few words in connection with amendments Nos. 77 and 78. I would not like to take much time of the House and would not like to repeat the argument which I advanced on an earlier occasion. I would only add something which I have not said before and which is relevant to the amendments which I have moved. It is obvious that there are some differences as regards the border issues. The differences are apparent and have come to the surface. The question is how to solve them.

I shall not read out the whole of the amendment, but I shall just give the essence of the amendment as it has been drafted and moved by me. There must be some basis to solve these differences. My amendment seeks to give the basis on which the problem can be solved, and the maximum satisfaction can be achieved. The hon. Home Minister thinks that an agreement between the two Chief Ministers could give the maximum satisfaction. If I may humbly say so, he is wrong.

It may be that the two Chief Ministers of the new States represent a large bulk of the people, that is, those who follow the Congress, both in Gujarat and in Maharashtra, but they have no monopoly to represent all the people. So, let us solve this problem on the basis of some principle. That is why I have suggested in my amendment that these differences should be solved by appointing a boundary commission, by taking language as the basis, village as the unit, and taking contiguity into consideration. If that basis is accepted, then all the differences which exist and which are on the surface today can be solved, I would not say, to the satisfaction of

[Shri Parulekar]

everybody, but I would certainly say, to the satisfaction of the maximum number of people.

Secondly, I would urge that the solution should be a just solution. Why do you advance a solution on the basis of an opportunist principle? Is there any principle behind it? Is there any principle behind the solution, which has been incorporated in the Bill? There is none. It is only an opportunist solution.

So, what my amendment seeks to suggest is this: Let us have some principle, and let us solve this question and let us solve these differences on the basis of the principle, so that it would be a just solution, and at the same time, a solution which will give maximum satisfaction.

I was amazed to hear that the principle underlying the Pataskar formula was the agreement between the two Ministers. Even granting so, it is quibbling and nothing more, on what principle did the two Ministers agree? Surely, they must have thought over certain things, and they must have laid down some principle on the basis of which the agreement was arrived at. So, it is no use saying that the Pataskar formula is without content, and its only content is the agreement between the two Ministers.

The amendment which I have moved will help to solve these differences which exist on the surface in such a manner that there will be maximum satisfaction to all.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 35 is out of order. Shri Khadilkar.

Shri Khadilkar: That is not mine.

Shri Mahagaonkar: That is my amendment. I just want to withdraw it. I moved it just to bring to the notice of the Home Minister this problem. The Home Minister has just now assured us that he will be doing his best to solve the border dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore. But one thing which I would like to point out on this occasion is that an

hon. Member of this House, Shri Nath Pai, who has been jailed there has been placed in the third class . . .

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, Amendment No. 35 is out of order. So, there is no point in saying all that.

Shri Mahagaonkar: I just wanted to withdraw it.

Mr. Chairman: There is no question of withdrawing it, because it is out of order.

Shri Khadilkar: I shall be extremely brief. All these amendments concern the boundaries between the new States that are carved out of the one bilingual State. They concern Dangs, a few villages of Umbergaon, and some villages in West Khandesh.

So far as Dangs is concerned, I had suggested on the last occasion that it should, for the time being, be kept under the Centre. After reading the reports in the press, I find that an ex-civil servant in the Bombay State, who had served in this area for thirty years of his life—he is not a Maharashtra—has independently addressed a communication to the President concerning Dangs and such other tribal areas. I shall not take the time of the House by reading out the whole passage, but I shall just refer to an article that he has contributed, from which I have an extract here. This article was printed in December, 1956 issue of the *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society*. His suggestions is this that so far as Dangs and Dandeli are concerned, they must be preserved as a sort of national parks or national forests, and the tribal people should be looked after with a different approach. Today, it has been made nothing short of bargaining between the two States. That is entirely wrong.

An old civil servant who has served the Bombay State for a long time, and who is not a Maharashtra, has appealed to the President in this

connection. I shall just give a reference to that letter, because I have no time to read it out.

So far as Umbergaon is concerned, I would like to make an appeal to the hon. Home Minister. The only problems between the two States are the border problem and another problem is financial; otherwise, there are not many problems on which there is a vital difference of opinion. So far as the border problem is concerned, I do agree that when there is an agreement between two Chief Ministers' there is give and take and that should be adopted. Perhaps the Home Minister is helpless at this juncture to alter the basis of that agreement. But so far as the villages in Umbergaon are concerned, the hinterland mostly belongs to the tribal people. So their interests should be looked into.

From this point of view, I would make an appeal to the Home Minister. This Bill will be passed today. Even then some loose ends will remain. This is the last act of the States reorganisation process that was started long ago. But some border pockets will remain. The Home Minister should give us an assurance that he will bring the two Chief Ministers together to reconsider the question regarding the tribal people in the villages that are being transferred to Gujarat.

So far as the villages in West Khandesh are concerned, I pointed out last time, and I repeat now, that expert opinion is divided on the Ukai project. Senior retired engineers in Maharashtra, met together and felt that this project should not be rushed through. Therefore, I would appeal to the Home Minister to examine this problem from a technical aspect first. Then the other question could be solved very easily.

I do recognise that in regard to the borders, there are bound to be some bilingual areas on either side. You

cannot carve out a border exactly on a unilingual basis so that there will never be a village where the people speak the language of the neighbouring State. So whatever is said about the Pataskar formula, some sort of adjustment is always necessary. Therefore, I would make an appeal to the Home Minister that as a last act of statesmanship, he should take into consideration all these problems, concerning not only Gujarat and Maharashtra, but Maharashtra and Mysore, Orissa, and Bihar and all that, apply his mind and once for all try to settle them by whatever way possible, instead of keeping these ulcers and live spots of discontent. If the method of bringing the two Ministers together is the best method, that may be adopted; if some other method is suitable, that may be followed.

Mr. Chairman: The following amendments to clause 3 are moved: namely, Nos. 77, 2, 106, 97, 3, 108, 34, 98, 55, 99, 4, 41, 78, 56, 36 and 5. Rest are repetitions.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: What about amendments Nos. 40 and 41?

Shri Goray: I have moved them. The Speaker said that they were perfectly in order.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 40 is a repetition of another amendment. Amendment No. 41 is moved.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: What about my amendments? I have already moved them?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I am referring to amendments Nos. 40 as well as 41.

Shri Mahagaonkar: What about my amendments Nos. 33 and 34.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 34 is moved. Amendment 33 is a repetition.

Shri Parulekar: What about amendments Nos. 77 and 78?

Mr. Chairman: They are moved.

Shri B. K. Galkwad: I have moved my amendments Nos. 106, 107, 108 and 109. They were not mentioned by you.

Mr. Chairman: They will also be taken as moved. I have just to make another announcement. We have to finish this clause at least by 4.50 and the Bill has to be finished by 5.30. So, there is hardly any time. (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: Time has been extended.

Mr. Chairman: We have to finish at least clause 3 by 4.50. There are 96 clauses and a number of Schedules also. They have to be finished by 5.30. (*Interruption*). Let us see how it will be done.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: It was ruled by the Speaker that if the Members are willing to sit till seven, he had no objection.

Mr. Chairman: May I know whether any amendment to clause 3 has to be put separately to the vote?

Several Hon. Members: All together.

Mr. Chairman: The Question is...

Shri Khadilkar: The hon. Minister has to reply.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. Hon. Minister.

Shri G. B. Pant: Some observations have been made which have not been listened to for the first time. I have all the same given them my undivided attention. But this question of boundaries—I think all these areas are covered there, Umbergaon, Ukai project and the Dangs, all of them, by these amendments—and these matters have been discussed and thrashed out fully more than once. In fact, most of the debate,

even in the morning today, centred round these very points. So, one should not expect much light from that side and much less from me. But, I would just submit that my own feeling throughout has been, and still continues to be, that a settlement between the leaders is the best method of solution of these border problems, or other problems.

Some friends have suggested the appointment of a Boundary Commission. And some have, not in a way but rather quite outspokenly and frankly, said that there are no principles behind these clauses or behind these arrangements that are embodied in these clauses. Can any arrangement stand; has one section or the other not raised objection to the principles that have been framed from time to time?

There was the Dar Report and certain principles were framed by Dar. Then there was the JVP Report and certain principles were framed. And, now, here we had the S.R.C Report which had framed certain principles. It also went over the entire country; and we based the States Reorganisation Act, as it exists today, on the basis mostly of the recommendations made by that Commission. That Commission was much more than a Boundary Commission. But that Commission had suggested that Vidarbha should be a separate State and also that the rest of what constitutes the Bombay State today should continue as a bilingual State. But this proposal caused such an amount of irritation and resentment that, inspite of the fact that it came from an impartial body, we had to revise them at the very initial stage. So, no commission has ever been able to satisfy everybody. If any satisfaction has to be found, it has to be found by goodwill. That is the position about these matters and the experience that I have had so far forces me to the conclusion that unless there is more of goodwill and more

of understanding and more of a spirit of accommodation and mutual self-help, we cannot get over these problems. Let us see whether really an outrage has been committed by this arrangement being accepted. Take the instance of Dangs first because there seems to be more of sentiment centred round Dangs than over the other parts or areas. About Dangs whatever may have been the previous history, it was accepted by the Samiti and the Parishad that the question would be reopened.....
(Interruptions.)

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: But you have not consulted them.

Shri G. B. Pant: I do not know how that affects the arrangement between the Samiti and the Parishad whether I did or I did not consult them. There was that agreement between the two that the question of Dangs should be reviewed which means that the previous position having been considered, these two responsible bodies felt that this question deserved to be reconsidered. Well, after that there were elections in Dangs and out of 30 persons returned to the local boards, barring five or six, all were, I understand, for the transfer of Dangs to Gujarat.....
(Interruptions.) I know that some of my respected friends have been saying that this particular issue was not placed before them very directly. Well, it may be so. But the question was all the same imperceptibly in the air. Even if nothing was placed before them, the whole air was permeated with this problem as to what was going to happen later especially when it had been agreed to between the Parishad and the Samiti that the question would be reopened. So, it was bound to have been there. After that the District Board or whatever name by which it is called there has passed two resolutions, I understand, to the effect that Dangs should be allotted to Gujarat and not to Maharashtra. So, there is ample ground for saying that the two Chief Minis-

ters had based their own arrangement on certain principles and it is not an unprincipled sort of an arbitrary affair but it is something which is based on some principles.

We are told that we are upsetting what was contained by the SRC and we have changed it. The Bill that is before the House shows that the decisions taken by the SRC are going to be revised, were revised and are being revised now. If about Dangs there had been a view at a certain time and now in view of the developments that have taken place since the two Chief Ministers felt that it should be allotted to Gujarat, I think, bearing in mind the history of all these things, we should not be upset.

Then, Shri Khadilkar has been repeatedly referring to the question of Mysore and Maharashtra border. I do not want to say more than what I have said about it from time to time. But the fact remains that in spite of these border having been determined by something more than a boundary commission, namely, the States Reorganisation Commission, today those borders are not accepted and there is a very sharp dispute over them. So, when Shri Datar said that the real essence of what is called the Pataskar Formula was the agreement between the parties he was stating only the truth. If this arrangement had not been based upon agreement between the two parties the parties would not have accepted the formula. Shri Pataskar was requested by me to take up this embarrassing job, and I also persuaded the parties to agree to some principle on which they could ask Shri Pataskar to proceed further.

Then, there is the question of Umbergaon Taluka. In Umbergaon, it is admitted by all that there are a number of villages which must go to Gujarat. It is also accepted that there are some villages which should go to Maharashtra. There is some intervening area about which there

[Shri G. B. Pant]

is some sort of difference of opinion. In these areas which lie in between the two linguistic regions, in a way, it is very difficult to say that only one possible decision is indicated. It is possible that some other men may have taken a different view. But, here, when it is accepted that some of the villages must go to Gujarat and it is also accepted that some should go to Maharashtra, then about the intervening region, I would submit, the Chief Ministers can be trusted to take a reasonable view and we cannot find any better substitute for looking into this matter. So we have to submit to that and I hope the arrangement that they have made is a fair one.

The next one was about Ukai Project. It is accepted that if this Ukai Project necessarily results in some of the villages being submerged, then so far as those villages are concerned, they have to go to Gujarat so that Gujarat may be able to look after them. But unless we give them some other strip round that the people of Gujarat are not going to be drowned in the reservoir. They must be able to do something. As to the Ukai project being a sound one, even the foundation has been laid and the Irrigation and Power Ministry as well as other experts have given their verdict in the matter.

An Hon. Member: No decision.

Shri G. B. Pant: No, no; I may tell you the details have to be worked out, as to the exact depth etc., but there is no doubt about the fact that the project is a sound one, this has to be done and money has been allotted for it. So there need be no objection to that.

It is in the national interest that these arrangements should be supported, and we should even at the sacrifice of our own interest try to promote national welfare to the ex-

tent we can. Shri Gorey has given some amendments. Well, he will be interested to know—I believe he knows—that I have got a representation from Shri Suresh Desai, Chairman, Shri Jitendra Mehta, Treasurer, Shri Ishwar Bhai Desai, General Secretary, Shri Sanat Mehta, Member and Shri Jaswant Mehta, Member.

17 hrs.

Shri Goray: I know they belong to my party.

Shri G. B. Pant: The Praja-Socialist Party. They tell me that not only this little bit that is to be used for the Ukai project but all the six Talukas, Navapura and others, should be allotted to Gujarat, and none of these should be allotted to Maharashtra. So, what I am indicating is this: in matters of this type, people are not even guided by principles but more by regional affinities. Otherwise, there should have been this same principle; why should there be a difference between Shri Goray and the Praja-Socialist Party in Gujarat? It is all because each looks at the thing from a different angle. Shri Goray is capable of looking at things dispassionately, I concede, but in this matter at least there is a difference of opinion between him and his own party in Gujarat. I see that the Mahagujarat Parishad today is more violently in disagreement with the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. *(Laughter)*. The House knows it. So, these questions are not easy of solution. I do not know what is the attitude of the Communist Party.

Shri Goray: The same is happening so far as the Congress is concerned with regard to the Mysore and the Maharashtra border.

Shri G. B. Pant: I do not deny. I do not say that Congressmen belong to a different race. We all have our failings and we all have our

approaches. I am not excluding myself even. But that is a fact of which we have to take note and notice.

I do not know if there is any other thing involved in these amendments. So, I respectfully submit and I repeat that we have to adhere to the decisions taken by the two Chief Ministers, the legislature of Bombay and the Joint Committee. I hope this House will endorse those decisions.

Mr. Chairman: Is it necessary that any particular amendment should be put separately?—No. I shall put all the amendments to the vote.

The amendments Nos. 41, 55, 56, 34, 36, 77, 78, 2 to 5, 97 to 99, 106 and 108 were put and negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

“That clause 3 stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

New Clause 3A

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I beg to move:

Page 2, after line 38, insert—

“3A. Appointment of boundary commission.—As soon as possible after the appointed day, a Boundary Commission shall be appointed for the demarcation of boundaries between the States of Gujarat and Maharashtra on the principle of demarcation of contiguous territory of a particular linguistic group, taking village as a unit.” (6)

Mr. Chairman: Amendment Nos. 6 and 24 are one and the same.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I have moved amendment No. 6.

Mr. Chairman: Is he going to say anything about it?

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: This amendment relates to the setting up of a boundary commission for settling the disputed boundary between Maharashtra and Gujarat. I have sufficiently explained this aspect in my speech and the Home Minister has replied. I have heard the Home Minister. Therefore, I do not want to speak on this amendment.

Shri G. B. Pant: I think Shri Parulekar's amendment was also in the same terms. It has already been considered. I do not remember the numbers. I know the contents.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2, after line 38, insert—

“3A. Appointment of boundary commission.—As soon as possible after the appointed day, a Boundary Commission shall be appointed for the demarcation of boundaries between the States of Gujarat and Maharashtra on the principle of demarcation of contiguous territory of a particular linguistic group, taking village as a unit.” (6).

The motion was negatived.

Clause 4.—(Amendment of the First Schedule to the Constitution)

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

Page 3,—

omit lines 13 to 16. (110).

Page 3,—

omit lines 17 and 18. (111)

Shri Mahagaonkar: I beg to move:

Page 3—lines 11 to 16,—

omit “but excluding the territories referred to in sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1960.” (37)

Mr. Chairman: Does anybody want to speak on these amendments: I find nobody rising. I shall put these amendments Nos. 37, 110 and 111 to the vote of the House.

Nos. 110, 111 and 37

The amendments were put and negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

New Clause 4A

Shri P. R. Patel: I beg to move:

Page 3,—

after line 18, insert—

"4A.(1) The State of Maharashtra shall preserve the cosmopolitan character of the city of Bombay and shall pay special attention to its proper development.

(2) The State of Maharashtra shall continue English as the medium of instruction in the University of Bombay till it is replaced by Hindi.

(3) The State of Maharashtra shall constitute a Linguistic Minority Council elected by an electoral college consisting of elected representatives of minorities in the Legislative Assembly and the Bombay Municipal Corporation on the basis of proportional representation to safeguard the interests of linguistic minorities in the State and advise the State in the matter." (100)

I have no doubt about the sincerity and honesty of the Chief Minister of Bombay, Shri Chavan. I take his word and he made the policy statement with sincerity. But the policy statement is not as good as law and

unless the policy statement is incorporated, it may be changed at any time by any subsequent Government. In a democracy, we cannot say what will happen tomorrow. Shri Dange is cool and honest enough to say that it may be changed.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): It will be changed.

Shri P. R. Patel: So, the policy statement has no sense in that case. I would request the hon. Home Minister to find some way out to put this in law.

An Hon. Member: Law can be changed.

Shri P. R. Patel: Law can be changed, but if it is put in this Bill, it cannot be changed without the consent of this Parliament. So, I propose that this amendment be accepted and the new clause 4A incorporated in the Bill, so that it may not be changed by any Government without the consent of the Parliament.

17.09 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri G. B. Pant: I discussed this matter in the presence of the mover in the Joint Committee and the various aspects of this particular proposal that has been placed before the House were considered. In fact, so far as the setting up of a minority council was concerned, there was in substance no objection. But we felt that it is better to leave these things to the good sense of that House. Even if you frame a law to the effect that is stated here, but the legislature there does not want to work in accordance with the principle that we lay down, it is not easy to force them. Moreover, whatever committee may be set up, a committee of minorities can at the most be an advisory body. It can only give its advice to the Government. If such a body does not possess or enjoy the confidence of

the people and the Government, then its recommendations will hardly receive much response. Therefore, it is better to depend on the goodwill of the Government or the party that is in power. The Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti, the Mahagujarat Parishad and, to the extent that Congress is supposed to be a live body, the Congress too, all of us agreed. Therefore, let us accept the statement of policy as being an authoritative one.

Shri P. R. Patel: I do not press my amendment.

The amendment No. 100 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6 to 11 were added to the Bill.

Clause 12.— (Provision as to sitting members)

Shri P. R. Patel: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 13,—

after "elected" insert "till interim elections day" (101)

Page 5,—

after line 14, add—

"(2) After the appointed day, as soon as possible the Election Commission shall fix a day for interim elections of members to the House of the People to represent the State of Maharashtra and the State of Gujarat." (102)

My submission is that in a democracy if the political party in power is defeated in anything, then the proper course for that party is to resign. The

250 (A) L.S.D.—7.

Congress party, at the time of the elections, stated that they are going to work out the bilingual State of Bombay and, at the end of three years, they have failed in it. So, also the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. They fought the elections on one point, that they are going to fight the case for Samyukta Maharashtra.

Shri S. A. Dange: We have not failed.

Shri P. R. Patel: So also, the Mahagujarat Parishad did the same thing. They fought the elections on more or less one point, breaking the bilingual State. No party was working for the unilingual State, either the Maharashtra or Gujarat parties. So, naturally, under democratic principles and with respect to democratic honesty, I think the fair course is for those members to resign. So, we should put some clause in the law so that there may be interim elections after some time. I do not want to create trouble on the 1st of May. But, after the 1st of May, the Election Commission may fix a date on which all the sitting Members may go home and there will be re-elections.

Shri C. D. Pande: They will never come back.

Shri P. R. Patel: I have nothing more to say.

Amendments Nos. 101 and 102 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 12 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Clause 13 and 14 were added to the Bill.

Clause 15.— (Allocation of Members).

Shri P. B. Patel: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 5, line 37,—

after "elected" insert—

"till the interim elections" (103)

Page 6, line 4,—

after "elected" insert—

"till the interim election". (104)

Page 6,—

after line 10, add—

"(4) After the appointed day, as soon as possible, the Election Commission shall fix a day for interim elections of members of the Legislative Assembly of Maharashtra and Legislative Assembly of Gujarat.

(5) Legislative Assemblies of the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat, shall stand dissolved on the day fixed for interim elections." (105)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall put all the amendments together to the vote of the House.

The amendments Nos. 103 to 105 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 15 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 15 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 16 to 22 were added to the Bill.

Clause 23.— (Chairman and Deputy Chairman)

Shri P. B. Patel: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 8,—

for lines 21 to 30, substitute—

"23.(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 16 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, after the appointed day, biennial elections to fill the seats of members of the Legislative Council of Maharashtra, retiring on the expiration of their term of office on the 24th April, 1960 may be held to fill seats falling short of the total number 78." (88)

Shri Assar: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 8,—

after line 32 add—

"(3) The legislative council of Maharashtra shall be abolished from the date on which the present Legislative Assembly of Maharashtra as constituted under section 13, is dissolved." (25)

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I wish to move my amendment No. 7.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments No. 25 and No. 7 are same. As amendment No. 25 has been moved, amendment No. 7 cannot be moved. Amendments No. 88 and No. 25 are now before the House.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I have to say only one thing. I want to submit before the House that after the formation of these two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat, Maharashtra will be a very poor State though figures are there to show that it would be a surplus State. But if Maharashtra has to come forward in all spheres of life it will have to spend a much larger amount. The Ramamurti Commission had a tour of the various districts of the Bombay State in 1952-53 and it has noted that—

"The Gujarat districts are liable to scarcity and famine conditions in two years out of five while the Maharashtra districts are liable

to scarcity and famine conditions in five years out of seven years."

If this is the state of things we cannot have the luxury of running these two Houses, that is, the Legislative Assembly as well as the Legislative Council. Gujarat has taken a proper step and they have done away with the Legislative Council. I appeal to the House that after the period of this Legislative Assembly is over, the Legislative Council of Maharashtra should also be abolished. This is only what I have to say.

श्री आसर् : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपने प्रमोडमेंट नम्बर २५ के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। गुजरात में लेजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल न रखने का निर्णय स्वागत योग्य है और इसलिये मेरा सुझाव है कि इनको महाराष्ट्र में भी लेजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल रखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि इस का प्रत्यक्ष रूप से कोई उपयोग नहीं मालूम देता। इसमें कोई ठोस काम नहीं होता और इसके कारण हमारे राज्य पर तीन चार लाख का खर्चा आ जाएगा। इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि महाराष्ट्र से भी लेजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल को हटाया जाए।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall put both the amendments to the vote of the House together.

The amendments Nos. 88 and 25 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 23 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 23 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 24 to 44 were added to the Bill.

Clause 45.— (Treasury and bank balances)

Shri P. R. Patel: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 13, line 39,—

for "602 lakhs of rupees and 614 lakhs of rupees"

substitute—

"935 lakhs of rupees and 914 lakhs of rupees" (89)

Shri Assar: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 13, line 39,—

for "602 lakhs of rupees and 614 lakhs of rupees".

substitute—

"407.92 lakhs of rupees and 432 lakhs of rupees". (26)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both these amendments are before the House.

Shri Assar: My amendments 45, 51 and 52 all belong to financial adjustments. Therefore, I will speak on all the amendments.

आर्थिक समझौते के बारे में बहुत सी बातें कही गयी हैं। लेकिन एक बात विशेष तौर पर खटकती है कि महाराष्ट्र को गुजरात को ५० करोड़ ५५ लाख रुपया देना होगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह आर्थिक सहायता देने की जिम्मेदारी किस की है। इस में जिम्मेदारी किस पर है यह विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह आर्थिक सहायता देने की सारी जिम्मेदारी केन्द्रीय सरकार पर है और जो कुछ देना हो वह केन्द्रीय सरकार दे। गुजरात को केन्द्र से कितनी भी आर्थिक सहायता मिले उस से हमें कोई विरोध नहीं है। उस से तो हमें आनन्द ही होगा। लेकिन गुजरात को महाराष्ट्र पैसे दे इस के लिये कोई बेसिक सिद्धान्त नहीं है और जैसाकि मैं ने पहले भी कहा था, यह बेसिक सिद्धान्त न होने के कारण ही झगड़ा हो रहा है। इस सम्बन्ध में बम्बई असेम्बली में जो डिबेट हुई थी उस को मैं ने पढ़ा है और दुःख के साथ

[श्री भास्कर]

कहना पड़ता है कि उसमें एक दूसरे पर ऐसे आरोप प्रत्यारोप किये गये हैं कि जैसे ब एक दूसरे के शत्रु हों। इस के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार और उस की नीति जिम्मेदार है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि गुजरात को पैसा देने की जिम्मेदारी केन्द्र अपने ऊपर ले ले। ऐसा करने से जो दोनों राज्यों में इस समय कटुता पैदा हो रही है वह नहीं होगी।

एक बात का मैं स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ। हम ने जो ५० करोड़ ५५ लाख रुपया देने का निर्णय किया है, उस में क्या मिडान्त है। इस में दस करोड़ रुपया राजधानी के लिये दिया गया है लेकिन इस का आधार कोई नहीं है। भट्टाचार्या और रंगाचार्या ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में इस दस करोड़ के बारे में कहा है लेकिन राजधानी के बारे में कोई एस्टीमेट नहीं किया गया है। उस में कहा गया है कि कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी के रिजोल्यूशन को देख कर हम १० करोड़ रुपया देना चाहते हैं। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बारे में स्पष्टीकरण होना चाहिये।

जहां तक राजधानी का सम्बन्ध है मैं समझता हूँ कि बड़ौदा में राजधानी अच्छी तरह हो सकती है, वहां सब सुविधायें हैं, बड़े बड़े मकान आदि हैं। अगर वहां राजधानी बनाई जाय तो यह १० करोड़ रुपया बच सकता है श्री पटेल साहब ने बताया था कि मद्रास ने आन्ध्र को राजधानी के लिये पैसा दे दिया था, लेकिन हैदराबाद स्टेट के मर्ज होने के बाद आन्ध्र की अलग राजधानी नहीं बनाई गयी और हैदराबाद को ही राजधानी बना दिया गया। तो मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस दस करोड़ रुपये की बचत कर ली जाय और इस को केवल इसीलिये राजधानी पर खर्च न कर दिया जाय कि यह महाराष्ट्र से मिल रहा है। आजकल देश को पैसे की तंगी है, इसलिये बड़ौदा को राजधानी बना कर इस रुपये को बचाया जाना चाहिये।

Shri P. R. Patel rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Patel has already replied to these arguments.

Shri P. R. Patel: No, Sir, I am not going to reply, but I will only read what was said by Dr. H. N. Kunzru in the other House. He has said on 7th April, 1960:

"As regards amortisation of the public debt of Bombay, Shri Rangachari took into account the open market loans and not the loans taken by the Bombay State from the Government of India. Sinking funds for some loans were also not taken into account. When a State is going to be divided we can fairly ask that the liability of the State Government to the Central Government should also be taken into consideration."

The Gujarat Government will be asked to pay the loans taken from the Centre and other loans also, and I do not understand why this was not taken into account by Shri Rangachari.

The other question is regarding the road fund, which is nothing else than the revenue received from the Motor Vehicles Tax Act and Sales Tax Act. If we do not take this as revenue, then naturally there would be more deficit to Gujarat. These taxes are specially meant for road, and so it must be transferred to the road fund.

Under the circumstances, I think there is some mistake, and I would request the hon. Home Minister that if he cannot amend the clause now, the Central Government may consider the matter and help Gujarat State.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member just now made a reference to the speech made by Shri Kunzru in the Rajya Sabha. Does it relate to the speech made in the recent session or some previous one?

Shri P. R. Patel: It relates to the recent session.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are the records printed?

Shri P. R. Patel: Not printed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That should not be referred to. I am sorry I did not take note of that earlier.

Shri P. R. Patel: May I submit, Sir, it was circulated to all the Members?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is for their benefit. But not to be quoted here.

Amendments Nos. 26 and 89 were put and negatived.

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav (Barabanki): Sir, I want to move my amendment No. 9.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is the repetition of amendment No. 26.

The question is:

"Clause 45 stands part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 45 was added to the Bill.

Clause 46 was added to the Bill.

Clause 47.— (Land and goods)

Shri P. R. Patel: I beg to move:

Page 14, line 6,—

After "Part" insert—

"and subject to their assessment of present value on the appointed day and their division on population ratio by a commission to be appointed by the Central Government." (90)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the amendment to vote. The question is:

Page 14, line 6,—

after "Part" insert—

"and subject to their assessment of present value on the

appointed day and their division on population ratio by a commission to be appointed by the Central Government." (90)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"Clause 47 stands part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 47 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 48 to 50 were added to the Bill.

Clause 51.—(Credits in certain funds)

Shri S. A. Dange: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 15,—

for lines 24 to 31, substitute—

"51(1) The Central Government shall pay to the Government of Gujarat rupees 10 crores for the construction of a capital for that State." (58)

Page 16, line 2,—

omit "the Dangs District Reserve Fund". (59)

Shri Goray: I beg to move:

Page 16,—

after line 13, add—

"*Explanation.*—The principal seat of business of the undertaking shall be deemed to be at the place where the administrative head-office of the undertaking was located on the appointed day." (45)

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I beg to move:

Page 15, line 26,—

for "ten" substitute "five". (10)

"Sir, while moving my amendment No. 10, I want that instead of Rs. 10 crores Rs. 5 crores should be given for the purpose of the construction of capital in the new State of Gujarat. Sir, I read a report in the newspapers that the U.S.S.R. oil experts have

[Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav]

given an opinion that it is likely that oil will be found out there and it will not be good to have a capital there. I, therefore, suggest that instead of having a capital there, it will be better if they have a capital at the birth place of Mahatma Gandhi or at Baroda. For this purpose, Rs. 5 crores will be sufficient. Therefore, I request the House to take this amendment into consideration.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have agreed to the objection taken that amendments Nos. 91 and 92 are out of order.

I shall now put the other amendments, namely amendments Nos. 58, 10, 59 and 45 to vote.

The amendments Nos. 58, 10, 59 and 45 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 51 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 51 was added to the Bill.

Clause 52.—(Special Revenue Reserve Fund in Gujarat)

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

Page 17, omit lines 5 to 9. (112)

Shri Parulekar: I beg to move:

Page 16, lines 37 and 38,—

for 'and in the financial year 1969-70, the balance, if any, remaining in that fund' substitute

'towards the payment of the deficit of that State for the next two years'. (79).

Pages 16 and 17,—

for lines 39 to 44, and 1 to 9 substitute:

(4) The whole financial question including the question of deficit of the State of Gujarat after 1961-62 shall be examined by a Finance Commission which shall determine the extent of deficit and the measures for meeting it." (80)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are now before the House. Does Shri Parulekar want to say anything?

Shri Parulekar: I shall say just a few words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has said enough, I think.

Shri Parulekar: I shall not take more than two minutes.

It has been suggested that the Samiti had agreed to make good to some extent the deficit of the Gujarat State. No doubt, the Samiti had taken up the position that it was prepared to meet some portion of the deficit of the Gujarat State, but it had never agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 50 crores. The Home Minister will point out that there was a dispute between the two would-be Chief Ministers of the two States, Shri Chavan on the one side and Dr. Jivraj Mehta on the other, and the dispute was referred to an arbitrator, namely Shri Rangachari. I want to point out that a third party was missing when this dispute was referred to Shri Rangachari. The third party which was concerned was the Central Government. What part of the deficit should be borne by the Central Government was not referred to the arbitrator. Therefore, this question was never considered from all points of view. That is why the amendment which I have moved lays down that Maharashtra should pay the deficit for two years, and afterwards, the Finance Commission should consider the whole issue and decide the matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does Shri B. K. Gaikwad want to say anything?

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I do not want to say anything at this stage. I have had my say already.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendments Nos. 79, 80 and 112 to the vote of the House.

The amendments Nos. 79, 80 and 112, were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 52 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 52 was added to the Bill.

Clause 53 was added to the Bill.

Clause 54— (Public Debt)

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I beg to move:

Pages 17 and 18,—

omit lines 29 to 41 and 1 to 3 respectively. (11).

Page 18,—

omit lines 30 to 33. (12).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are now before the House.

Shri Assar: I want to move my amendments Nos. 28 and 29.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 29 is the same as amendment No. 12, and amendment No. 28 is the same as amendment No. 11. Therefore, both have been moved already.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: In the committee that was appointed for this purpose, two members have differed in this respect, namely Mr. Barve and Mr. Yardi. Whenever there is a case in the court, and there is some doubt created, the benefit of doubt always goes to the accused. Here, we are the sufferers, and when two members have given a different version as to the amount to be given, I think the benefit should go to us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should prefer being a complainant rather than an accused.

I shall now put amendments Nos. 11 and 12 to the vote of the House.

The amendments Nos. 11 and 12 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 54 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 54 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 55 to 59 were added to the Bill.

Clause 60 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 61 to 68 were added to the Bill.

Clauses 69 to 84 were added to the Bill.

New Clauses 84A and 84B

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I beg to move:

Page 32,—

after line 5, insert—

'PART VIIIA

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR NEO-BUDDHISTS

"84A. After the appointed day, the State of Maharashtra and the State of Gujarat shall by suitable legislation promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the neo-buddhists treating them as economically weaker section of the people for the purposes of article 46 of the Constitution.

"84B. After the appointed day, the State of Maharashtra and the State of Gujarat shall pass suitable legislation making provision for equitable allotment of appointments or posts under the States to the neo-buddhists treating them as backward class citizens for the purposes of article 16(4) of the Constitution." (13)

My hon. friend, Shri B. K. Gaikwad, has explained his point very well. It was admitted by the Chief Minister of the Bombay State also that their case should be taken into consideration. A change of religion is not going to give them uplift at once. Economically, educationally and in every other respect, they are very backward. It will be better if the Government gives them protection in

[Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav]

this respect. So these provisions should be included in the Bill.

Shri D. A. Katti (Chikodi): I beg to move:

Page 32, after line 5, insert—

PART VIII A

**SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR THE
NEO-BUDDHISTS**

"84A. After the appointed day, the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat shall by suitable legislation extend to the Neo-Buddhists all the economic and educational facilities which they, as the members belonging to the Scheduled Castes, enjoyed before their conversion to Buddhism with a view to promote the economic and educational interests of this weaker section.

"84B. After the appointed day, the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat shall by suitable legislation give due representation to the Neo-Buddhists in the services of the States by reserving adequate number of posts for them."'
(93)

In support of this amendment, I would like to quote the relevant portion of the speech made by the Chief Minister of Bombay in reply to the debate in the Bombay Legislative Assembly when this subject was discussed by many Members. This is what he said:

"In that respect, I wish to tell publicly to this hon. House that the problem of Neo-Buddhists is a delicate social problem in the proposed Maharashtra, and we have adopted a policy that this problem should be solved amicably, with compromise and with a view to bringing homogeneity in the social life. I am confident that this problem will be solved in that manner. With that in view, we have decided to consider the demands of the Neo-Buddhists and

facilities to be given to them immediately after the reorganisation and we have decided to solve that problem in a just manner. I had expressed to the members of the Samiti and the Republican Party that the feelings that were expressed in paragraph 14 of the letter sent by the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti in this respect particularly represented my views. I wish to tell earnestly that that feeling is true. I express my views only because if there is even slight doubt in the minds of the leaders of the Neo-Buddhists and the Republican Party, they should remove it".

This is the view that has been expressed by the Chief Minister of Bombay. At the same time, the Samiti leaders also have expressed similar views. Comrade Dange is also willing to extend the same facilities to Buddhists. Shri Goray is also willing to extend these facilities to the Buddhists. Shri Naushir Bharucha is also willing to do the same. So is Shri Yajnik. Here the Home Minister also expressed his views when this Bill was discussed by the Joint Committee. I learn from Shri B. K. Gaikwad that the Home Minister has issued instructions to all the States to extend these facilities to Buddhists. The Home Minister is also willing. I think the Home Minister has got a soft corner for these people. He knows that these people are down-trodden and have been exploited for centuries together and they should be brought to a certain level. All these people are willing to give these facilities to these Buddhists. Then, why not make a specific provision in the Bill itself to see that these facilities are given to them.

As my hon. friend Shri Jadhav said they have changed the religion and they cease to be the Scheduled Castes. But simply by change of religion overnight their economic condition is not improved, their educational condition is not improved in any way. In no

way there is a change in the lot of the people except the change in religion. Therefore, I feel that such a provision should be made in the Bill itself.

There is a feeling which I want to make clear. Some people feel that this conversion movement is an attempt to disintegrate society. But that is a wrong notion. As a matter of fact, this conversion movement is to integrate the disintegrated society. That is why this conversion movement should be encouraged by Government. I believe and hope that the Home Minister will be kind enough to accept this amendment and see that specific provision is made in the Bill itself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are now before the House.

Shri Achar: Shall I say a word, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry; there is no time.

Shri G. B. Pant: I regret that I find it difficult to accept the amendments because provision cannot be made to that effect in this Bill. So far as the statement of the Chief Minister of Bombay goes and what I am reported to have said at another place, I stand by it and I will be glad if it were regarded as part of the statement of policy that was made by him with regard to other matters.

Shri D. A. Katti: In view of the statement made by the hon. Home Minister I am glad to withdraw my amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw the amendments?

(The amendments Nos. 13 and 93 were, by leave, withdrawn.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That clause 85 stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 85 was added to the Bill.

Clause 86

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause 86.

Shri Balasaheb Patil: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 32, line 17—

for "and Maharashtra"

substitute "Maharashtra and Mysore". (85).

Page 32,—

omit lines 18 and 19. (86)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put these amendments to vote.

The amendments Nos. 85 and 86 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That clause 86 stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 86 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 87 to 96 were added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us take the Schedules. First Schedule.

Shri Parulekar: Sir, I have my amendment No. 81.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I have my amendments 14 and 15.

Shri Assar: I have my amendments Nos. 31 and 32.

Shri P. R. Patel: May I submit that all the amendments have been moved or deemed to have been moved and lost under clause 3?

Shri Goray: The Schedules form part of clause 3 and when clause 3 was passed these Schedules also have been passed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They will all be barred. I do not think the hon. Members could press their amendments.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

The question is:

"That the First Schedule to the Thirteenth Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

First Schedule to Thirteenth Schedule were added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 1 and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

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

Long Title

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the Long Title to the vote of the House.

Shri Yadav Narain Jadhav: I beg to move my amendment No. 75:

Page 1,

for Long Title, substitute—

"A

BILL

to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay into linguistic States of Marathi speaking Maharashtra and Gujarat speaking Mahagujarat and for adjusting the disputable boundaries by the appointment of a boundary commission, on the basis of the Pataskar formula." (75)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall put this amendment to the vote of the House. The question is:

Page 1,—

for Long Title, substitute—

"A

BILL

to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay into linguistic States of Marathi speaking Maharashtra and Gujarati

speaking Mahagujarat and for adjusting the disputable boundaries by the appointment of a boundary commission, on the basis of the Pataskar formula." (75)

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Long Title stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

The Long Title was added to the Bill.

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee, be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee, be passed."

Shri S. A. Dange. Now, the speeches would be short and brief, I am sure.

Shri S. A. Dange: We are now coming to the end of a problem which haunted us for a very long time and in order to solve it a lot of suffering had to be undergone and a lot of thinking also. However, the end of the problem, more or less in its major aspect, is in sight though unfortunately a little lingering remnant of the past is continuing in the Bill as it is now going to be adopted. I would think that the Maharashtrian people as well as the people of Gujarat on the whole would be satisfied by having got this basic problem resolved—that is, the establishment of the State of Maharashtra and the State of Gujarat. The reorganisation of all our States on the basis of the linguistic principle is being finalised.

Some people may raise a doubt whether this is the last chapter of the problem, not the problem of the Bombay State or the State of Maharashtra or the State of Gujarat but the whole problem of the carving of

the States on the basis of the linguistic principles. Some might suggest that one more problem remains—that is the problem of the Punjabi Suba. I do not want to go into that. That is certainly a problem for the whole country. I do not say it is a problem only for Punjab and so let them look after it. But I am not going to discuss that. In any case today the Constitution, so to say, is more or less complete and the Indian Union is now established more or less on the basis of linguistic States comprising the whole Union. So far as the little problems that are left, we have indicated them in the Minute of Dissent. The six Members of the Samiti who signed that would be not very happy that none of these points made therein had been accepted by the Government. These points are not very unimportant. I do not want to dilate on them. Certainly money which is given can be spent and can be forgotten. But the proposed transfer of areas with human beings living in them and having some linguistic ideas and ideologies is certainly going to be a problem for the new State of Gujarat as well as for the State of Maharashtra. If Gujarat is able to persuade them and assimilate them under their statehood and take away their discontent, I shall be happy. But I do not think that the problem is so easy because the linguistic feelings and the disadvantages that would follow from going into a State which is not linguistically their own might create some bad blood and continue as lingering remnants of the past, as I said earlier. I would have wished that the principle of the Pataskar formula on the borders had been followed in finalising the whole Bill as it is. However, that is that.

There was also the question of the policy statement. While the debate was on, I butted in and said that the policy statement would be changed. Therein I was referring to the fact that now even, when the State of Maharashtra is being born, there is an attempt to put on it certain strings

which it would not willingly accept except as a matter of compromise. For example, in the policy statement there is an insistence that the University of Bombay shall teach in English. There is no reason why it should, and this part of the policy statement of the Government of Bombay shall be blown up, because, after all, we form a linguistic State in order to develop our own language and an administration based on that language.

I congratulate my Gujarati friends that they have a leadership which from even now on says that the language of Gujarat will be Gujarati, that the State administration will be run in Gujarati and that education in schools up to university stage shall be in Gujarati. They have certainly shown a good pride about their language, about their literature and about their culture when they make a statement when the State is being formed.

But I am sorry to say that a certain imposition has been placed on the leaders of Maharashtra. I do not know why they should have agreed, why the Chief Minister of Bombay should have agreed that the Bombay University shall teach in English, later on to be substituted by Hindi. I have no quarrel on the Hindi part, but certainly I have quarrel on the English part. So with regard to that policy statement, the students of Bombay coming from various regions will get their education in their language. But, certainly, the Maharashtra students in the Bombay University and Bombay University as a whole belonging to the State of Maharashtra shall not be dominated by English, and in that part, the policy statement of the Government of Bombay is certainly very bad, that part of the policy is bad. That is why I had to butt in and say that the policy statement shall be changed.

With regard to the other part of the policy statement I have no quarrel, that is with regard to the

[Shri S. A. Dange]

guarantees given to Vidarbha, Marathwada, Konkan and so on. They will be observed and the Samiti, all its exponents and supporters will certainly see that those parts of the policy statement are carried out though they do not find a provision in the body of the Bill, because they affect the people. Those guarantees are given, though I do not understand how they are at all necessary because everywhere it is admitted that every backward part in any State has got to be developed, whether it is Nagpur, Marathwada, Konkan or anything. It would look as if Nagpur, Marathwada and Konkan are being given guarantees because they are backward and Bombay City because it is advanced. Then the other cities will come round and say that they are the only forlorn children of the State and they are not being looked after. But in the present conditions in which we are, where there is uneven development, poverty here and riches there, such types of guarantees are found necessary and, therefore, those are being given. And, though they are not part of the Bill, I am glad that the whole House, will endorse them sentimentally, not as part of the Bill, but as by acceptance through the Bombay Assembly.

Then, coming to the last part, Sir, so long it was thought that linguism is separatism. No, Sir, linguism is not separatism. Linguism is an attempt of a multi-lingual country to gather its own people speaking a common language together in statehood and then develop a wider unity of a federal State. Therefore, the idea, the ambition to have a linguistic State which was condemned as a separatist movement is certainly a very legitimate desire on the part of the people. If it is the basis of a democracy that a particular State or a Government should govern in the language of the people and the development should take place on the basis of the language, because language is not merely language, it inherits tradi-

tion, culture, history and so on. Though we all in India are one nation in that sense, yet we are a multi-lingual nation and these other parts—I do not know what to call them—are linguistic groups or sub-nationals, whatever name you might like to give it.

An Hon. Member: Nationality.

Shri S. A. Dange: Some people may quarrel on that—linguistic group or sub-nations within a wide nation. When Bengal, Tamil, Nad Uttar Bharat, Punjab and so on wanted a linguistic State, that was not a separatist quarrel. Therefore, let us once for all be cleared of the hurdle and admit that this is not separatism. Let us not abuse the Maharashtrians or the Gujaratis for having demanded a separate linguistic State. Let us forget those remnants of ideology, which were not really ideologies but were more or less a sort of resistance given because some vested interests did not like it. The S.R.C. itself says that: that there was a fear of the Bombay city's commercial interests being lost. However, we are glad that the whole of the Congress Party has been now persuaded to agree to the new set-up, that the threat to the commercial interests or the vested interests in Bombay in the event of the formation of a separate Maharashtra State exists no more, and that a sort of goodwill will now prevail.

Therefore, it is a very happy event and I am quite sure that when the new States are established, all the people will first unite in order to see that the States develop properly and reconstruct their economy. I hope that a certain new and healthy spirit will come in; for so long, the Marathi people had no State of their own and a sort of cosmopolitanism of Bombay was used in order to inhibit the Marathi culture. Now at least that cosmopolitanism of Bombay will no longer be used to inhibit the development of the Marathi people and the Marathi people will as a whole con-

tribute to the development of the country as a whole.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the hon. Member is concluding

Shri S. A. Dange: Yes. Maharashtra has certainly got that capacity as every other State has got. But every State has its own peculiarities, and each State has some wonderful thing to contribute to the totality of the Indian nation as a whole.

You may not remember but you will appreciate the fact that the Maharashtra State has not got any big multi-millionaire. If you ask whether there are multi-millionaires in Maharashtra, well, there may be some in other groups, but in Maharashtra, there are very few; almost none. A multi-millionaire does not exist there. A solitary name here or there may be there, but even that name is a sort of sub-tenant of some other multi-millionaire! Thus, the whole of the Maharashtra is more or less composed of peasantry; the majority is peasantry, working class and middle class. Even in Bombay city,—now it is included in Maharashtra—there may be multi-millionaires in other groups but not among the Maharashtrais. That is why perhaps Maharashtrais can make a certain contribution to the development of socialist thought, particularly in the context in which we are now situated.

Take the case of the Bombay city. Its working class composition is drawn from all the States. There is absence of big landlordism in Maharashtra. Maharashtra never had a permanent zamindari as unfortunately Bihar, Bengal or Uttar Pradesh had. We had a sort of absence of landlordism and absence of multi-millionaires. Therefore, I think that Maharashtra will develop a new thought and make a new contribution to the development of Indian economy on the road to socialism. I think that would not be quite a speculation for the simple reason that you will find that social-

ist thought of all parties, wherever it has come up, has more or less come up through Maharashtra. I am not chauvinistic or narrow minded to say that others have not contributed to this, but because of the big proposition of the working classes in Maharashtra and Bombay city, they have developed a Congress socialism, Praja-socialist socialism, neo-socialism, or Communist Party socialism, but all the same some socialism. Therefore, you will find that this new State imbibes all the enterprising spirit of the Gujaratis and other virtues of the surrounding States, and we hope that we will help the development of our country on the road to socialism.

But, of course, even there, struggles cannot be ruled out altogether. We all want to co-operate in developing the new State in a big way, peaceful way, in a good way and in a socialistic way, but unfortunately elements are there which will object to it, and therefore struggles should not be ruled out. But I am sure the new State, will contribute to a happy future for the country.

18 hrs.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I consider it my painful duty to oppose the motion which has been moved by the hon. Home Minister just now. It is not very pleasant for a man to be singled out as an opponent in the midst of so many friends, but nonetheless, duty requires sometimes that a man should act up to his conscience and respect it more than even the consolation of friendship.

Before I give the grounds on which I oppose the motion, there are two or three small points which I would like to dispose of in a few sentences. In today's debate, two of my esteemed friends took part and I was very glad to listen to them. One was my friend Shri K. G. Deshmukh and the other Dr. Gohokar. There were other friends also. They made references

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

to two important points and they stated that they were not able to understand me. I shall try to make them understand as much as I can.

Hon. Members may remember that when I made my last speech, I stated that I look upon this Bill as a victory of linguistic fanaticism. That was the phrase that I then used. My friend put me the question that; while I was attacking the Bill on the ground that it was linguistic fanaticism, nonetheless, I was asking for separation of Vidarbha, which he considers is mainly based upon linguistic considerations. I want to tell him one thing. Formation of States on a linguistic basis is one consideration. But there is another point in it. To say that one language can cater to one State is another principle.

In this whole controversy between Vidarbha and Maharashtra, the point was this. Under the existing conditions, there may be linguistic States; that principle is conceded. But what Maharashtrian friends say is, if there is one language, then that must become part of Maharashtra and form one province, whether they were in any way connected with them previously by history, culture, etc. or not; these conditions are not to be taken into account. That was the position taken by my friends in Maharashtra. That is why I say their attitude is one of linguistic fanaticism.

As a matter of fact, they know in India today there are certain States which speak the same language and yet they are separate States. (*Interruptions*). All my friends know the map and geography of India very well. I need not mention the States here. The Home Minister, who is sitting by my side, was the Chief Minister of a big State and by its side there was the Bihar State. I can go on. The States Reorganisation Commission also had seen these things and created Rajasthan. I do not know whether they can make a Hindi State or not.

My point is this. The constitution of a State, though language may be an important consideration, is more or less a matter of administrative convenience. It is done for that purpose. It is not with a view to create a new sense of nationality in them, so that they may constitute into some new nationality. If there is so, care has to be taken, if some nationality is likely to be too strong in some time or other, so that it may be a matter for serious consideration by the Central Government. What I am making is this. My hon. friends in Maharashtra, who have been opposing the formation of Vidarbha, had no other grounds to urge against the formation of Vidarbha except this one thing, "you speak the same language as I speak". They persist on that ground. Therefore, I have said it was more or less linguistic fanaticism, and I do not want to refer to other matters which ultimately led me to say that this Bill constituted a victory to linguistic fanaticism.

Then I come to the second point referred to by Dr. Gohakar. I am afraid, he said that Vidarbha means only four districts. I do not know from where he has learnt his geography about it. He confounds varhads or Berars with Vidarb. He said that Vidarbha meant only four districts, Akola, Amraoti, Yeotmal and Buldana. He excludes the four Nagpur districts out of Vidarbha. I only want to say that he is a very learned man, he has obtained the doctorate....

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: It is called Nagvidarbh.

Dr. M. S. Aney: It is Vidarbha after all. You forget that. You do not want that word itself, that is my trouble. However, I do not want to quarrel with him. My point is this. I only want to say that if he has read the history of Vidarbha, the old history of Vidarbha, he would have found, that the limits of Vidarbha are

between Narbada and Godavari. Pikhshagiri which is Sathpura is the mountain border of Vidarbha. This is treated in the old works and all Sanskrit works refer to this territory by the term Vidarbha. I do not want to go further into this matter, because that will be a lecture by itself and a large number of quotations will have to be given on it. But I only want to suggest my friend, Dr. Gohokar, that he may once more revise his history, Indian history, particularly that of Vidarabha and then he will find that his idea of Vidarbha as it is at present is narrow and it will have to be widened in order to understand or have a proper comprehension of what Vidarbha territory was.

The third point is that Vidarbha is a deficit State. He quoted some figures which my friend, Dr. Khedkar has published somewhere. I am glad to find that my hon. friend, Shri Khedkar, has published certain extracts from the speeches of Mr. Kazi and circulated them for information of hon. Members. Here I want to say that the matter about the subject of deficit was recently under serious discussion between the Chief Minister of Bombay and Dr. Jivaraj Mehta of Bombay. The result of Dr. Jivaraj Mehta's estimates of the expected deficit of Gujarat is to the tune of Rs. 10 crores. Our friend, Shri Chavan, the Chief Minister, did not want to go beyond, Rs. 4 crores. So, these Ministers, when they want to manipulate figures, can run between Rs. 4 crores to 10 crores. That is the difficulty about it.

After all, with all my admiration for my young friend, Shri Kazi, he has come out as a financial expert for the first time and some time at least must go for me to accept as reliable or authoritative his figures about Vidarbha. It is admitted by him and on all hands and the memorandum which was submitted by me to the Commission in 1953 gives the figures.

I took the figures from the Government records and published them.

Therein I have shown how Vidarbha was a surplus tract up to that time. After 1956 because it has been joined to Bombay and new developmental expenditure has begun the surplus Vidarbha tract has become a deficit tract. I want to know if it is a matter of credit to the Bombay State that a surplus tract has been turned into a deficit tract. It is really a matter to be seriously considered.

Thirdly, when this objection is put forward they forget one thing. At a time when you are creating a deficit State for which you have to pay crores and crores of rupees, when that can be created they say that creation of Vidarbha State, which has a deficit of a crore of rupees, assuming those figures as correct, is an impossibility. You can see the absurdity of the argument that they are adducing and also the absurdity of the claim that the Bombay Administration....

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: That deficit was shown by me during the years 1953 to 1956 when it was in Madhya Pradesh.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Madhya Pradesh also was governed by you and by those persons who are Ministers today. You forget that thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It would be better if no attempts are made to correct the hon. Member. I would request the hon. Member to be brief now. It is the third reading stage.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I shall make one or two points. Now after the Bill is passed it will become a law within a short time, that is, after it gets the assent of the President. Appeals have been made by hon. Members since the Bill was introduced in this House to the effect that a new era has opened, a new epoch is coming and a historic event is coming into existence and so on. What is it that is being done? I can understand that Gujarat is created out of the existing State. What remains, the residuary State is called

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

Maharashtra. It means the merger of Vidarbha altogether with Maharashtra. I want all my hon. friends to say whether at any time the boundaries of Maharashtra had exceeded those of the eight or nine districts of the old Bombay Presidency. You are hereby claiming that Maharashtra means territories up to Gondia as if they had no separate existence, no separate culture, no separate history, no separate tradition at all. It was all Vidarbha. It was there for so many years. It is being obliterated today by your putting the name Maharashtra.

My objection to this is for another reason also. When the agitation was started it was in the name of Samyukta Maharashtra. Let me tell my hon. friends, Shri Dange and Shri Goray that I was lying on my death bed in Poona when my friend Datta Waman Poddar, one of the most enlightened men of Maharashtra came to me and I asked him, "What is this Samyukta Maharashtra affair?" He said, "Mr. Aney, it is a concession to you and to your contention that Vidarbha and Marathwada are not Maharashtra; they are being joined to Maharashtra and in order to indicate that and to recognise your special existence also we are trying to call this territory as Samyukta Maharashtra." The agitation was carried in the name that we are going to form a Samyukta Maharashtra. But as soon as it was seen that the hon. Home Minister is amenable to anything that comes from the Chief Minister of Bombay. He said, "How was it done in the case of others?" The implication of the agitation and the name that was given to it was forgotten. At that time they said "Why have Samyukta Maharashtra? Call it Maharashtra." I am not quarrelling with you for calling it Maharashtra. But the change of name to Maharashtra and not keeping it Samyukta Maharashtra indicates a kind of mentality that is behind this movement. I make myself bold to assert and it is

a matter on which my Maharashtra friends may feel proud also that they think that they belong to a race which has ruled that they had spread all over India, that they had fought for the liberty of the motherland and they had their martial traditions. It is a feeling of being superior and fighting the rest, and therefore they feel that anything that can be affiliated to them in one form or another should be Maharashtra and nothing else. That is the position. At least people feel these things about their motives,—it may be wrong, I hope it will be proved wrong—that it is this kind of aggressive tendency of certain sections of the people in Maharashtra—I do not want to name anybody—which is making this merger more suspicious and more dangerous also.

They have chosen the inauguration ceremony to begin with Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj festival. In those days when Shivaji's name was anathema and people were not coming together to take part in the celebrations, we were playing our humble part to carry the sacred name of Shivaji and to inspire the people with the high ideals for which Shivaji stood. Now, it is well known that this 27th April is an exploded date. Anybody who has read modern history knows that is an exploded date. They have chosen this exploded date and extended the celebrations for four days, so that it should become a festival for the inauguration of the new Maharashtra State. Let them do it. I do not want to grudge but there is something behind that.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh rose—

Dr. M. S. Aney: I can understand the feelings of my hon. friend Dr. P. S. Deshmukh on this point, and I am sorry if I am saying something to injure his feelings.

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): What I say is this has nothing to do with the Bill.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I apologise to him for that. The obvious object of this is that the reception to the new State may be universal in character which would not be the case if it is not coupled with the name of Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj. I have personally said that if they hold the festival, we will go and pay our tribute. Nonetheless we shall not give up our opposition to the new State that is being imposed upon us.

Whenever the question of the formation of a separate Vidarbha State was considered in the past by the Central Government, by the Congress Working Committee or by some commissions,—I do not want to go into the history of it—every such body ultimately in its own way gave the finding that Vidarbha could be a separate State. This was said by each commission including the last, namely the States Reorganisation Commission. The recommendation of the Dhar Commission was that Vidarbha could be a separate State, but that its formation was being opposed by those who stood for Samyukta Maharashtra. That is what they said. Therefore, though they recommended the formation of the State, there was no such State formed. That is the position.

The V.J.P. Committee consisting of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the late lamented Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and the late Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya said that if the Maharashtrian friends wanted a separate State, they could have it, but whether the people of Vidarbha and Nagpur—they had put in these words—should join or not would depend upon their will, it could not be imposed upon them. This is their clear verdict. We thought when the time came we could hold up this charter and ask the Central Government and those who were responsible for running it, whether they were going to give the benefit of this promise to the people of Vidarbha or not. What we say is this. If you will

not consider us fit for it, then, hold a trial, take a referendum, have a plebiscite, or fix some date by which you intend to do that. We shall be prepared to abide by the decision of that. If the electorate of the general population of Vidarbha by a majority, vote for continuing with the present State which you are creating by this law, I tell you I shall be the first man to go and approach everybody and say, "Do not talk now, it is your bounden duty to submit to it; but if it goes against you, then I think the Home Minister should assure us that in that case he would be prepared to make adjustments and form a new Vidarbha State."

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

Dr. M. S. Aney: I shall conclude with one request, which I had made even in my last speech. My request was this. In order to avoid the calamity and the troubles into which the Vidarbha people will be thrown hereafter, after this Bill is passed, a promise, or an assurance is necessary that now or within a year or two years, Government would be prepared to call upon the people of Vidarbha to come together and express their opinion as to whether the present state of things should continue or not continue. If that assurance would have been given, then the thing would have been all right. You do not know what the position today is. I only want to say this. In the last month, in more than 25 places, a satyagraha campaign has been carried on.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Of hired people.

Dr. M. S. Aney: My hon. friend is entitled to say that, and I can also throw back something in return.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member might be allowed to conclude now.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I shall conclude with just one sentence, and no more than that.

Shri Goray: Now, it is a fight between one Congressman and another Congressman.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, the hon. Member is very happy?

Shri Goray: Because they were happy when we were quarrelling.

Dr. M. S. Aney: More than one thousand people have offered themselves as satyagrahis, and about one hundred of them are in prison as prisoners or under-trial prisoners. The thing is that it has begun. Whether this is to grow and gather in volume and strength will certainly depend upon the attitude that the Government of India will take.

Shri S. A. Dange: For Bombay city 105 people died. What is the satyagraha of one thousand people?

Dr. M. S. Aney: I thought that that was the story of the past, and that would not be repeated in future.

On account of these considerations for the people of Vidarbha who are likely to face a terrible situation hereafter, I have to declare here in their name that I am unable to support this Bill, and I oppose it.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): I am very happy to express my joy and gratification at the fact that the curtain is about to be rung down on the tragedy of the bilingual State and the tragic events that followed in its wake. It was more than three years ago that the bilingual State was settled upon by this House, and when the decision was received in Ahmedabad and in Gujarat, it created consternation and sorrow and suffering. We have passed through three years of stress and storm and we are glad to see that our efforts have not been in vain.

In the first few days, when the worst of repression was let loose on Ahmedabad and Gujarat, we almost felt as if we were absolutely alone,

and we had no friends outside the limits of Gujarat. But we were very glad to find within a month or so that the events that crowded in Gujarat, the firing and the janata curfew and the parallel meeting, that we had to hold when the Prime Minister came to Ahmedabad to show him the depths of our feeling for Maha Gujarat, were all noted with sympathy in the press of Maharashtra. We were very glad to find that the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and the people, the vast millions of Maharashtra, whom they represent, gradually began to give us a helping hand and to sympathise with our whole movement for the bifurcation of this big Bombay State. It is worthy of note that the worst tragedy, the worst firing, that took place before the bilingual State was formed, was in Bombay. It was more or less a fight for the City of Bombay. The worst tragedy that took place after the decision on a bilingual State was taken, was in Ahmedabad.

As the elections took place, we sat together—men of the Parishad and of the Samiti—and we decided to cooperate to however limited an extent in Opposition in the legislature of the Bombay State. Then more things happened. We just felt that we had to get together nearer and nearer in order to solve the problems that would confront us when the State was divided into two, and we set about it in right earnest. We met in Poona in 1957. We met in Bombay in January 1958. We came to three decisions. I am happy to state that though we could not come to a final decision we laid down principles that have more or less been adopted in the formulation of the Bill that we are about to pass.

The three principles, as Shri Datar very briefly pointed out a few hours ago, were as follows. The first principle was that the representatives of the two States of Maha Gujarat and Maharashtra would study the problem of giving aid to the sister State of Gujarat from the funds of the

Maharashtra State in the initial years. The rest was naturally kept pending. When we further met in Bombay, it was again decided.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would he want to describe all those meetings and what happened there? This is the third-reading stage.

Shri Sonavane: It is relevant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It may be essential, but we are on the third reading stage.

Shri Yajnik: The second principle was that Dangs was treated as a separate question. The third was that all the rest of the border problems were to be settled according to the Pataskar formula.

It is my complaint also that the Pataskar formula has not been applied to the six taluks of Nandarbar, Navapur, Akkalkuva, Akrani, Shahada and Taloda. Gujarat has just been granted 150 villages on account of the Ukai dam which is a fact and a reality. We feel, and the people of the six taluks have represented to the Government of India, that they are well prepared for a plebiscite or referendum. What we plead for is not in vain. History and geography stand by us. All the big authorities on linguistics have also given their verdict that Ahirani, Dangi and Bhili are species of the Gujarati language.

The point is that while we feel that some bigger areas might have been allotted to Gujarat, in the case of Umbergaon and Nandarbar, after all the compromise that has been effected and the arrangements that have been made in view of the Pataskar formula, all that has happened before between the representatives of the two would be States should be taken seriously into consideration.

We have, to a certain extent, been at a disadvantage. If the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti was not consulted by the 9-man Committee, we were also not consulted. It is no fault of ours

that we were not consulted. It is not out of any favour or partiality for Gujarat that some areas have been allotted to us. I may say that there is an amount of lingering discontent in Gujarat today, that larger areas have not been given, that the financial arrangement has been comparatively miserly, and that the deficit of Rs. 9 crores has been reduced to Rs. 4 crores and Rs. 6 crores.

All that is there in our minds. But, we have taken, Sir, a more statesman-like attitude. We feel that after all a State that has been together for the last 100 years and more is separated into two parts, and when the two Chief Ministers or the would-be Chief Ministers of the two States have come to a certain arrangement in the way of partitioning the family assets in a friendly accommodating manner, we feel that that arrangement should be accepted. We know that they worked under the guidance of our Home Minister and the Government of India. And, it is in the spirit of statesmanship that we have to look at this Bill and look at all the arrangements that are symbolised in the Bill. It is not because we have liked every arrangement that is made there but it is because we feel that if this partition has to be effected within a limited period, there is no time now for a Boundary Commission to be appointed. Some arrangements must be made here and now and the arrangements have been made.

I may state that they have taken pretty long over it. While the decision was made or at least made public in the month of August last, we are now in April. It has taken a long time for the nine-man committee and also the Working Committee of the Congress and the Congress leadership and the Ministers to come to this agreement and work out all the details of the partition. They have taken great pains. Villages and other details have been gone into. Though we may not like every part of the arrangement that has been made, I

[Shri Yajnik]

would appeal to my Maharashtrian friends with whom we have been, to a certain extent, divided over this boundary issue and questions of division during the last few months, after our long and glorious co-operation for years together, I would appeal to them at this hour, when within 2 weeks the two States are to be formed, to bury the hatchet, to adopt the Bill as it is and work it out as a deed of partition of family property; and particularly take care to see that the boundaries are respected and no unhappy accidents occur on either side of the boundary. I will say that on our part we will see that all that is expected of us will be attempted by us.

So far as the Adivasis and Scheduled Castes are concerned, it is Thakkar Baba and Mahatma Gandhi who have set the tradition for Gujarat. It is Thakkar Baba who went to West Khandesh and started the Adivasi Seva Mandal. The Adivasi Seva Mandals and other organisations are also working in Dangs and I can assure my friends that we of Gujarat, the Government and the people alike, and all their organisations will do their level best to see that the most backward of the communities get the best treatment and the best deal at our hands.

Therefore, I would request my friends of Maharashtra, the Maharashtra Samiti and the Republican Party and all others now to bury controversies and look to the future and divert all their energies and attention, to concentrate them on making their State, as we shall attempt to conduct ourselves to make our State and our people, more happy and more prosperous in future.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Goray. I will request the hon. Members now to confine their remarks to 5 minutes only. There are quite a number of hon. Members wanting to speak and I will have to accommodate a few of them at least.

Shri Goray: Today, the long travail will be over and the long debate also will come to the end. Ever since we were returned to this House, it has been our constant endeavour to persuade this august Assembly to appreciate the justice of our demand for a separate State of Maharashtra and a separate State of Gujarat. We are naturally happy, therefore, that at last what we asked for and what we fought for and what we suffered for had been appreciated. There is no question that henceforward the energies of the people in Maharashtra will be used for building a prosperous and happy Maharashtra. The appeals were made here by the Home Minister as well as by my friend Shri Yajnik that we should forget all quarrels and all the differences should be forgotten now and that the hatchet should be buried, and henceforward the two neighbouring States of Gujarat and Maharashtra should work hand in hand. I know it is rather late in the day to say here that full justice has not been done to us. I would only like to point out that a few things have been left which we would have liked to get amended or rectified—the question of the 16 or 17 villages of Umbergaon, the question of the Dangs and the question of the transfer of the villages which are likely to be submerged under the Ukai Dam to the State of Gujarat. There are other questions and I do not want to enter into details of them... (*An Hon. Member:* What remains?) As I said, it is rather late in the day. I do not want to mince words and give you false hopes. Why I am trying to point out these things is that at least so far as the villages in West Khandesh are concerned, it is not only the transfer of villages but it is a new principle that you are trying to introduce. Last time also, I pointed out but I failed in bringing conviction to you. Nowhere in India, wherever dams have been built, the areas that are submerged or likely to be submerged had been transferred to the other State. That statement, I suppose, still

stands unchallenged and if you have already taken a decision, I have no quarrel with you but I would like to point out that so far as Ukai dam is concerned, please once again go into the report that has been submitted to you. It has been pointed out by the experts committee that the total acreage that is likely to be affected is 157 lakhs of acres. Out of that, if you take into consideration, the cultivable land only 7 per cent of land is in Madhya Pradesh, 7 per cent. in Gujarat and 85 per cent land in Maharashtra. The whole calculation is based on the data that the Bombay Government had supplied. It was said that nearly 90 million acre feet of water was available. I am not quoting figures from some source which is not available to the Government. If you go into the debates of the Bombay Legislature, one of the members has pointed out from the Government figures this fact.

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

Shri Goray: Sir, you have given so much time to Dr. Aney and other people. Why are you so hard on me?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is exactly the reason why I am saying this to the other hon. Members.....
(Interruptions.)

Shri Goray: In short, I would ask you to go into it again and then you will find perhaps that very little water would be available for the dam. Tapti is a very erratic river. The figures that you are quoting are true only once in five or six years; otherwise, Tapti does not give so much water at all. So I leave it to you.

I would like only to point out this. I was really sorry when I heard the veteran Congressman, Dr. Aney. I had never thought that in old age a man wanted to forget all that he had preached and professed in his young days. Even he went to the extent of saying that the Shivaji festival should not be the starting point of new

Maharashtra. I would like to tell you that this Maharashtra is inconceivable without Shivaji. Whatever good is there in Maharashtra is due to Shivaji. Therefore, it is but proper that we should start with a bow to the great hero who created Maharashtra.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Who created India also, not only Maharashtra.

Shri Goray: Very good. I am very glad. If I may quote one sentence, Sir, he was the man who typified the revolutionary spirit in Maharashtra. When the question of his coronation came and when at that time the priestly class said that he was not a kshatriya but a sudra, he was the man who said:

“शूद्र होसाते राज्य करून दाखवू”

whereby he meant: “Though I am born a sudra, I will show you that even a sudra can administer a kingdom.” That is the spirit that has inspired us. As Shri Dange said, Maharashtra is a poor province. We do not trace our descent from Ram or Krishna. We trace our descent from Shivaji. We can say even now:

“शूद्र होसाते राज्य करून दाखवू”

Shri Datar said, let us build up India, in the name of the good of the nation, let us now march forward. There again, I would like to tell him what Shivaji had said. He had said:

“देशासाठी फकिरो घेतली आहे”

We have reduced ourselves to poverty for the sake of the nation, that was what he said. Therefore, I would like to assure the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, I would like to assure the Home Minister—I am glad that the Prime Minister is also here—that so far as nationalism is concerned, sacrificing for the nation is concerned, it is in our blood and we shall never betray our blood.

Sir, I have nothing more to say. I only wish, let Gujarat prosper. Let Gujarat teach us the secrets of trade and commerce and industry. We want

[Shri Goray]

to learn from them. For the last 300 years, in spite of the fact that we came into close contact with them, we did not learn from them. Now we would like to learn from them. We would like to send some of our young Maharashtrians to Gujarat, when the new capital is formed, to study there for some time and like Kacha learn the sanjeevani vidya and come back to Maharashtra. And, Sir, if we have something to contribute to the nation by which the Gujaratis also will profit, they are welcoming to Maharashtra to learn from us.

I feel that there is no likelihood of any inimical feelings between the two States. Whatever our differences may be, we will try to argue about them. We shall come to the Home Minister for a settlement. It is our tragedy, in a way, that we have lost here what we have gained outside. It is quite possible that we may yet win the points that we are stressing here. We will go on putting forward our point of view. One day or the other we will succeed.

So, Sir, I agree with all my friends in saying, "Let us begin a new chapter". Every story has its end. And this story also is ending. Let us now start on a new page and wish good luck to Gujarat and good luck to Maharashtra.

Shri Khadilkar: Today I am very happy because after a long period of time, the struggle and a certain amount of bitterness that had entered the life of Maharashtra and Gujarat have come to an end. Perhaps today we are reaching a phase in the evolution of a federal union that we are building up, where every unit of the federation more or less now is organised on a homogeneous base. That will strengthen our country and strengthen the nation.

On this occasion I would particularly like to thank the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad. One of the arguments that was advanced in support

of the bilingual State from the start by the Gujarat leadership with a certain type of authoritarian tradition was that "we want a big State; the Maharashtrians are fools; they do not understand the advantage of a big State like bilingual State of Bombay, because we can combat and equal the balance at the Centre with Uttar Pradesh and other big groups". That idea never caught hold of us so far as Maharashtra is concerned, and though we have quarrelled about certain matters in the process of formulating this Bill, the credit goes to my hon. friend Shri Yajnik who came forward and told the people of Gujarat after the Gandhian era, for the first time, "You will have to fight against this leadership in Gujarat". Therefore, ultimately, because of this struggle ...

Shri P. R. Patel: Are we discussing this Bill or any other thing?

Shri Khadilkar: He is taking away my time. Because of a joint struggle and our resolve, ultimately the Congress leadership accepted the verdict of the people of Maharashtra and this House also is ultimately putting its seal on that verdict. This is a great day for democracy.

There are certain problems, but when we solve problems by democratic methods, there is no cut-and-dried solution. Some leaders were saying that the bilingual State had come to Stay. But ultimately we have seen today that two States are being carved out. Therefore, I have every hope that, whatever little patches there are here and there on the border and though certain problems here and there are still there unsolved,—and I am confident—if we apply our mind and if the leadership also takes a broad view in order to remove all the spots of discontent on the broader interests of the nation, these problems will be solved sooner than later.

We have created language States. We are a multilingual nation. Just now history was quoted. One great,

eminent leader of India has said that perhaps in the evolution of our country history is likely to prove a curse. That is a very significant sentence. Therefore, when we are building up language units, our enthusiasm in the sense of any patriotism should not assume a certain amount of exclusive nationalism or chauvinistic character at the cost of broader unity. Let us all, who are really very happy now, bear this fact in mind.

We welcome this day and will remember this day, when we have completed the process, which we had started, of building up a strong Indian union of a federal character. We had not enough time to organise the units on a certain homogeneous and socially integrated basis. We have done that today. Therefore, this Bill will go down in history and this day will be remembered as a historic event.

Shri G. B. Pant: We are almost at the end of the journey, and the clock too is beckoning to us not to prolong this discussion very much.

I have a feeling of relief and I should like to express my appreciation of the way in which this whole subject has been handled by the hon. Members of this House. It involved some ticklish issues, as all questions relating to re-organisation of States generally do, but in spite of occasional lapses, a spirit of friendliness, understanding and goodwill was maintained throughout the discussions and the deliberations.

It is not for me at this stage to enter into the merits of this measure. I would, however, remind hon. Members about the expeditious way in which efforts have been made to form these two States and to get this legislation through the Parliament. The President of the Congress at that time, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, was the first to raise this question and it was through the efforts of the Chief Minister, Shri Chavan, and Dr. Jivraj Mehta that we were able to give a

concrete shape to the aspirations of the two sections of the people in Bombay.

There is, however, one lesson which I think stands out prominently and which we might well heed. We can gain our ends and objectives not through violence, but through peaceful and democratic methods. Again, we may enter into alliances in a state of frenzy or fury, but when it comes to real settlement, then such alliances do not yield great results. It is only when unity is based on basic principles and directed towards the achievement of constructive purposes in a peaceful way that alliances can also prove fruitful. What we have achieved today is due to the spirit of understanding, appreciation of each other's point of view, goodwill and a desire to accommodate each other which was shown by the leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat, the Chief Minister, Shri Chavan and Dr. Jivraj Mehta. Dr. Jivraj Mehta is the prospective Chief Minister of Gujarat. They two entered into an alliance, and that alliance was of a fruitful character, because it was not tainted by any sort of violence or any sort of reserve. We saw that the Samyukt Maharashtra Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Parishad had worked together for some time. But when it was put to test, they failed. (*Interruptions.*)

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri G. B. Pant: I saw before me here, today as well as previously, whenever this Bill was taken up there were sharp differences between the two.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: That does not matter. We have attained our objective.

Shri G. B. Pant: I have been forced to say so by certain remarks that have been made in the debate which I wish had not been made. I, however, wanted to say that let us work in a brotherly spirit, which has been shown by Chavan and Jivraj Mehta.

Shri S. A. Dange: We fought and you made the alliance.

Shri G. B. Pant: You fought and we took notice of your sentiments and of your views and also of the public and we have always been ready, and will always remain ready, to do what we consider to be in the interests of the millions of people whom we happen to have the privilege to serve today. So, that will be our guiding principle and I hope we will try to act up to it. Nothing will be allowed to come in our way and we will try to do the right thing with a view to serve the interests of the people in a right manner and in a way that will ensure to their lasting benefit.

Now this chapter is almost closed. I hope these two States will flourish and prosper and that there will be unity and goodwill between the two communities or groups who have lived together for decades and centuries and who have contributed to the growth of the nation and to the progress of nationalism in this country in a large measure.

19 hrs.

Language is a uniting force, Language is the basis of culture, but linguistic frenzy can also sometimes

cause serious damage and even disaster. So, while doing all we can to promote the regional languages, we have to continue the process of synthesis in our country, which has really enabled us to build our composite culture and which has helped all parts of our country, in spite of the languages being varied and the way of life being in certain respects also different to treat each other as brothers. And, above all, we owe allegiance to India and everything else comes next or after that. So, while doing our best for our regional languages, for our respective regions, we have on an occasion like this to remember that whatever we do has to be consistent with the higher supreme loyalty that everyone of us must owe to this country, from which alone all benefits can flow. So let this great India bless these two States. Let us all join together in wishing them all happiness, progress, peace and advancement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

19:01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 20, 1960/Chaitra 31, 1882 (Saka).