

**THE BOMBAY REORGANISATION
BILL, 1960**

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith and resolves that the following members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee:—

1. Shri Khandubhai K. Desai
2. Shri T. R. Deogirikar
3. Shri K. K. Shah
- Shri M. D. Tumpalliwar
5. Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi
6. Shri V. R. Pandurang
7. Shri K. P. Madhavan Nair
9. Shri Purna Chandra Sharma 9. Shri Vijay Singh
10. Shri Gopal Swarup Pathak
11. Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel
12. Shri Lalji Pendse
13. Shri Suresh Jamiatram Desai
14. Shri B. V. (Mama) Warerkar; and
15. Shri Govind Ballabh Pant (*the m'over*)."

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all; no speech?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Well, Sir, I think it would perhaps be pardonable if I were not to make any speech, but the conventions of the

«5 R.S.D.—3

House have to be observed. So, I have to make a few remarks. Before, however, dealing with the subject of the motion that I have just moved I would, Sir, very respectfully endorse the observations that you were pleased to make in your own inimitable way when you welcomed the Members who have just joined this House. With your permission I should also like to accord a hearty welcome to the new Members. I count upon their unstinted support in ensuring the common weal and welfare of the great Union to which we have the honour to belong. It is a lucky coincidence and perhaps a good augury for the new States that are to be ushered in by the Bill that I have just placed before the House for consideration. This is the House of States, and as such it is specially concerned with the composition and reorganisation of States, and when there is, to a great extent, a recomposition of this House itself, it is, I believe, a good promise for the future that this Bill providing for the birth of two new States should find the first place in the order paper today.

Sir, so far as the merits of the Bill go, I do not know if I am required to make a long speech as this Bill has been the subject of discussion in the Bombay Legislative Council and in the Bombay Assembly for a number of days; every clause of the Bill and the principles underlying it were discussed in the Bombay Assembly for five days and in the Bombay Council for three days, and after some discussion the following Resolution was adopted by the Assembly as well as by the Council:—

"The draft of the Bombay Reorganisation Bill, 1960, referred to the State Legislature by the President under article 3 of the Constitution, having been fully considered, this House is of the view that the said Bill be approved subject to the amendments passed."

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant] The matter has since been considered fully and adopted in the Lok Sabha. As may be known to the hon. Members, I am glad to mention that the motion that I had made was adopted by the Lok Sabha almost unanimously except for one dissentient voice. I have, however, great respect for the one Member who dissented. But, so far as the Bill is concerned, it received almost the unanimous support of the House barring some differences in matters of detail which, compared with the major issues, almost pale into insignificance.

Sir, as I just observed, this Bill was adopted almost unanimously by the two Houses of the Bombay Legislature. They have suggested some amendments. Of these amendments, one relates to the change of name. They have suggested that the State of Bombay should be called the State of Maharashtra. I think there were certain advantages in continuing the name of Bombay but out of regard for the wishes of the people, I have decided to recommend to the Select Committee the adoption of the name of Maharashtra in place of Bombay.

The other amendment relates to the setting up of a permanent Bench of the High Court in Nagpur. Well, if such a Bench is to be created, provision for it could be made under the States Reorganisation Act, but as the Bombay Legislature has expressed its preference for such a provision being made in this Bill itself. I propose to place that suggestion too before the Joint Select Committee for its acceptance.

The other amendments are more or less of a minor character. I have my sympathy with them. How far they can be accommodated in the Bill will have to be considered. But I have in principle or in substance no objection to these amendments either. With these remarks I venture to state

that the Bill, when so amended, will fully carry out the wishes of the Bombay Legislature.

Sir, this House is, I think, familiar with the history of this Bill and the developments which have led up to the introduction of this Bill. I wonder if it would be necessary for me to give the background in detail. Originally, the States Reorganisation Commission had suggested that the bilingual State of Bombay, as it existed even previously, should remain and should retain its feature, but some areas like those of Marathwada, Saurashtra and Kutch should be added to it. But that proposal did not fully commend itself to Parliament when the report of the States Reorganisation Commission was discussed. So, a formula was devised under which the bilingual State of Bombay was to be further enlarged by the inclusion of Vidarbha also.

But while that proposal had been adopted by the Select Committee, when the matter went back from the Select Committee, 180 Members wanted the bilingual State to be retained. Keeping in view the spontaneous proposal made by the Lok Sabha and the collective demand of the Members of that House regardless of any party interests almost unanimously, the demand for the bilingual State of Bombay was accepted.

This State has been functioning since, and it has been functioning efficiently. It has maintained the high standard which has been associated with the administration of the State of Bombay. But, while progress has been made, the one basic fundamental on which everything else depends—the cohesion and the emotional integration of the people even within the States—could not be ensured. Because ultimately everything depends on that, steps were taken at the instance of the Chief Minister of Bombay for looking into this question and a committee was appointed by the Working Committee of the Congress on which all

regions were represented. That Committee unanimously gave its findings on the situation as it existed and made its recommendations about the division of the bilingual State into two States, and also dealt with other matters, namely, the territorial jurisdiction of each State, financial arrangements and so on. On the basis of those agreed conclusions, further consideration was given to this very important matter and ultimately this Bill assumed the shape in which it has come to this House today.

I must say that it is a unique example of the spirit of accommodation, goodwill and mutual understanding shown by the representatives and leaders of the two States. As I said, it is based on agreement and embodies the recommendations made by them jointly after full consideration of the issues. I had stated even previously that however ideal a solution may be, we cannot find it very satisfactory in its working unless it carries with it the goodwill of the large mass of the people concerned. This measure now has that support and it has, if I may say so, come here on a tidal wave of goodwill and with the support of the leaders of both States.

Sir, as I said, the Bill contains provisions which cover many pages and many clauses. The State of Gujarat when constituted, will consist of 17 districts, including Dangs and 50 villages of Umbergaon and perhaps 156 villages or thereabout of the Khandesh district. The rest of the bilingual State of today will form the new State of Maharashtra. There was a strong feeling in Vidarbha, among certain sections of the people I may say, that Vidarbha should remain separate and should form a State by itself. Well, that matter was considered thoroughly by the representative of Maharashtra and also by the Government here and we found that in the interest of Vidarbha itself and in

the larger interest of the country, it would be better to have a unified State of Maharashtra and that Vidarbha by itself need not form a separate State. I need not go into the reasons. Similarly, there were some points relating to the city of Bombay and also about Marathwada. About these, that is to say, Vidarbha, Marathwada and the city of Bombay which has a place of pride in our country, a policy statement was made by the Chief Minister of Bombay which we accept and which, so far as it concerns the Central Government, we would like to implement. That policy statement is designed to give full assurance to these three areas.

The State of Maharashtra will have a population of roughly about 322 lakhs and that of Gujarat about 160 lakhs. The proportion will be roughly one to two. The State of Bombay or Maharashtra will have two House*— the Assembly and also the Council, but Gujarat they will have only one House, a unicameral legislature with no Council. It will be of some interest to this House that the number of representatives when these two new States are constituted, in this House will go up by two so that this House also will gain to some extent by the reorganisation of these States. So, while I hope these two States will add to the strength of the country and bring about greater cohesion within the States, they will also serve the larger interest of the entire people of our country.

Certain financial arrangements have also been made between these two States, about which a paper has been already distributed. I do not consider it necessary to give the details about these financial arrangements, because they are fully explained in the Memorandum that has been circulated along with the proceedings of the Bombay Legislature.

[Shri Govind Ballatah Pant] I do not think I should take much time of the House. I may, however, submit that while we are now having fifteen States in our country on more or less linguistic basis, we should not lose sight of the fact that we primarily owe allegiance to our great Union of India. Narrower loyalties should not come in the way of the basic loyalty on which our polity and our Constitution rest and which alone has given us strength so far and on which alone we can depend either in the States or in the Centre for the further progress and for the advancement of the country. I am sometimes perplexed, not only perplexed but distressed, as happened recently when I saw how a revered leader of our country was treated in Banaras. That is a matter which cannot bring credit to anyone. Everyone, according to our Constitution, is entitled to freedom of speech and to the use of any language he likes. Those who do not choose to attend a meeting are not in any way bound by ' - w or otherwise, to do so. The kind of attitude shown in that incident does not become to any country and is altogether repugnant to our notions of decency. It in a way mars the greatness of the heritage which we possess, a heritage of tolerance, of mutual goodwill and of regard for views even if we differ from them, and also of humility and of reverence for elders. When one who has served the country all his life is treated in this manner, and especially when it is done in the name of Hindi, it indicates a frenzy which sometimes eclipses the light and the mind is warped altogether. The cause of Hindi has suffered on account of this intolerance and it is in the interests of those who love Hindi that they should secure . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Why does he talk of Hindi imperialism and is working against the provisions of the Constitution?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: I do not know what my hon. friend is

saying but I think he does not disagree with me.

So, I hope that while we are advancing that way, and while many new problems are facing us, problems which call for concerted actions, for united endeavours, for still greater harmony and emotional integration and cohesion among all sections of the people, among all the regions and between the various interests of the country, we should not be victims of narrow-minded parochialism. Otherwise, this process which has resulted in the formation of fourteen States which will now become fifteen, instead of being a boon may become a source of anxiety and concern. I am sure that so far as the new States of Maharashtra and Gujarat are concerned which have approached this question in a spirit which is commendable, they will continue their brotherly relations and that the harmony between the two States and between the two communities will be greater than it was even in the past. They have lived together for ages and I see no reason why the formation of two administrative units should in any way disturb the relations, the ties which have grown up in the course of centuries. I hope that these two States will have the goodwill of everyone in this House.

Before I conclude, Sir, I should like to read out an extract from a letter received from the Governor of Bombay in which he has referred to the debates in the Bombay legislative Council and also to the way the Members who will now be allotted to these two States parted on the last day. I am reading the extract:

"From March 14 to 18, day after day, discussions went on in both the Houses. It gives me much pleasure to record that the debates were carried on in a spirit of understanding and goodwill, and touching scenes were witnessed on the last day when this 'Bifurcation Session' ended, and when

members from Gujarat and Maharashtra vied with each other in expressing their sorrow at their parting, and their good wishes for each other's happiness and prosperity."

We also wish them all progress, happiness and prosperity.

The question was proposed. [MR.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI S. K. LIMAYE (Bombay): Sir. I crave your indulgence over a certain matter. Since I am new to the House and to the procedure of the House, if I ever default, I shall not be defaulting deliberately.

While commenting on this motion I have to draw the attention of the House, particularly when Members of this House will be meeting in the Joint Committee, to certain points that have been raised in the Bombay Legislative Assembly. I want to enlarge to a certain extent three points that were made relating to Ukai, Dangs and the financial arrangements.

Before I proceed to deal with these three points, I have to clarify certain issues or points that were raised in the House of the People. I feel a little miserable when I have to proceed against a volume of prejudice that has been built up against the people of Maharashtra who are insistent on implementation, in full, of the demands of the people there. At times we are accused by implication that we are parochial in our outlook and that we are asking and struggling for a clod of earth. I submit, Sir, that that is not correct. It is not for a clod of earth that we are struggling or are putting up our demands. For instance, in the Ukai or in "Umbergaon or in the Dangs area it is not the territory of Dangs or the

particular territory in West Khan-desh that we are insisting on but rather the people there in order to have a proper democratic development of their areas are insisting that they should be integrated with their blood-brothers, their kin, in Maharashtra.

I have to make certain comments in regard to the financial arrangements also. There is a sort of prejudice of a long-standing nature that the Bombay State which under the British regime was a sort of prosperous State, continues to be so. According to the standards and as the economy then was, it could be said that it looked prosperous, that is, the revenue income of the Bombay State in comparison to other States was large. It so happened; it is a sort of historical accident that Bombay State was more industrialised than other States and in certain items particularly income-tax and other things Bombay bore the major share. During those days, that is, under the British regime, I need not point out to the House that the State then was not by any standard a welfare State or a State which had committed itself to the development of the country and as such there was hardly any effort on the part of the State itself to develop the economy of the country- And because by a historical accident Bombay happened to be highly industrialised a notion was entertained that the Bombay State is prosperous and one can lay claim on the prosperity of Bombay and that Bombay had certain surplus revenue from which other States can derive benefit. Since the motion is for reference to a Joint Committee my friends will be studying the documents and the papers and therein they will find a certain table submitted by my colleague in the Bombay Assembly, Shri Datta Deshmukh, where he has shown by reference to official figures how the Bombay State which was a premier State from the point of revenue income is going down slowly and how the tempo of

[Shri S. K. Limaye] the development of this income is also going down. I shall not go into the details because they will all be studied in the Joint Committee but just to give an indication to the House as to how the situation is developing, I would say that Bombay State has been reduced to the ninth position as regards the tempo of development of the revenue income and so far as per capita income is concerned, it has been reduced to the fourth position.

Now, it has been the tendency of the Government—and it is a good tendency I should say—that efforts are made to diminish the disparities between the various States and accordingly Finance Commissions are appointed. And it has been the consistent policy of both the Finance Commissions to see that the deficit States are supported and helped. Now, tables are given—I need not refer to them—showing how the various States have been helped through the Central pool and how their revenue gap has been covered. It is a matter of regret—and soon the people of Maharashtra may feel, not only feel but they may be roused to a certain extent—that from their revenue income they have been compelled to help other States when there is a Central pool from which the deficit State of Gujarat can be helped.

Here I may point out—because I represent the Samiti or rather the Samiti has sent me here—that there is a talk that the Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad had come to a certain agreement, and I have to take up that issue. I have to submit that there are written documents signed by the representatives of the Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad. In December 1958 the representatives of both these organisations had met and discussed the various issues between Gujarat and Maharashtra including

the Dangs and the financial arrangements. Then the issue of Umbergaon was not there; how the issue of Umbergaon has been raised, one does not know. But on both these issues it was agreed—particularly about the Dangs—that the Samiti accepted the contention of the representatives of the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad that the decision to include the Dangs in Maharashtra area was taken hastily and arbitrarily. So again it should be reopened in the sense we have to study it; the experts have to study whether the language of the Dangs, that is the dialect spoken there, is a dialect of Maharathi or whether it is a dialect of Gujarati. Besides that no commitment was made. It is argued at times that certain leaders of the Samiti had made certain statements and advantage is taken of those statements. I would like to submit that it is to the credit of those leaders as well as to the strength of democratic opinion in Maharashtra that they had to refute this. Possibly if they had made any statement, it was their own opinion. It is argued that Shri S. A. Dange made a certain statement in a public speech but it was his individual opinion. The Samiti as such had never committed itself that certain villages of the Dangs could be handed over as if in a bargain for the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. It is not true; it would be scandalous; it would hurt the honour of the Maharashtra people to suggest that they wanted to bargain on the issue of Bombay by granting certain villages as if those villages and the people there are chattels. I submit that the democratic opinion is quite firm not only in Maharashtra but, as you might be noticing from the papers, even the people of the Dangs who have been so backward—not only just backward but have been kept backward I should say—have been roused to a certain passion and it is not as if they have been roused to have some earth or to have some fields, hardly they are the owners there of the fields, but they have been roused to get integrated with their

brethren in Maharashtra. So, they are not fighting for a clod of earth; I think human beings cannot be treated like that. It is the people living there in the Dangs as well as in Umbergaon who have begun to feel that they should be integrated with Maharashtra.

Then about the financial arrangements between Maharashtra and Gujarat, it was stated earlier that at the end of the second Finance Commission whatever revenue deficit would be there would be covered by the residuary State, that is, the Maharashtra State. In January 1959 it so^N happened that certain remunerative items under the sales tax like tobacco, textile and sugar were taken over by the Central Government and I think the House will be surprised to know—even the Government will be surprised to know—that the leaders of the Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad stated that because of this encroachment by the Central Government it should be rather the common cause between these two organisations to fight the encroachment and then casually it was stated that this revenue gap which was to be filled according to an earlier tentative arrangement should be referred to the Experts Committee. Now, the committee appointed from among the members of the Services is not that way an expert committee. It had simply given us or supplied us with certain figures but the point to be studied was what would be the possibility for the new States of Maharashtra and Gujarat to develop. In what way could they develop and what would be the general economic trend in the country and what would be the place of Maharashtra which happens to include the city of Bombay? It is a well-held notion among many that Bombay is a lucrative place. But since it is growingly the policy of the Central Government to pool the finances of all the States and to eliminate disparity between the various States, the issue does not

arise at all, that a particular State, a brother State, should bear the responsibility of covering the revenue gap of the other State.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2.30.

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

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

SHRI S. K. LIMAYE: Sir, I was speaking about the financial arrangement and also making certain statements about the agreement that was entered into between the leaders of the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad and the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. That is not only with the leaders of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti but also with the leaders of the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with what transpired between the two organisations. We are concerned with the provisions of the Bill.

SHRI S. K. LIMAYE: I am just referring to that because there was reference to it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with it.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh) But the hon. Home Minister referred to it that agreement was reached between the leaders of the two States.'

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That in the Bombay Legislature.

DR. R. B. GOUR: These are parties in the Legislature.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): The Home Minister had stated that the Working Committee of the Congress

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The hon. Member is standing.

SHRI S. K. LIMAYE: So, to proceed, I want only to make a statement that our approach was very principled. We were proceeding on a certain principled approach. Now, I know that the motion cannot cover and does not cover the border issue. But just to illustrate the spirit in which we work in Maharashtra, I would refer to the struggle that is going on in the border area, that is, Belgaum area.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. That is not relevant.

SHRI S. K. LIMAYE: I am not referring to the border issue as such. I am just submitting to the House that the spirit of the Maharashtra people is that they are ready to sacrifice everything for getting integrated with their blood brothers, with their kinsmen, just as in Dangs, the people are roused there and are ready to sacrifice everything. So many are offering *satyagraha*. Therefore, our request is and my submission to the Joint Select Committee would be that if they want to heal the wound, let them not be deluded into the supposition that the wound has been healed. No, it is not a complete healing of the wound. There it is, a sort of pestering thing and later on troubles will arise. Temporarily, the wound has been healed. But the atmosphere outside is sultry. All these injustices may pale into insignificance, as the hon. Home Minister stated, but still the wound would be there. The people will be feeling that you are not doing justice to the cause, since their own brothers have been neglected.

Many from the ruling party had stated that the States were not reorganised on the principle of linguism. But today I was glad that the hon. Home Minister had perforce to admit that more or less all the States had been organised on a linguistic basis. Now, when all the States have been organised on the linguistic basis, very big chunks, I should say, of humanity, who want to assert their democratic rights through their own language, reel that for their proper development, they should be integrated with their own linguistic brothers. If we now sort of betray them, if we now do not stand by them—there are certain queer experiences to which I cannot refer.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): I have not yet been able to understand what the hon. Member meant by the term 'ruling party'. I know the Communist Party, I know the Socialist Party, but I do not know a party the name of which is the 'ruling party'.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think the tradition of this House is not to interrupt a maiden speech. I hope the oldest Member of this House would kindly bear this in mind.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I have not interrupted needlessly. He should know the difference between needful interruption and needless interruption.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Bombay): Because he said the ruling party, why is he offended?

SHRI S. K. LIMAYE: I am thankful to the hon. Member for correcting me I would say the Congress Party.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. Order, order. Please continue.

SHRI S. K. LIMAYE: I was stating that the people in Maharashtra would feel hurt and betrayed if their wish to get themselves integrated with Maharashtra is not supported.

Now, I would proceed to the third point. That is also a very important point and that is the Ukai dam. There was a demand from the Gujarat side, I suppose, that certain talukas from West Khandesh should be integrated with the new State of Gujarat. Now, by way of compromise it seems that certain villages have been handed over, I would say under the excuse that the Ukai dam is to be constructed. I would request the Members who will be participating in the Joint Select Committee to refer to the data that has been supplied by a Member of the Bombay Legislature, Shri Datta Deshmukh, about this Ukai dam. I must explain, to a certain extent, the situation that may arise because of the construction of the Ukai dam. The dam is going to be raised on the Tapi, which is a westward flowing river. From the east it flows to the west. The course runs through three States—Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat. Out of this, the course in Madhya Pradesh is something like 6 or 7 per cent. In Maharashtra it is over 85 per cent, and in Gujarat it is 6 per cent. The strange thing about this dam is this. As a matter of fact it is a technical matter and I am not competent to speak about it. But my colleague, Shri Datta Deshmukh, being himself an engineer, has supplied considerable data and very competent data, I should say, to show the absurdity of raising this Ukai dam. It is up to the State of Gujarat to say whether they should raise the Ukai dam or not. In the statements that were made on the floor of the Bombay Legislative Assembly we are finding that the height has not been determined. There is a lot of discussion as to how much water can be impounded and whether the State of Gujarat can impound so much water or not. Supposing the other States, that is, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra States, claim their legitimate share from the Tapi river, I do not know how far anticipated storage is feasible there. Of course, that is a technical job. But even then I think the Members of the Joint Select Committee

can go into such details. The matter was referred to the Central Water and Power Commission. Again, it was referred back to the Bombay State. Again, it was referred to the Planning Commission and so much correspondence has passed. So, my submission would be that it is not that the people of Maharashtra will resist raising or constructing of any dam, even though it is not of immediate use to the people of Maharashtra. But the spirit of distrust is there. Even knowing that this area does not belong to Gujarat legitimately and that the people staying in that area are Maharashtrians—that has been admitted,—even then not only those villages but a corridor of two miles too is going to be handed over to the State of Gujarat. This is also not understandable. Technically, the dam is not a feasible proposition. That would be possibly the opinion of the experts, but that will have to be gone into. How far the Members of the Select Committee or the House would like to go into such technical details I do not know, but the question which arises is this; It does not matter when the dam is raised, but finally when it is decided to raise it, certain areas will be submerged. Why should the Central Government feel that the people there would be resisting a national undertaking? It is not the spirit of the people of Maharashtra to resist undertakings which are in the interests of the nation. So my submission would be that the Members of the Select Committee should see that unnecessarily an element of distrust should not be introduced into the relationship between the newly formed States of Gujarat and Maharashtra. The people of Maharashtra will not be opposed to the people of Gujarat, but it is but natural, and it flows so to say from the situation, that they will be feeling that the people of Maharashtra are being discriminated against and that the discrimination is particularly in the interests of Gujarat. As a matter of fact that it is not in the interests of the Gujarati people as such. If we study the Ukai proposition, and it is a regular proposition, and if we look into the experiences of the Kakrapar dam and the

[Shri S. K. Limaye.] attitude of the Gujarat peasantry towards the irrigation water, there are certain peculiarities of the land, and there are certain peculiarities of their ways also. This is an area which has got an assured rainfall, and it is very doubtful whether the Gujarat peasantry nearby will be interested in utilising this Ukai water. All these technical details will have to be studied and the element of distrust ought to be eliminated.

Sir, I would say that this bilingual idea—I do not mean to hurt anybody in saying that—was a stupidity, and now it is being rectified. My request both to the House as well as to the Members of the Select Committee who would be discussing things very dispassionately would be, if the desire of both the Houses is to establish a proper relationship between the two States and if they want to promote a national feeling among the Maharashtra people and the Gujarat people, things should be dispassionately studied and justice should be meted out to the people of both the States. As I must conclude now, I would submit that the House should not entertain any feeling that the people of Maharashtra are parochial in their outlook. They are ready, as the people of other States are ready, to sacrifice for any undertaking that is promoted in the interests of the nation. The Maharashtra people are also interested in all national undertakings, and they are as patriotic as any other people are. But if the Congress Party which is the ruling party feels that now things will be eased and that the people will be appeased, then I would state that it would be an illusion. Let us not be impatient with things, let us learn from the past experience. I do agree with the hon. Home Minister when he said in the Lok Sabha that they did not claim to be infallible. We also on this side do not claim to be infallible, but our request would be that we should not do things deliberately which will be hurting the sentiments, the deep rooted sentiments of the people. And now, if I may say so, nobody should feel hurt, we have suffi-

ciently outraged the feelings of the Maharashtra people. The Maharashtra people are second to none in promoting the interests of the nation, but during the last three or four years it has been the misfortune of the Maharashtra people not to be able to concentrate on the issues that really matter in life. So, my request now would be that the Members of the Joint Select Committee, because the motion is for reference of the Bill to the Joint Select Committee, make a principled approach and do justice both to the people of Maharashtra and to the people of Gujarat.

With these words, Sir, I conclude my speech.

SHRI BABUBHAI CHINAI (Bombay):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Bill before the House is for the bifurcation of the present State of Bombay into two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. According to me this is a major political decision. Sir, we have to look at this bifurcation and creation of the new States of Maharashtra and Gujarat with the background of the larger interests of the country as a whole and also of the development of the two new States. I have no doubt that if it is viewed in the proper perspective there would be no misunderstanding and doubt in the minds of the people of both the States.

Sir, I must admit that I am not very happy on seeing the bifurcation of the existing State of Bombay into two States. When I say so, I say it with a heavy heart, and I would like to take this House back to the era immediately after the independence of this country. One and all know, Sir, that the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel took great pains to see that the country was integrated. He integrated more than 500 Princely States which were dangerous pockets in the country for its integration. Having made this effort successful and the Princely Order having been removed once

and for all and a very sound base for the development of the nation having been established, I must admit that creating States only from the linguistic point of view, according to me, will start a process of undoing the work of integration which the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel did for the nation. Sir, it is not my desire now to dwell on this point any further since the people of both the States have agreed that they should part as brothers.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:
People or leaders?

SHRI BABUBHAI CHINAI: I would not say that since the Bill has been passed by the Bombay Legislative Assembly, to which most of the Members of that august Assembly agreed in principle, that there should be two States, namely the State of Maharashtra and the State of Gujarat. Sir, so far as the city of Bombay is concerned, it has always remained the bone of contention, as to what will happen to that city which has got a historical background, which is of a cosmopolitan character, which has several minority communities and which has remained the number one city of this country. I am sure, Sir, that the policy statement read out by the hon. Chief Minister of Bombay when he piloted the Bill in the Bombay Assembly will go a long way in fulfilling the aspirations of the citizens of Bombay. One and all know that the citizens of Bombay have not asked for any safeguards for themselves. They believe—and believe very rightly, Sir—that no amount of safeguards would be of any avail if there is no goodwill towards each other, and taking that as a barometer, the citizens of Bombay have plunged their lot with the new State of Maharashtra, and I have every hope that with the goodwill with which they have joined the new State of Maharashtra they will develop the whole State for the future benefit of all the citizens of the new State. I would go a step further and say that for the development of the new State of Maharashtra,

the city of Bombay would be the spring-board to jump for further developments and to see that the resources, both of men and material, of the city of Bombay are canalised for the rest of the new State of Maharashtra which is under-developed and, to a certain extent I would say, backward. It is necessary to see that the whole new State develops in kind of atmosphere of goodwill and confidence, and I am sure that the people of the new State of Maharashtra will not be wanting in it.

Sir, it has been said about the financial arrangement which has taken place, that Gujarat has been given something more than what actually it ought to have received. There can be two opinions on this but one must not lose sight of the fact that for one hundred and fifty years the eight lakhs of Gujaratis residing in the city of Bombay have also given their share for the development of the whole State and taking into consideration the assets of the whole State including the city of Bombay, when they are to be divided, naturally a legitimate part should go to the one who is going out of the State. Looking from this background, I have no reason to say that whatever has been allotted to the new State of Gujarat has been given as a *bakshish* or that it does not deserve it. After all, in life there is something as give and take, and when you give and take, it is necessary that it should be done with grace and not only with grace but with a magnanimous heart.

Sir, the question as to why this bilingual State of Bombay should be bifurcated baffles me. It was only three years before that practically everybody in the Lok Sabha and in the Rajya Sabha decided that in the interests of the country the bilingual State was the best. But it seems that emotional integration of the people has not taken place and therefore the leaders think that they must bow down before the will of the people. In doing so, democracy has prevailed, and the leaders should be congratulated that they have seen that what

[Shri Babubhai Chinai.] was necessary for the further development of the State had not taken place due to lack of emotional integration of the people and they have readily agreed to the bifurcation of the State into two States, namely, Maharashtra and Gujarat. Now, having conceded the request of both the regions, I am sure the people will see that their resources and man-power are utilised for the further development of these two States.

Sir, the question will arise about the industrial development of the two States. As I said, so far as the new State of Bombay is concerned, they have got in the city of Bombay and its industrialists a spring-board for development. So far- as the new Stat* of Gujarat is concerned, I have no doubt in my mind that the industrialists of Gujarat with all the acumen at their disposal will try to help and develop this new State, even though initially they may face some difficulties due to lack of certain resources and lags. But I have no doubt that given full co-operation to the new Government, the industrialists will succeed in developing the new State.

At this stage, I want to point out one thing and that is, whether we are in one State or in two States, we will have to think in terms of national development and national unity, and if that is the backbone with which we are going to have these two States, I have no doubt in my mind that we are going to march ahead in the furtherance of the development of this country.

When I say that I am not happy over this formation of the new States, let there be no misunderstanding; I only wanted to convey that it would have been better if there had been emotional integration and the original State continued. But, as I said, since the people of both the regions found that emotional integration was not there, our leaders decided to bifurcate it into two States and it becomes

our bounden duty to develop the States to the best of our ability and see that we fall in line with the developmental programmes of the country.

Sir, I would once again point out to you that Gujarat has got a small are* namely Kutch which has all along depended on the city of Bombay, and I have to appeal to those who will be in authority in the new State of Gujarat to look after this area of Kutch which is a very under-developed part of the new State, and see that it is nourished and the aspirations of its people are satisfied. They have got the Port of Kandla at their disposal, and I would appeal that it should be planned in such a way that the Port of Kandla is accessible to the new State Capital and to all parts of the new State, <> that Kandla may develop not in the interests of this new State alone, but in the interests of the country at large as soon as possible. There ia also a feeling that if it is left to them, it would be difficult for them to develop that area. The Centre has also got a responsibility towards this small area. As you know, Sir, this small area was under Central rule formerly and was looked after by the Home Department of the Government of India. Afterwards they were asked to join the bigger bilingual State of Bombay and they agreed to it readily. Now again you have asked them to join the new State of Gujarat and they have readily agreed to that

also. Therefore, their saying 3 P.M. "yes* and falling in line with

the wishes of the Government or with the wishes of their leaders should not be misunderstood and should not be thought as if they were toe'ng the line in respect of everything you say without even caring for the future development of their small area, which is a very backward and under-developed area.

With these words, Sir, I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House. Thank you.

SHRI D. B. DESAI (Bombay): Sir, I rise to express my views on this important Bill, a Bill to bifurcate the present State of Bombay. The hon. the Home Minister has expressed that this Bill is giving birth to two new States, namely Maharashtra and Gujarat. Formerly, the Bill provided that the two new States were to be the State of Bombay and the State of Gujarat, but taking into consideration the expressed desire of the Bombay Legislature the Home Minister has been pleased to accept their amendment that the residuary State of Bombay is to be named Maharashtra. So, it is now clear that the residuary State of Bombay, that is Maharashtra, and the State of Gujarat are sought to be created by this Bill. Sir, I want to know from the Government whether they have fully accepted the concept of a linguistic State in this Bill, namely, that the State of Gujarat as a Gujarati-speaking State and the State of Maharashtra as a Marathi-speaking State, and while going through the Bill it is for Use Select Committee to consider whether the real concept of a linguistic State has been accepted by the Government. I do not think the concept of a linguistic State has been accepted by them, but the Home Minister has been pleased to express in this hon. House that generally the demand for linguistic States has been accepted. As I said, I do not think that the provisions which are expressly made in this Bill go to accept the concept of a linguistic State. I think, Sir, I should give my idea about the concept of a linguistic State, and the concept can be explained thus. A State representing a certain homogeneous group of people, speaking a particular language and spread over a contiguous part of a territory can be called a linguistic State, but applying this definition when we look to the territory that has been included in the proposed State of Maharashtra, I do not think that the picture is complete for it to be called the State of Maharashtra, because, as my friend put it, some area from the northern portion of Maharashtra, that is, Umbergaon,

Dangs and some area of Khandesh have been ceded to the proposed State of Gujarat. There is another area which is ceded to Madhya Pradesh. There are certain areas¹ which are ceded to Mysore State, and I want to stress here that some areas now included in Mysore State are in dispute and the dispute is well known as the Bombay-Mysore border dispute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with that here.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: I want to explain the point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are concerned with the bifurcation of Bombay State.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: While speaking on this Bill I may be allowed to speak on that point because the Bill provides . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, it will be irrelevant, and I shall not allow any diversion.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: In clause 81 of the Bill it is provided—

"In section 15 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956—

(i) in clause (d), for the word 'Mysore', the word 'Gujarat' shall be substituted".

This clause relates to the Zonal Council, and the Zonal Council is the Western Zonal Council.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is only to enumerate the number of States; the serial number of the States will be changed when the new State of Gujarat is included; it is only for that purpose; the enumeration is changed. That is all. That is the only amendment that is sought to be made.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: On the Western Zonal Council . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with the border dispute or linguistic States.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Let me complete my explanation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. Member not to introduce any controversial matter which is not relevant to the Bill before the House. Otherwise a controversy will be raised.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: I just want to complete my explanation. Then you may give your ruling.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: He was trying to give expression to his grievances. There was the Western Zonal Council where the grievances could be placed. He was trying to explain that that Council could not be availed of now to place the grievances.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with that. It will not be relevant, and I shall not allow it.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: I refer to section 21 of the Spates Reorganisation Act and clause (b) thereof reads ;

"any matter concerning border disputes, linguistic minorities or inter-State transport;"

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only between the States of Bombay and Gujarat.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Between Bombay and Mysore.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is between Bombay and Gujarat; Mysore does not come into the picture at all here.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: It comes in as the Western Zonal Council is going to be dissolved.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry; the hon. Member is not right.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: All right, Sir. Certain areas of Belgaum, Karwar and Bidnr districts are kept out of Maharashtra.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: They are Kannada-speaking areas.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: And it is there that there is a dispute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may tell the hon. Member that it is not relevant. The hon. Member should not raise that issue at all here.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Bombay): This being his maiden speech there should be no interruptions from hon. Members. '

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But irrelevant observations naturally will be disturbed.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: I do not mind the interruptions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pleas* do not enter into those controversies. Come to the Bill

SHRI D. B. DESAI: It is not a controversial point, Sir. I was referring to the point and was asking whether the Government has accepted the concept of a linguistic State, and if they have, I would like to ask as to why the areas like Dangs, Umbergaon, Belgaum, Karwar and Bidar have been excluded from the proposed State of Maharashtra, and I do not think, taking into consideration the exclusion of these territories, the concept of a linguistic State in regard to the proposed State of Maharashtra is complete. So, I am submitting that it is a question for the Select Committee to see whether the Government has really accepted this concept, and if the Government has accepted that concept as such, the Select Committee will have to complete the picture in so far as the proposed State of Maharashtra is concerned. Otherwise, Sir, an impression—which is not the correct im-

pression—will be allowed to float in the minds of the people that the State of Maharashtra is created, whereas in fact it is not Maharashtra. It was only the question of Bombay City that was discussed for the last three years, but I would submit that it was not only a question of the city of Bombay but it was also a question of the whole of Maharashtra, that all the Marathi-speaking areas were to be included in one State. Going into the history of the last three or four years of discussions, the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed *(Interruption by Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee)*. Let me complete my point and then you can raise your point.

The Commission raised a number of issues. The Government accepted some of them and rejected some. The latter, on the initiative of some Members of Parliament, came out with the formula of bilingual Bombay. The Government then said that they had accepted their collective wisdom. Now, they have again reverted from their position. Perhaps they have accepted that they had done a wrong thing and as such they have come with the formula of splitting up the bilingual State of Bombay. Sir, I would request this House and the Select Committee to do justice to the Marathi-speaking people in clear terms once and for all if they at all want to do justice to them. As a matter of fact, there are already a number of wounds flowing. One of them is with regard to the southern borders of Maharashtra. The second one sought to be created is with regard to Ukai, Umbergaon and Dangas.

Sir, the Government is in the habit of creating problems and then finding out solutions for them. I would say that they should solve rather than create problems. The Central Government specially has created a number of problems in the case of Maharashtra. The Government has already wasted energy, time and money in creating the Bombay problem but

they cannot solve it; they have created an anomalous position. There are already a number of problems before the people, namely the problems of food, clothing, housing and so on. The Government have no time to solve them but they have time to create problems by developing a number of conflicts. I would say that they have created the problem of the Bombay-Mysore border dispute which they propose to solve. But I do not know how they will solve it because under this Bill the Western Zonal Council is to be reconstituted. The Western Zonal Council was the only forum which, according to the hon. Home Minister, was the forum to discuss the dispute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with all that. I have been asking you not to raise that issue but you have been persistent. I think I will have to ask the hon. Member to resume his seat if he persists like that. Do not bring in the border issues.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: My only point is that the Government has created problems which they cannot solve.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already said that.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: So, I want this honourable House to note the point about the Bombay-Mysore problem.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I think the hon. Member will have to sit down if he persists like that. It is not relevant.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Sir, I would like to submit my position. There are a number of problems before the Government.

Regarding the linguistic States, I would like— to request the Select Committee to consider the desirability of including all the Marathi-speaking people in one State. It is a legitimate demand and I think the Select Committee will consider it without any prejudice and predetermined formulas.

[Shri D. B. Desai.]

Sir, we find some indications as to the Bill being passed as it is. And I think the Select Committee is empowered to amend it. Especially in regard to areas outside the State of Maharashtra, the Marathi-speaking people have a specific grievance against the Central Government, namely that they are not legitimately given justice. Therefore, I would request the House and the Select Committee to go into the case of all the Marathi-speaking areas that are excluded and find out a clear solution to complete the picture of the Maharashtra State. I am referring to this point because only an impression is created of conceding the request for the creation of Maharashtra but this impression will not solve the problem at all. The ruling party has been trying to create this impression to demolish opposition. But, I think, that opposition on a certain point will not be demolished only because this impression is created. The Government or the ruling party will be successful only for the time being but the people of Maharashtra realise that this is not the picture that they anticipated; this is not the picture they expected. They expected a clear picture of Maharashtra comprising all homogeneous, contiguous areas of Marathi-speaking people. Now they are getting a State of Maharashtra which is not complete. I think the people will clear up their minds in no time and the Government will have to face again a different problem which will have to be solved by them. So, my submission to the Government is not to create problems. The Joint Select Committee should specially look into this question and solve the problem once and for all. With these words I close.

SHRI M. M. MEHTA (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak on this Bill with a mixed feeling. The hon. Members of this House already know how the bilingual State of Bombay came into existence. They also know that various Commissions

and Committees were appointed to reorganise the States of India and that due consideration was given while this composite State of Bombay was formed. It was not formed merely to see the economic development of the State but it was formed to enable the people to realise a feeling of nationalism and unity also. But as my friend, Mr. Chinai, said just now, that emotional integration was backing in it. As a result of that popular feeling this Bill has come before us. Now, it is our duty to see that this fluid state of political consideration ceases and this is the finality about the reorganisation of States. This changing of the map of India every now and then has come in the way of the development of the country, specially of the areas concerned in the composite State of Bombay.

I hail from Kutch. I know its problems. In this short period it has had to undergo so many changes which have come in the way of its development with which it started. Before independence, it was a most backward Princely State of India. After its integration with the Union of India, our revered and respected leader, Sardar Patel, exhorted it to buck up. Sir, as Kutch is very near Saurashtra in the matter of culture, naturally it has to be a part of Saurashtra. However, for the sake of the proper development of that part of the country, Sardar Patel said that this part would remain under the Centre. That clearly shows that we are for the development of the country and we do not have any parochial or narrow outlook based on language or other factors. I am happy to say that it smarted with gusto and the development of this area went with good speed. Unfortunately, however, again the boundaries of the States of India were to be re-adjusted and specially the State of Bombay of which Kutch was a part. When the States Reorganisation Commission was set up, the people of Kutch put in their claim and said they did

not mind going either with Bombay or with Gujarat, provided their development plans were not hindered or hampered. I am happy to say that the States Reorganisation Commission recommended thus:

"It will be fair to the people of those States which are under the Centre for the specific purpose of their economic development, if the Centre does not divest itself of the responsibility for their development until a stage has been reached when they can be left entirely to the care of the State Governments concerned."

This was not the only assurance given. The Select Committee at that time also had assured us that the development schemes of Kutch would continue with as much force and speed as they were doing. Anyway, we were placed with Bombay. Due to this fluid state and uncertainty about boundaries and maps in this State, the tempo of development did go down and development work did not go with as much speed as was required. Now again, when the new State comes into existence, Kutch goes with Gujarat. Here I would like to say that Kutch is nearer to Maharashtra than to Gujarat

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: You mean the coming Maharashtra.

SHRI M. M. MEHTA: I am sorry, the coming Maharashtra, because as many Kutchis today live in the coming Maharashtra as live in Kutch.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the parts, but the people.

SHRI M. M. MEHTA: Yes, people definitely. They live there and they are part and parcel of Maharashtra. "They have settled there and have married there Maharashtrian girls and vice versa and the people have contributed to the culture on both sides. And so when there is a change here, I would say emotionally it would rather be a disintegration to us. Any-

€5 R.S.D.—4.

way, Sir, Kutch has always taken the attitude that for the development of the country, it will toe any line that the leaders decide upon and with that attitude and with full faith in the new coming Gujarat, Kutch goes with Gujarat with the same pleasure with which it joined the Bombay State.

I may, however, remind the present Select Committee of what was stated by the Select Committee which considered the States Reorganisation Bill, namely, that the Centre has equal responsibility for looking after the development of Kutch which is one of the most primitive parts of the State. After making this request to the Select Committee to bear this in mind, I resume my seat.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Bill that is now before the House has been rightly described as a response and a democratic response, to the wishes of the people, because both the people of Gujarat and those of Maharashtra, wanted States of their own and as a result of this particular Bill, they are going to have those States. Sir, the hon. Home Minister, while moving the Bill, assured us that there are enough indications to suggest that when the two States are created, the people of Gujarat and the people of Maharashtra will part as brothers and that there will not be any difference as far as co-operation between these two sets of people is concerned, for developing not only their respective areas but the other areas also, and that that co-operation will be forthcoming in full. Sir, in Bombay there are large numbers of Gujarati-speaking people settled and "I hope they will not in anyway be disturbed by the creation of these two new States and that they will continue to consider Bombay as their home. I was very happy to hear my hon. friend Shri Chinai when he said that the industrialists of Bombay, whether they are Maharashtrians or Gujaratis, will help in the development of Maharash-

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.] tra and see that the city of Bombay becomes the spring-board for the •conomic development of Maharashtra as a whole. This is the spirit which has to work and which has to prevail when the two separate States are created. In Gujarat also there are large numbers of Maharashtrians and I am quite sure that they will also consider Gujarat as their home and will do all they can to develop the State of Gujarat, culturally, economically, socially and in all other respects.

This being the case, Sir, it would have been much better if some of the controversial points, that still seem to persist when the bifurcation of the bilingual State takes place, are also settled in that spirit of brotherly co-operation. Sir, as has already been mentioned in the debate in this House, in the other House and in the debate in the Bombay Legislature also, there are three or four points which still remain as bones of contention. There is the inclusion of Dangs in Gujarat, the inclusion of some of the areas of West Khandesh and Umbergaon taluk in Gujarat and the financial arrangement that has been made. In this connection, Sir, all those who want to see that ere is a spirit of mutual co-operation and goodwill would like to .see these questions a^o settled on certain well-defined principles and on certain arguments. We have heard a lot about the arguments from the two sides. We have been told that Dangs was not part of Gujarat and we have also been told that some of the areas that have been included in Gujarat from Umbergaon taluk or from West Khandesh ought not to be tacked" on there. We have been told on the other hand in the Bill that they ought to be there and that the financial arrangement that has been made is a just one. All these are statements and unfortunately in spite of going through the entire literature I did not come across any arguments in support of the statements made on this side or on

the other. Sir, when two brothers settle down to discuss some of the problems that affect them, in which they are interested, they would certainly like to see that they resolve these problems in the spirit of some general principles and in the background of certain arguments. It would have been much better if the hon. Home Minister had taken this Hous« into confidence as to why these provisions have been included and what were the arguments that led the Government to come up with these propositions and what were the principles on which these arguments were based. If we had that complete picture, perhaps it would have been very easy for this House to judge a* to which contention is correct and which is incorrect. In the; absence of that data, it becomes difficult for thia House to give any opinion one way or the other. At any rate this Bill is going to the Joint Select Committee. At least the Government should take the Joint Select Committee into confidence and tell the Committee as to what are the reasons why these particular provisions have been incorporated in the Bill. For example, what are the considerations that led to this particular financial arrangement which is going to be made* We read in the papers that two expert committees have gone into the matter, that the matter was discussed between the two important Ministers, one from the-Maharashtra area and the other from the Gujarat area, that the hon. the Home Minister also had participated at some stage in tlite discussion and that these arrangements have been made after all these discussions. We are told that the discussions took place, but what was the basis on which these discussions took place, we are not told, and in the absence of that we are left only with two alternatives, either to accept that all the arguments—all possible arguments—that could be adduced on one side or the other must have been adduced there and after that some decision must have been taken, which must have been a just decision. Sir, this requires an amnust

a£ faith on both sides but looking to the discussions that took place—-or rather are taking place here and in the other House—it seems that the protagonists of the two points of view are not willing to take this on trust and therefore they want a more detailed argument and more detailed reasoning as to why these particular arrangements were made. I know that some documents have been circulated which do give a certain idea and a certain basis on which these arrangements have been made but that is not what was in my mind. What I am trying to point out is that there should be certain general principles in terms of which these financial arrangements are to be made and it is to those principles that I am referring and I hope that the Joint Select Committee will be taken into confidence regarding these principles.

Secondly, as regards the inclusion of the various areas in Gujarat or the cases of those who believe that they ought not to have been included, again it is necessary that certain general principles are observed. We have got two or three principles before us. One is the principle as it has been enunciated by the States Reorganisation Commission and another is the principle which is known as the Pataskar formula. These principles are there; perhaps other principles also might be enunciated. I am also prepared to agree that even after the principles are enunciated, there may be certain special cases, there may be certain special reasons why a particular principle may not be applicable in a given case. What is really required is a complete enumeration of all the principles that are involved, of all the exceptions that are made together with the reasons why these exceptions are made so that it may be possible for this House and for the Joint Select Committee to judge whether justice has been done to both sides or not. Sir, ultimately the question really boils down to this. When the States Reorganisation Act was passed, the State Legislature?

and the Parliament had before them the whole Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. It was, on the basis of that Report, on the basis of the arguments that were put forward in that Report, the exceptions that were made in that Report and the reasons for the exceptions that were made—they were all before them—that it was possible for them to come to one conclusion or the other. That conclusion might be right; that conclusion might be wrong. It might be of a longer duration; it might be of a shorter duration. All that is a different matter. But as far as the decision was concerned, the decision was based on certain well-reasoned and certain well-argued case. In this particular instance, we have not got any such Report which gives at one place all the various reasonings and arguments that were advanced in support of this particular Bill and the provisions made therein.

In this connection I may tell that some of the Members of this House who wanted to study this question carefully to judge the various arguments that have been put forward in some of the documents that have been circulated to us and to check up on the data mentioned in these documents were not in a position to find the relevant official documents on the basis of which alone these particular arguments could be judged one way or the other. For example, the Census Report. The debates that took place in the Bombay Legislature at the time when the States Reorganisation Bill was before that body are not available. Attempts were made to get them but those attempts did not succeed. I myself found that in some of the important libraries of the city of Bombay which normally stock this literature, it was not available. This makes it difficult for the Members of the House to come to certain decisions regarding the cases and the items that are in dispute. I hope the Government of India will be in a position to supply it at least to the Members of the Joint Select

[Shri Kohit M. Dave.] Committee or those Members of the Joint Select Committee who are interested in this literature so that they may be in a position to judge the various arguments that have been put forward. As I have said, my only anxiety is that when this Bill is being discussed by the Joint Select Committee and when it is returned to this House after it has been discussed in the Joint Select Committee, we should have enough clear, concise data, coherent data, data which will give us the various statistical information, data which will give us the arguments that are necessary for the support of one proposition or the other and the reasons why a particular alternative is chosen as against another alternative so that it may be very easy for this hon. House to give its opinion on the various controversial issues that are involved in this Bill and that are connected with this Bill.

Sir, in the end I hope that in the Joint Select Committee and in this House also the discussion will take place on the high plane of reasonableness, arguments and principles with a desire to see that justice is done to both the States that are now going to be created and I hope that no prejudices, no past associations, no controversies and arguments that are not strictly relevant to the determination of the issues that have to be determined will be allowed to poison the discussions and the deliberations in the Joint Select Committee as well as in this House. If we approach this question in that spirit, I am quite sure that this House and the other House will be in a position to do justice to both the areas and both the areas will accept the just and the reasonable attitude which this Parliament will take and henceforward there will not be any recrimination as regards the reorganisation of these areas and all the issues will be settled once and for all. Sir, thank you.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is with privilege, pleasure and pride that I rise to make this maiden speech on the

floor of this House on this motion of the Leader of the House to refer the Bombay Reorganisation Bill to the Joint Committee. Believe me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I cannot think of anything more auspicious than this for me to make this maiden speech because I believe that there could not have been a greater decision reached in more perfect unanimity than what has been witnessed during the deliberations on this Bill both in the Council and in the Assembly of Bombay and also in the two Houses of Parliament here. That augurs well for the inauguration of the two States.

It may be surprising to hon. Members as to why I am interested in this question when I do not belong either to Maharashtra or to Gujarat. That is exactly the reason, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that I am most interested because I can bring on this subject a detached view, an unbiassed view. Because of the passions and controversies of the moment the vision of the people has got clouded with prejudices. I have got a more weighty reason why I want to speak on this because I have come here with an example, a glorious example, from the State of Madras which has given an inspiration to the country as to how a State could be bifurcated and with goodwill. The State of Madras, as you know, was bifurcated only a few years ago into Andhra and Madras and we are not sorry for the decision. On the contrary we are happy and times without number the Head of the Government of either State has gone out to extend his hand of cooperation to his counterpart to establish that amity and goodwill in that spirit of co-operation, of live and let live, of give and take. Even recently we have come to a decision over Tiruttani which incidentally, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is going to bring to this House one more Member from the State of Madras. How has that come about? In spite of all the currents, under-currents and crosscurrents of power politics trying to pollute and poison the atmosphere, it stands to the glory, to the redounding glory, of the leadership of our party.

and also to the leadership in the two States of Andhra and Madras that they had come to a very wise decision rather than having a dispute ail along the line and all the time and said, 'let us part as brothers, part as friends, part with goodwill'. During these four or five years we have demonstrated this goodwill successfully and this should be an object lesson and inspiration for the entire country.

Knowing as I do the city of Bombay—and I have got the best of goodwill for both our friends in Gujarat and in Maharashtra—it is this bifurcation that is really going to be the solvent of all their disputes, their misunderstandings, their bickerings and the passions that are ruling at the moment. After all what is the leadership in the country to do when people are not able to work out a solution and live together in peace? For me as a citizen of India, it matters little whether this part or that part goes to Maharashtra or to Gujarat. That is a matter of local significance; it has no valid significance in relation to the larger interests of the country.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: The hon. Member did not take that broad view in regard to Madras and Andhra but insisted on bifurcation.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have got a right not to be interrupted when I make my point

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I was only pointing out the facts.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Sir, this problem of the city of Madras was hanging like a Damocles' sword over the people of Madras State; for years and years it was a bone of contention; it was the point of dispute between the two parties and yet most magnanimously when the hour for decision was reached, the Andhras and the Tamili-ans parted in a spirit of goodwill and the city of Madras came over to Tamil Nad. But since then the Andhras have

been making tremendous progress and happily the Chief Minister Shri Sanjeeva Reddy who was responsible for all that progress is now the President of the Indian National Congress and he can himself bear witness to the fact that we have worked the scheme of bifurcation to mutual satisfaction. I believe that what is sauce for the goose would be sauce for the gander too and equally can we expect this of the State of Bombay too. I know my friends opposite might have been looking forward to these controversies continuing for long and I know there are many who would like to fish in troubled waters but it redounds to the glory of the leadership of the party in power that at least they have come to realise this: Let us try to keep these people as friends but in their own States and let them build their own houses.'

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have got infinite faith in the capacity of the Gujaratis, in their genius for enterprise and I am quite sure that overnight they can build up that State into one of pre-eminent significance in our country. May be that at the moment their resources do not compare very well with the resources of other States. While I was touring overseas many a time, it used to give me a great deal of surprise, when I went to Germany or the United Kingdom, how the people of these countries even in the zero hour of devastation had not given up their faith and how within a period of six, seven or eight years Germany has come back as an economic tower of Europe and Japan as the moneylender for Asia. Can we not expect that we should have similar prospects particularly where the Gujaratis are concerned? They are people who are renowned for their enterprise all over the country. Which is the nook and corner of the country which they have spared? And why should they be like frogs in the wall worrying over the dreadful prospects that would befall the State if they part from Maharashtra? On the con-

[Shri N. M. Anwar]

urary, I would appeal to them in a spirit of goodwill, that they should, particularly as the richer member of the family, part in good grace and also give their blessings for Maharashtra, because Maharashtra has been suffering from the problems of poverty. Otherwise, what would have really happened is that we would have simply made over this State to the Communist Party. I am sure that is exactly what our adversaries want and we are not going to play into their hands. On this bifurcation of the State of Bombay I give the example of the State of Madras. Let there be no misgivings. Let there be no doubts about the future of Gujarat and even about the future of Maharashtra. As regards the city of Bombay, what does it matter to me as a citizen of India, whether it is in Maharashtra or Gujarat so long as it is part of India? Therefore, I would appeal to our friends not to feel in terms of despondency, but to take this up as a challenge to their spirit. They should redouble their energies and build up Gujarat in the most wonderful way so that it can be an example for every one. The Andhras are now building up their State. We are happy that in so many walks of life they have built up their State much to the glory of our country. Even that tiny Httie State of Madras, under the dynamic leadership of the hon. Chief Minister, Mr. Kamaraj, has been so wonderfully galvanising the energies of the State that we are not confronted with the problem of smallness. On the contrary we think that we can do things much better, more intensively and much more vigorously if our problems are territorially restricted to smaller frontiers. I can say without fear of contradiction that the future of Gujarat is going to be much more brilliant, infinitely more brilliant than it has ever been. They can build up not one city of Bombay but many cities like Bombay more vigorously than what has been done. We have also got the example of people who in the very difficult days came as refugees to this country and who have

within a few years built up wonderfully their business. When such potentialities are there our friends in Gujarat should not feel worried. It rather puts me to shame sometimes when any Gujarati is crying over the dreadful prospects of Gujarat. On the contrary I tell him: 'Well, I look to you for leadership. I look to you for enterprise. I look to you for giving glorious examples about what the country's future should be.' Par'icularly Gujarat has contributed the greatest hero, the architect of our freedom, Mahatma Gandhi. It is Gujarat that has contributed Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. May his memory live for long, who has done so wonderfully well for the integration of the five hundred and odd States in our country? That was only integration, but this is consolidation. What is the use of simply putting the heads together when the hearts are not united? If the people babel in different voices, that only adds to the confusion, thit only sets a premium on pandemonium We do not want to see that. After all in Europe there are as many States as there are languages and which are sovereign territorial States. Our country, which is too big, can admit of ever so many States. After all it is under the sovereignty of this Parliament and so long as it is under the sovereignty of this Parliament, I believe it is much better to have as many States as there are languages in this country, in order that the people who are born and brought up in the love of their mother-tongue can understand each other's aspirations and try to work out their destinies according to the genius of their own language and cultural heritage.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We art only dividing Bombay now, not the whole of India.

SHHI N. M. ANWAR: Yes. But there could not have been any more auspicious and more glorious opportunity for me than to make this maiden

speech on a matter which has received universal acceptance. I was distressed when I heard it. In fact, that was what inspired me this afternoon, when an hon. Member said—I do not still know who it is—'Well, the leadership has settled it, not the people'. I cannot understand what it means in a democracy. After all, who are we, Mr. Deputy Chairman, but the servants of the people, the tribunes of the people, with whose sanction you and I and the other hon. Members are supposed to be here. And is it fair and proper to the democratic working of the Government to say that the leaders are speaking differently from the people? If we speak differently from the people in this House, how can we go to the polls and face the music and come back to this House? The leadership of the nation has rightly and wisely come to this timely decision. They have acknowledged the pressure of public opinion. After all, in true democracy such as we experiment in this country of four hundred millions our masters are the public and we must work out their general will.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: It is too bold for a maiden speech.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I must conclude with the fond hope and prayer that Gujarat and Maharashtra alike will prosper well. In their prosperity lies the prosperity of our country. If Gujarat prospers much more than Maharashtra, the country to that extent prospers much more. If, *vice versa*, Maharashtra in healthy competition with Gujarat prospers more, even to that extent our country prospers. We are happy with our leadership. As I said, there should be healthy competition between Gujarat and Maharashtra. Let that healthy competition add to the prosperity and glory of our country.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (मुम्बई) :
अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय उपसभापति जी, तीन वर्षों पूर्व
मैंने इसी सदन में बाइलिंगुअल बाम्बे स्टेट

का हार्दिक स्वागत किया था और आज आप देखते हैं कि मैं यहां खड़ा हूं और बाइफर्केशन आफ बाम्बे स्टेट का भी स्वागत कर रहा हूं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : दुनिया परिवर्तनशील है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : मैं भी परिवर्तनशील हूं। आप जानना चाहेंगे कि यह क्योंकर हो रहा है। मैं तवारीख में नहीं जाना चाहता कि तीन वर्षों में इस देश में और खास कर बम्बई राज्य में क्या हुआ, परन्तु आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूं, आप सब जानते हैं और मानते हैं, माननीय प्राइम-मिनिस्टर ने, माननीय होम मिनिस्टर ने, अनेक वक्त इस सदन में और उस सदन में यह कहा है कि बाइलिंगुअल बम्बई का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बहुत अच्छा चल रहा था और उस एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन से सब खुश थे परन्तु ऐसा होत हुए भी आज हम फिर विचार कर के यह निश्चय करने बैठे हैं कि वह बम्बई स्टेट बाइफर्केंट किया जाये, यह क्योंकर हुआ। इसके कारणों में, वजूहात में, मैं जाना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि वह तवारीख है, वह भूत-काल में जमा हो गया है, परन्तु मैं एक बात यहां शुरू में कह देना चाहता हूं और वह यह है कि मैं मानता हूं कि हालांकि वहां का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन और डेवलपमेंट बहुत अच्छा चल रहा था तब भी आम जनता में एक जो शान्ति की भावना, परस्पर प्रेम की भावना पैदा होनी थी वह हम नहीं कर सके। यह हमें मान लेना चाहिये और यही कारण हुआ खास कर के कि जिसकी वजह से हमें इसके ऊपर फिर से सोचना पड़ा और बाइफर्केशन का प्रस्ताव यहां प्रस्तुत करना पड़ा। परन्तु 4 P.M. मैं यह भी कह देना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक मेरा सम्बन्ध है, I would have been more happy if the bilingual State would have continued मैं यहां अपने दोस्तों को याद दिलाना चाहूंगा कि मेरे जिन बूजुर्ग मित्र ने सात वर्ष पहले महाराष्ट्र में संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की ध्वजा

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

खड़ी की थी, आन्दोलन का नेतृत्व क्या था उनसे मैंने पूछा कि आपकी क्या राय है तो

"I am happy that Samyukta Maharashtra has come, but it would have been glorious if the bilingual would have continued."

मैं भी इस बात को मानता हूँ परन्तु मैं वास्तव-वादी हूँ। खाली प्रिंसिपल को बकवास करके दुनिया में जीवन नहीं चला करता। Life is based on adjustment. It is not based on principle alone but it is lived on compromise and adjustment alwayn

नहीं चलते। जब हमें समाज में अनेकों के साथ रहना पड़ता है तो हर वक्त हमें कम्प्रोमाइज और एडजस्टमेंट के लिए तैयार रहना पड़ता है और इसलिए हम ने देखा कि उसकी आवश्यकता है। सियासत में बहुत दूर की सोच कर काम नहीं चलते, रोज की भी सोचनी पड़ती है और जब हम निकट की सोचते हैं तो हमें कम्प्रोमाइज और एडजस्टमेंट की ही बात करनी होती है। इसलिए जो आज हुआ है वह ठीक ही है क्योंकि यह आवश्यक था। परन्तु मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि हालांकि पार्लियामेंट सार्वभौम है और सर्वाधिकार सम्पन्न है तब भी जहां तक इस बिल का सम्बन्ध है उसे महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात राज्य के नुमायंदों ने करीब-करीब सर्व सम्मति से सम्मत करके भेजा है। हम यहां पर काउंसिल आफ स्टेट्स में अपने स्टेट की एसेम्बली के प्रतिनिधि हैं और हमारा तो यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि जो हमारी स्टेट हम से कहे उसको हम करने की कोशिश करें। आपने यह देखा कि बम्बई एसेम्बली ने और बम्बई काउंसिल ने इस बिल का सिर्फ प्रिंसिपल ही नहीं बल्कि क्लॉज वाई क्लॉज इसको मंजूर किया है और आपके सामने तो आशीर्वाद के लिए इसको भेजा है ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ। आप सम्मति की मोहर लगा दीजिये, करना कराना तो उनका काम था। उन्हीं का इससे सम्बन्ध है, उन्हीं के जीवन से सम्बन्ध है।

आप तो अधिकारी हैं, बुजुर्ग हैं इसलिए आपका काम यह है कि आप आशीर्वाद दें और उसे सम्मत कर के भेज दें।

इतना कहने के बाद अब मैं उन बातों की ओर जाना चाहता हूँ जो कि इस बिल की मुखालिफ्त में कही जाती हैं हालांकि कहीं नहीं जानी चाहियें। परन्तु यह तो हो नहीं सकता। अभी मेरे एक भाई कह रहे थे कि सरकार प्रान्त्वल्स पैदा करती है परन्तु मैं ने इस मुल्क में देखा है कि जब से स्वतंत्रता पैदा हुई है तब से हमारे कुछ दोस्त हैं जिनका यह धंधा है कि वे प्रान्त्वल्स पैदा करते रहते हैं। इंडिपेंडेंस के बाद कौन कौन से प्रान्त्वल्स इस देश में पैदा हुए। करीब-करीब यूनेनिमसली बाइलिगुअल स्टेट का प्रस्ताव पास हो जाने के बाद किसने प्रान्त्वल्स पैदा किये और किस तरह के प्रान्त्वल्स पैदा किये। आज भी कहा जाता है कि यह हम जो कर रहे हैं उसको नहीं होने देंगे, इससे महाराष्ट्र में शांति रहने वाली नहीं है। इस से आप को पता चलेगा कि महाराष्ट्र की शांति को कौन बिगाड़ना चाहता है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : उनको दुकान बन्द होने वाली है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : तो वे यह

By this Bill you will not be able to appease Maharashtra.

मैं उन से कहना चाहूँगा कि भाई, या तो ईश्वर के लिए माफ कीजिये, तीन वर्ष आपने ऐसे ही झगड़े में बिता दिये अब तो उसे शांत करिये और उस झगड़े को यहीं खत्म करियेगा। आपने देखा होगा कि बम्बई के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने इस बिल को पेश करते हुए यह साफ कहा था कि यह कोई प्रिंसिपल की बात नहीं है, यह आपस में कम्प्रोमाइज द्वारा तय किया हुआ बिल है। दोनों फरीकों की राय जब मिल गई

और हम इस बात पर आये कि यह बिल ठीक है तब हम ने इसको मंजूर किया। दो फरीक आपस में किसी झगड़े को मिटाते हैं तो यह कभी निश्चयपूर्वक नहीं कहा जा सकता कि हर एक फरीक को पूरा संतोष हुआ है। इसलिए मैं नहीं कह सकता कि इस में भी दोनों फरीकों को बिल के ऊपर पूरा संतोष हुआ है परन्तु यह बात माननी होगी कि जब यह कम्प्रोमाइज बिल है, दोनों की राय से, एमिकेबिल सैटलमेंट से, बना है तो हमें इसे मंजूर करना चाहिए और मंजूर करने से ही हमारी और वहां की जनता की बेहतरी है।

श्री बी० डी० खोबरागडे : यह कम्प्रोमाइज किस किस में हुआ था ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : यह कम्प्रोमाइज दोनों राज्यों की मजोरिटी पार्टीज में हुआ था। मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूं थाप जरा सब्र करें। गत तीन वर्षों में एक बार वहीं चार दफे आप जिन सवालों को उठा रहे हैं उनको तय करने की कोशिश की लेकिन आप उन्हें तय नहीं कर सके और जब हम उन्हें तय करके दिखाया तो आपको दुःख होता है, आप आंसू बहाते हैं। तीन वर्षों में थलबारों में जो कुछ निकला और बम्बई एसेम्बली में जो भाषण हुए उनको आप देखियेगा तो पता चलेगा कि इसी डांग के सवाल पर या फाइनेंशियल एडजस्टमेंट के सवाल पर कई दफे हमारे इन गुजरात परिषद् और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के भाइयों ने बातें की। वे यह मानते थे कि वे इन सवालों को तय करने से मिल कर झगड़ा कर सकेंगे। इसलिए डांग के मामले को तय करने के लिए या फाइनेंशियल मैटर्स तय करने के लिए ये कई दफा बैठे और कहते रहे : Yes, it must be reconsidered, it must be re-examined. और फाइनेंशियल मैटर्स के बारे में तो यहां तक कहा कि नहीं गुजरात को हमें मदद करनी चाहिए। कहा और कैसे करनी चाहिए ये बातें आगे होनी थीं परन्तु उन में आपस में बनी

नहीं, वे आपस में तय नहीं कर सके उन बातों को। अब चूंकि हमारे नेता श्री यशवंत राव चव्हाण उनको तय कर सके इसलिए उन लोगों को इस बात का दुःख है कि उनकी हाथ से बायडोर निकल गई, उनके हाथ यश नहीं आया। जो यह कहा जाता है कि आप ऐसा करेंगे तो महाराष्ट्र में शांति नहीं रहेगी तो उसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह कहना है कि जब तक आप हैं शांति नहीं होगी।

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: The hon Member may remember that Dangs is in Maharashtra even to this day.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I am coming to that point; I am going to reply to that.

अब चार बातें हैं जिन के कारण मेरे भाई चलती गाड़ी को रोकना चाहते हैं हालांकि बुजुर्ग कहते हैं कि चलती गाड़ी को रोकना नहीं चाहिए। परन्तु मेरे भाई, जैसा कि उनका स्वभाव है, वे रोकना चाहते हैं। पहला सवाल है डांग का। क्या मेरे भाई भूल गये कि बम्बई कारपोरेशन के इलेक्शन के बाद इसी सदन में उन्होंने कहा था कि हमारे पक्ष की जीत हो गई है और बम्बई के लोग कांग्रेस के साथ नहीं हैं, वे तो हमारे साथ हैं। यदि ऐसा है तो मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि डांग डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड के चुनाव गुजरात तथा महाराष्ट्र के बेसिस पर हुए थे और उन में ओवरलैपिंग मजोरिटी में

SOM* How. MEMBERS: Wrong statement.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: It is true.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: It is not true.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I say it is true, 100 B** cent true. Wait a bit, I am coming to that.

बम्बई की जीत यदि इन के मन की जीत है तो डांग लोकल बोर्ड की जीत गुजरात-वादी पक्ष की जीत क्यों नहीं मानी जाये ?

\Shri Deokinandan Narayan.]

और यदि उस बात को, उस बेसिस को जिस बेसिस को ये दुहाई देते रहते हैं, मैसूर के झगड़े में भी बोलते रहते हैं, आग उगलते रहते हैं, उन बेसिस को यदि माननीय मन्त्रबन्तराव चव्हाण जी मानते हैं तो उनको दुख होता है। प्रथम तो आप यह बात समझ लीजिये कि इस डांग की जनसंख्या ४६ हजार है।

SHRI LALJI PENDSE*: Eortyeight thousand.

Sum DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: All right; two thousand does not make any difference.

तो वहां की आबादी ४८ हजार है और करीब ८० लाख रेवेन्यू आती है। वहां का डेवलपमेंट जो है वह दूसरी तरह से निर्धारित किया हुआ है क्योंकि यह प्रदेश पहले राजाओं के कब्जे में था। इंडिपेंडेंस के आने के बाद यह प्रदेश हम लोगों को मिला। तब इन राजाओं के साथ एक कांटेक्ट हुआ था और उसके अनुसार वहां का जो पैसा है, वहां की जो रेवेन्यू है, वहां से जो माल और जायदाद मिली उस सब का एक अलग फंड के रूप में निर्माण किया गया जिस का नाम "डांग डेवलपमेंट फंड" है, जो अभी तक कायम है और जिसका पैसा इस "डांग" पर खर्च होता है। तो डांग के डेवलपमेंट के बारे में एक सज्जीब तो राजाओं ने की है और उसके बाद जब हम आपस में कुछ बात तय करते हैं तो हम ने इस बारे में कोई झगड़ा नहीं किया, सत्याग्रह नहीं किया। हम लोगों ने विदभं-बादियों की तरह जंगल जलाने का कोई काम नहीं किया और न जंगल काटने की कोई बात की। हम लोग अपने गुजराती भाइयों के साथ आपस में बैठ गये और माननीय गृह मंत्री जी की सलाह से यह बात तय हो गई। कांग्रेस ने इस काम के लिए जो कमेटी बनाई थी उस में विदभं के भी आदमी थे, सब जगह के आदमी थे। कांग्रेस ने ६ आदमियों की कमेटी इस काम के लिए बनाई थी और उसने

यूनिमस डिजीजन किया और उसी का पालन एक तरह से हम कर रहे हैं जिसमें all parts of Maharashtra were represented.

दूसरी बात अम्बर गांव के बारे में कही गई है। अम्बर गांव के पचास गांवों के बारे में आपस में बात तय हो गई है। मैं यह नहीं कहता, और जैसा मैंने पहले कह दिया है, कि जो कुछ हुआ है उससे सब को संतोष हो गया है, इस तरह का दावा मेरा नहीं है। परन्तु आपस में बैठ कर यह बात तय हुई है। उस में भी यह कहा जाता है। जहां तक मुझे याद है १६ गांव ऐसे हैं जिन्हें मेरे भाई गुजरात को नहीं देना चाहते। परन्तु वहां की हालत यह है कि उन गांवों की ग्राम पंचायतों ने यह प्रस्ताव पास किया है कि हम गुजरात में जाना चाहते हैं।

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: It is a wrong statement that he is making.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: You may correct it when you speak. Why do you bother? If you feel that I am incorrect, go through the debates of the Bombay Assembly and you will find that it is there. Your friends have also admitted these things.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I have found it.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: No, no; you have not.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: You again go and see; your friends have admitted it; not I but your friends.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayan, please address the Chair.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : तो मेरा कहना यह है कि अम्बर गांव के बारे में भी जो हुआ है या तो गांवों की ग्राम पंचायतों की सम्मति

से या वहां की जनता अधिकांश गुजराती भाषा बोलने वाली है इस कारण । यह मानी हुई बात है कि १६ गांवों को छोड़ कर शेष गांव अधिकतर गुजराती भाषी हैं ।

अब तीसरा सवाल आता है जिसका सम्बंध मेरे से है—चाहे आप नाम से कहिये या पड़ास की हैसियत से कहिये—वह पश्चिमी खानदेश में उकाई का स्थान है । उकाई के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि वहां पर एक डैम बनाना निश्चित हुआ है । मुझ से यह कहा गया है और गवर्नमेंट ने भी कहा है कि वहां पर डैम बनना तय हो गया है और काम भी वहां पर शुरू होने को है । और यह बात मान ली जाये कि उकाई में डैम बनने वाला है, अगर यह डैम बन जायेगा, तो जिन गांवों के बीच यह डैम बनेगा वे गुजरात को मिलने वाले हैं और उस का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन गुजरात सरकार के हाथ में रहने वाला है । ऐसी हालत में डैम का जितना पानी फूलेगा और उस फूलने के कारण जो गांव बरबाद होंगे उन के देने-लेने का सवाल गुजरात सरकार का हो सकता है । इसलिये जो कुछ गुजरात सरकार की जिम्मेदारी होने जा रही है उस बात को मान लेना सही बात होगी । हमें इस झगड़े को मोल नहीं लेना चाहिये और बाद में गुजरात सरकार से लड़ते रहें, यह व्यावहारिक होगा, मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता । इसलिये १५० गांव जाने की जो बात कही जाती है उस में से दो तिहाई यानी आधे से ज्यादा गांव पानी के नीचे जाने वाले हैं । जब डैम बनेगा तो पानी फूलेगा और गांव डूबने वाले हैं । जिन लोगों की जमीन पानी में डूब जायेगी उन्हें कम्पेनसेशन देना और दूसरी जगह बसाने की जिम्मेदारी महाराष्ट्र अपने ऊपर नहीं ले सकता है । मुझ से यह कहा जाये कि मेरा तो यहां पर घर बनेगा और जिन का घर उखाड़ा जायेगा उन को बसाने की कोई दूसरे लोग तजवीज करें, यह बात उचित नहीं मानूम होती है । उन लोगों को बसाने

की जिम्मेदारी उन्हीं लोगों पर होनी चाहिये जिन को बांध से लाभ होगा । इस के साथ ही साथ दो मील की और भी जगह दे दी गई है क्योंकि यह कोई नहीं कह सकता है कि पानी कितना फैलेगा । इसलिये एक्सपर्ट्स की राय ले कर यह सोचा गया कि दो मील की आसपास की जगह जहां पर डैम बनने वाला है उन को दे दी जाये ताकि आगे कोई झगड़ा खड़ा न हो । इस तरह से उकाई का मामला तय हो गया है । जैसाकि मैं ने कहा कि १५० गांवों में से आधे गांव पानी में डूब जायेंगे और इन आधे गांवों में से ज्यादा गांव आदिवासी लोगों के हैं । इन आदिवासियों के जो गांव हैं वे छोटे-छोटे हैं, हमारे जैसे गांव उन के नहीं हैं । तीन-चार हजार जन-संख्या के गांव नहीं हैं, बहुत छोटे गांव हैं और वहां पर गरीब लोग रहते हैं । यह जो उकाई का मामला है उस के बारे में आप को न्यायसंगत बात कहनी चाहिये । हर वक्त यह दुहाई नहीं देनी चाहिये कि महाराष्ट्र पर अविश्वास दिखाया जाता है । इस बिल के द्वारा जो कुछ गुजरातवालों को दिया जा रहा है क्या उस से यह मानूम नहीं पड़ता कि महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात में विश्वास और मित्रता बढ़ने वाली है । इस बिल द्वारा तो उन के साथ भलाई ही की जा रही है । उन के डैम बनाने के लिये जो जमीन पानी में डूब जायेगी वह भी उन को दे दी जा रही है । तो आप फिर क्यों इस में अड़ंगा अटकाते हैं, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है । आप को इस डैम से क्या दुश्मनी है ? जब हम वहां का डेवलपमेंट चाहते हैं, जो डेवलपमेंट होने वाला है उस के लिये कुछ कहते हैं, तजवीज करते हैं तो आप को दुःख होता है । तो मैं आप से यह कहता हूं कि उकाई का जो मामला है, जब वह बनने लगेगा तो आप वहां बोलियेगा और देखियेगा कि आगे किस तरह से वहां के गांव वालों को कम्पेनसेशन मिलता है । मेरा तो आप से यह कहना है कि जो गांव पानी के नीचे डूब जायेंगे, जिन की जमीन

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

पानी के नीचे डूब जायेगी उन को उचित मुआवजा दिलाने और उन को रिहैबिलिटेड करने की आप को कोशिश करनी चाहिये। इस बारे में आप का यह कर्तव्य होता चाहिये, कि आप इन लोगों को गुजरात सरकार से हर तरह की मदद दिलवायें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस तरह की कार्यवाही करें।

अब मैं चौथी बात के बारे में जोकि पैके और फाइनेन्सल हैल्प के बारे में है कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। इस के बारे में भी हमारे भाई कहते हैं कि हम ने प्लान के पांच वर्षों में से बाकी दो वर्ष के लिये मदद देना मान लिया था। आपने दो वर्ष के लिए माना, तीन वर्ष के लिए माना या चार वर्ष के लिये माना, परन्तु आप ने यह बात मान ली है कि गुजरात की मदद करनी चाहिये। जब आप इस बात को मान लेते हैं कि गुजरात की मदद करनी चाहिये तो उस मदद की बात को तय करने का काम एक एक्सपर्ट कमेटी को सौंपा गया था जिस में कांग्रेस का कोई भादभी नहीं था। उस कमेटी में न गुजरात के नेता थे और न ही महाराष्ट्र के नेता थे। वह काम एक्सपर्ट कमेटी को दिया गया और उस ने कई दिन लगा कर यह बात निश्चित की। इसलिये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप ने यह बात मान ली है कि मदद देनी चाहिये, और कितनी देनी चाहिये, यह एक्सपर्ट कमेटी ने तय कर दिया है, तो यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है कि आप उस चीज को मंजूर क्यों नहीं करते। जो काम एक्सपर्ट कमेटी को सौंपा गया है और उस ने जो बात निश्चित की है उसे आप को मान लेना चाहिये इस में कोई गैर इंसान बात नहीं है, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan) : This is the resolution of the Working Committee.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN :
No, the Bhattacharya Committee was not appointed by the Working Com-

mittee. You are wrong.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order; you go on.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : तो मैं आप से यह कहना चाह रहा था कि इस बात को हमें मान लेना चाहिये क्योंकि दिया मेरी ही दियासलाई से जले, यह दुराग्रह डिमो-क्रेसी में नहीं चल सकता। जब हम एक बात एक्सपर्ट्स को तय करने के लिये सौंप देते हैं तो उन के निर्णय से सब खुश होते हैं, ऐसी बात नहीं है। लेकिन उस को मान लेना ही योग्य होता है और तभी कोई कार्यवाही चल सकती है, नहीं तो नहीं चल सकती है।

अब आती है प्रान्सल्स की बात। अभी कहा गया कि सरकार प्रान्सल्स पैदा करती है। यह सुन कर मुझे बड़ी हंसी आई क्योंकि मेरा तजुर्बा तो यह है कि ये हमारे भाई सारी प्रान्सल्स पैदा करते हैं। यह कहा गया कि सरकार फूड या दूसरी बड़ी बड़ी प्रान्सल्स को देखती नहीं है। तो क्या गत तीन वर्षों में महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात में फूड प्रान्सल्स नहीं थी? जब ये तमाम भाई इस शगड़े में पड़े हुए थे, तब इन्हें फूड प्रान्सल्स की याद नहीं आई, लेकिन आज यहां फूड प्रान्सल्स की याद आ रही है। गत तीन वर्षों में फूड प्रान्सल्स की याद न गुजरात में गुजरात परिषद् वालों को थी और न महाराष्ट्र में महाराष्ट्र समिति वालों को थी, लेकिन आज यहां इस बात की याद दिलाई जाती है कि क्यों सरकार फूड प्रान्सल्स की बात नहीं करती है और दूसरी प्रान्सल्स की बात करती है। इस तरह से बहुत दिनों तक दुनिया को धोके में नहीं रखा जा सकता है।

आखिर में आप का और हमारा देश एक है। आप को और हम को एक जगह रहना है। जब बड़े भाई और छोटे भाई एक जगह रहते हैं तब तो ठीक है। लेकिन जब बड़े भाई और छोटे भाई अलग होते हैं, तो बड़े भाई का यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि वह अधिक उदारता से काम ले। यदि महाराष्ट्र ने अधिक उदारता से काम लिया है

जो उस ने अपना धर्म निभाया है, अपनी परम्परा कायम रखी है, और अपने पूर्वजों का नाम रखा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो इसका विरोध करना चाहते हैं और करते हैं, वे पूर्वजों की शान नहीं रख रहे हैं। शिवाजी का नाम लेना ठीक है, परन्तु शिवाजी की परम्परा चलाना बड़ा कठिन है। इसलिये मैं अपने भाइयों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि बड़े भाई और छोटे भाई जब दो अलग घर कर रहे हैं तो बड़े भाई का वह धर्म है, यह फ़ज है—वही हम निभा रहे हैं और यशवंतराव चव्हाण ने उसी को निभाया है—कि वह यह देखे कि छोटे भाई का घर जो बने उस को नुकसान न पहुँचे, बेफ़िस्ट से वह बच जाय और कुछ वर्षों तक वह अपनी ताकत को बढ़ावे ताकि वह जल्दी अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो सके।

SBKI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: What about the big brother in Delhi?

MB. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : तो इस तरह से आप को इस सवाल को देखना चाहिये। यह आपस का सवाल है, न्याय कोर्ट का सवाल नहीं है, और आपस का सवाल आपस में बैठ कर निपटाना पड़ता है। यह कहना भी गलत है कि न्याय कोर्ट में सौ टका जस्टिस ड्योती है। अगर यह मान लिया जाय कि किसी कोर्ट में सौ टका जस्टिस होती है, तो वहाँ की जस्टिस से कभी आपस के झगड़े मिटते हैं, ऐसा मैं ने नहीं देखा। आपस के झगड़े आपस में बैठ कर तय होते हैं और आपस में जब तय करना होता है तब उदारता से काम लेना पड़ता है। वहाँ किसी तरह के दुराग्रह से काम नहीं चलता। इसलिये मैं अपने भाइयों से कहना चाहूँगा कि आज तक का जो आप का तजुर्बा है उस पर आप सोचिये। गुजरात परिषद् प्रस्ताव करती है कि एक महीने के बाद डिजोल्यूशन हो जाय, यानी वे अधिक व्यवहार चतुर लोग हैं,

लेकिन हमारे महाराष्ट्र समिति वाले लोग अभी तक कुछ तय नहीं कर पाये और आपस में ही झगड़ रहे हैं। यह पी० एस० पी० का प्रस्ताव है कि एक महीने के बाद समिति खत्म कर दी जाय क्योंकि अब काम हो गया है और उस की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। परन्तु जो झगड़े को कायम रखना चाहते हैं, जो झगड़े को मिटाना नहीं चाहते हैं, वे उस को बनाये रखना चाहते हैं चाहे पी० एस० पी० रहे या जाय। ये जो बातें मैं कह रहा हूँ, इन से आप को पता चलेगा कि ये हमारे भाई क्या चाहते हैं। वहाँ झगड़े को कायम रखने के लिये हमारे भाई यहाँ झगड़ते हैं। इसलिये आप सब इस बात को समझ लीजिये कि अब यह काम हो गया। सौ टका नहीं हुआ, तो ६० टका हुआ, लेकिन अब आप अपने झगड़ों को खत्म कीजिये। जिस तरह से गुजरात परिषद् खत्म होने जा रही है, उसी तरह से आप भी संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति को खत्म कीजिये। परन्तु क्या आप ऐसा करेंगे? मुझे डर है कि आप नहीं करेंगे। पर मैं ईश्वर से यह प्रार्थना करूँगा कि वह आप को सद्बुद्धि दे और इस झगड़े के घर को जल्दी से जल्दी आप के हाथों मिटवा दे।

(Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel rose.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are a member of the Select Committee, Mr. Patel. You cannot speak.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Bombay): I bow to your ruling, Sir, but with due respect I may submit that two Members of the Lok Sabha who are also members of the Select Committee were allowed to speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But we have established a convention of this House that Members of the Select Committee will not speak...

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: So, the conventions are different in the two Houses. But I hope you will allow Mr. Anand Chand of our group to speak.

MU. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Any new Member also can speak. Are you ready, Mr. Anand Chand?

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am afraid I cannot speak with such intimate knowledge and authority as my friend of the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad would have spoken; neither am I in a position to take sides with one or the other of the two States that are being created now, but I would like to say a few things in general, and one of them is that, on this historic occasion, when the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat are on the anvil, are being forged into two separate entities, I congratulate—I am afraid I cannot congratulate the Government—I congratulate the people through whose sacrifices these units have been achieved. I know, and I remember with regret the emphasis which was laid on behalf of Government benches in the then Lok Sabha in 1956, when it was said that the bilingual State of Bombay had come to stay, when it was boasted that no power on earth could break it. In support of this the view which was given expression to all over India that it was through bilingual and multilingual States more than through uni-lingual States that the destiny of this great country was going to be achieved. I am glad that the people of that area were not duped by this propaganda. I am glad they stuck to their demand, and I am glad today their aspiration has been fulfilled. Sir, when in 1956, after the establishment of the States Reorganisation Commission and after the receipt of its Report, we created unilingual States in most parts of this country, it was really a tragedy—and I should say it was a personal sorrow to me—that the bilingual State of Bombay

was allowed to continue without being split into unilingual States. At that time I had the privilege of serving on the Select Committee from the other House, and we were emphatic that something should be done and the decision should be taken so far as the question of bringing into being Bombay and Gujarat as two separate States was concerned. But then the city of Bombay was the main hurdle, and it was on the city of Bombay that no agreement could be reached between Gujarat and Maharashtra. This was the reason why there was a subsequent amendment tabled by not less than 180 Members of Parliament and it was adopted whereby the bilingual State of Bombay came into being and it is staying from 1956 right up to now; it will be there up to the end of this month and the new States will begin to function from the 1st of next month. Anyway, Sir, the mistake has been realised, and I am glad that at least now we are doing what we should have done at that time.

I am however not convinced on two points, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to both of them. One is the question of the Dangs, and the other is the question of the southern border of Maharashtra, Belgaum and Karwar. There is no doubt that so far as the Dangs district is concerned, even the committee which consisted of Shri Morarji Desai and the late Shri B. G. Kher, I think, gave the clear indication that so far as Dangs was concerned, it was a Marathi-speaking area.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S-N. TANKHA) in the *Chair*]

I believe at the time when Dangs was going to be incorporated into Surat, there was an objection from the administration itself that Dangs should not go there because it was a Marathi-speaking area. I do not know why it has gone to Gujarat. One of the reasons given in the proceedings of the Bombay Legislative Assembly was that certain District Board elections had gone against a certain group

which advocated its merger into Maharashtra and the people there had voted for their continuation in Gujarat I do not know how such an argument could be brought into discussion in the absence of such a manifesto. So far as I know, there was no pamphlet saying that this kind of election in that District Board was actually to decide the future of Dangs. Sir, if they were to decide its future linguistically, I would say that the best course would have been to appoint either a Commission or some other impartial body to go into this question specially when it is a debatable point and specially when the up-to-date history shows that so far as the language of Dangs is concerned, it has been Marathi.

Sir, another thing about Belgaum. I need not go into it as it falls outside the orbit of the Bill. But if I say a few words I would crave the indulgence of the House to allow me to say them. We know the feelings of Maharashtra so far as Belgaum is concerned. It is not only that it rests with the political parties outside the State Legislature, in the Bombay State Legislature itself, I believe, a Resolution has been moved and this point has been discussed. I know that under the States Reorganisation Act we have the Zonal Council and I know that one of their functions is to adjust boundary disputes between the States, such as a boundary dispute between Mysore and the future State of Maharashtra. But still in this Bill we have given to Gujarat certain villages because of the impending re-mergence of these villages under the Ukai dam. Therefore, these villages, even though they were in West Khan-desh, should go to Gujarat. I do not see why this problem about the southern borders of Maharashtra, especially Belgaum and Karwar, could not have been decided at the time when this Bombay Reorganisation Bill has come before Parliament. That, of course, is something to which I would await a reply of the Home

Minister; I should like to hear what he has to say in this matter.

I would not like to go at all into the financial decisions. I wholeheartedly agree with my hon. member there that even if there is a little injustice done to Maharashtra or even if Maharashtra has had to pay a little more money to Gujarat, I think, that should not be grudged by Maharashtra. After all Gujarat is a deficit State. Further, it has been one of the parts of the composite State of Bombay for so long. Moreover, I believe that even at the time of carving out of the bilingual State, Gujarat for one never said that they wanted separation outright. Their demand for separation flowed only because Maharashtra did not want to stay in the composite State. I think nobody would like to pay if he were not made to pay. I accept that principle. But I think a few crores being given out to Gujarat to cover their deficit and for building up their capital should not be grudged by my friends in Maharashtra; they should not be touchy about it.

Then, Sir, I wanted to say a few words about Vidarbha. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. Home Minister say that a policy statement had been laid on the Table of the Bombay Legislature in which it was said that Vidarbha would be given special treatment, that one Bench of - the Bombay High Court would sit at Nag-pur. I have read that statement just now. It also says that one Session of the Legislative Assembly of the Maharashtra State would be held in the Vidarbha area and so on. Well, I do not know why these things are necessary. There is no doubt that in the unilingual States that have come into being or even in other States which exist there are certain areas which are deficit areas and certain areas which are surplus areas. When we have a democracy and when we have a State Legislature, surely repre-

[Shri An and Chand.] sentatives of the people coming from these areas, elected by adult franchise guaranteed under the Constitution, have it well within their power to ser how they finance a particular unit, how they distribute money to the various districts, what areas arc hack-ward which need to be brought forward and which areas are those in which the development tempo may be slowed down so that their backward brethren might come up to a uniform standard. Why are we so keen in giving those guarantees? To my mind, if I may be permitted to point out, it is not strictly because those areas are backward, but it is necessary perhaps to appease the people of Vidarbha because in a certain election fought for the Lok Sabha by the Congress Party a promise was made, and the victory of the Congress Party in a particular constituency in Vidarbha was hailed as a blow to the idea of a unilingual State of Maharashtra. Perhaps, it is to make amends in that direction, to stand up by the promise already given—which, to my mind should not have been given—that now an effort is being made to appease th«>:e people. Here again, I think, politics is being injected into a purely, what I might call, administrative field, where there was no necessity for it. I do not see what constitutional basis these guarantees are going to have *m* due course of time. Whether we gave them as a policy statement or not, I am sure it would be for the governing party or for the government of the coming State of Maharashtra to see what is good and what is bad to the people as a whole. But these guarantees do raise, what I might call, a kind of haggling and bargaining spirit among the various legions of a State and mar its homogeneity; they take away its oneness, because the more we accentuate these guarantees in the regions that compose a unilin-*gm*\ State the more we create in the

minds of the people the feeling that they are not one, and thereby sentimentally, by dividing them in th»

name of economic uplift, we do not give them an opportunity to come together and think about the State or about its future as a whole. That is, what I might call, my reaction to this guarantee. The proposal may not be necessary at the present stage because we know that we are not giving the State of Vidarbha because the States Reorganisation Commission wanted it The States Reorganisation even when they said that Vidarbha should be formed into a separate State were not thinking in that context at all. They were thinking in the context of a bigger unilingual State of Maharashtra minus Greater Bombay. The report of the States Reorganisation Commission is quite clear on that point. They said they could not think of Vidarbha going into Marathwada or the Marathi-speaking State because the Greater Bombay was not recommended by them to form part of it. Therefore, they said that Vidarbha could have legitimate apprehensions that because of their surplus in the cotton growing districts and so on they might not receive a nice treatment at the hands of the Maharashtra State minus Greater Bombay. They conceded the point because Greater Bombay was not going to form an integral part of the Maharashtra State. I do not think the question was at all to give a separate State to Vidarbha. And for that I do congratulate the hon. Home Minister and the Government that they have seen to it that Vidarbha, though viable, being a Marathi-speak-ing area goes to Maharashtra. After all, the Maharashtra State is being created not on certain economic lines. It is being created to bring together the Marathi-speaking people in one State under the linguistic ideal. Therefore, I think, a right decision has been taken. But my apprehensions are that these guarantees sometimes stand in the way of oneness being brought about. I, however, feel that if for the first years they are a necessity and they will bring a closer union between the composite areas of the Maharashtra State, I do not see any eerious objection to that.

One word more and I have done. Shri Govind Ballabh Pant, our Home Minister, at the end of his speech, when he introduced this Bill, was kind enough to say that he condemned whole-heartedly the commotions that were created in certain meetings in U.P. when Rajaji addressed those meetings. I am glad that he condemned that. In public meetings we go to listen to people in their own language. Rajaji might have spoken in Malayalam or he might have spoken in Kannada, or in Tamil. If we do not want to listen we just walk out. But so far as the people are concerned, of course, it is a larger question. It is a question of discipline. We cannot order about people. We can only inculcate better habits through education and so on. But there are certain elements today in India which we can order about. But I am sorry that the Home Minister is not ordering them.

* * * * *

I am referring to this matter by the way. Anyway, I think I have made my point, Sir, and I would only say that in such cases a certain amount of constitutional propriety should be there and I am sure the hon. Home Minister, the wise man that he is, will bring that about and see that there is no kind of passing the line, not only in the case of public meetings, but also in the case of people in high offices.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, this is relevant in this way, for in the Lok Sabha it was said that people took the view that if the Governor could do such a thing, why not the people also?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): It is not a question of being relevant, or irrelevant. It may be relevant. But since the Governor cannot come here to defend his action it is not proper to discuss the matter here.

• • Expunged as ordered by the Chair. 65 R.S.D.—5.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This is, *pos* what the hon. Home Minister had said about that meeting. So, he may also do something with regard to somebody on whom he has control.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Sir, as I said, I have made my point and so I would not go into it. I would only, if you permit me, touch on one more point, which is not very much outside the subject now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): Please try to finish, there are other speakers also.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Yes, Sir. Speaking in the context of the President's Address I made myself bold here to say that it was our good fortune that the idea of unilingual States had been accepted with the Government's decision to carve two States out of Bombay. And I also said that the only remaining bilingual State was Punjab. Sir, I hope that the time is not far when with their sagacity and I should say political acumen more than sagacity, this demand also will be viewed in its proper perspective and this great country of ours will be formed into States, strong because of the ties of language within themselves, owing allegiance to the Centre, owing allegiance to democratic ideals, each in its own areas vying with the next-door neighbour, not for political greed or power, but for advancement and thereby make this country of ours stronger and *stronger* in the years to come.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, अभी सदन के समक्ष जो बम्बई पुनर्गठन विधेयक आया हुआ है उस का मैं सख्त विरोध करता हूँ। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जिस तरह से स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन के बारे में जो बिल आया था उस के बारे में उस समय पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को सुबुद्धि आई थी और उससे बम्बई का विभाजन हो जाने वाला था, बन्द हो गया। वैसे ही इस बिल में भी होना चाहिये।

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

में सम्मति है कि जो सरकार चलाने वाले लोग हैं यदि वे हम पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को स्वतंत्रता दें तो यह बिल रद्दी की टोकरी में जाने वाला है, ऐसा मेरा पूर्ण विश्वास है। अभी इस विधेयक पर बहस करते हुए...

SHRI : (SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Why not then try for the unification of Bengal and Bihar? 'AMU' i

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : We stand for it. अभी इस विधेयक पर बोलते हुए कुछ सदस्यों ने यह कहा था कि डिमोक्रेसी की जीत हुई है और मैं ने कहा था कि डिमोक्रेसी की नहीं। कुछ लीडर लोग बैठ कर इस चीज को तय किये हैं। डिमोक्रेसी का मापदंड जनता है और जनता इलेक्शन के वक्त जब चुनाव होता है उस समय आती है और अक्सरियत से, बहुमत से जो तय होता है, उसके मुताबिक यह समझा जाता है कि यह गणतंत्रवाद है, डिमोक्रेसी है। गते आम चुनाव में संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति और महाराष्ट्र परिषद् के जितने लोग थे सब लोगों ने चुनाव लड़ा और चुनाव लड़ने के बाद जो उसके विरोधी थे, जो द्विभाषी स्टेट चाहते थे, उनकी जीत भी हुई और उनकी हार भी हुई जो अलग-अलग महाराष्ट्र तथा गुजरात चाहते थे। पंडित जी ने भी जो हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं कहा था कि यदि चुनाव में हमारी हार भी हो जाय और अपोजीशन के लोग यदि भाषावाद के नाम पर बम्बई में सरकार भी बना लें तो उसको भी मंजूर करना चाहिये, लेकिन हम को भाषावाद का शिकार नहीं होना चाहिये। लेकिन अभी चुनाव के बहुत पहले चव्वाण साहब मैदान में निकल आये। गुपचुप तैयारी होने लगी और जनता-जनार्दन को नहीं पूछा गया। यहां डिमोक्रेसी की दुहाई दे रहे हैं लेकिन यह माबोक्रेसी की जीत हुई। बार दंगे करा दिये गये, कहीं पर आग लगा दी गई और अभी ये लोग कारवाड़, बेल-

गांव और डांग के नाम पर एक आंदोलन खड़ा करने वाले हैं और आगे भी तोड़-फोड़ की कार्यवाही होने वाली है। ज्यों-ज्यों इलाज करते हैं मर्ज बढ़ता ही जा रहा है।

* * * * *

वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं कह रहा था कि ज्यों ज्यों मर्ज का इलाज हो रहा है यह मर्ज बढ़ता जा रहा है और बम्बई से हमारे ये जो पी० एस० पी० के लोग हैं या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग हैं जिनकी दुकान अब बन्द होने वाली है वे मास्टर तारासिंह की गोद में चले गये हैं और पंजाब में भी उनको उकसा रहे हैं। मास्टर तारासिंह का आंदोलन हुआ कि धोती टोपी जमुना पार। तो वे जो धोती टोपी पहनने वाले हैं, उनको जमुना के पार जाना चाहिये। पंजाब में हिन्दुओं की अक्सरियत है, उनका बहुमत है, वहां मास्टर तारासिंह का मजहबी आंदोलन हो रहा है कि पंजाब का अलग प्रान्त पंजाबी सूबा बनना चाहिये। वहां हिन्दू हैं, मुसलमान हैं, सिख हैं और सब की भाषा पंजाबी है, कोई झगड़ा नहीं है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्या० सु० तन्ना) : आप कृपा कर के इस बिल के ऊपर बोलें।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इस बिल की बुराई बता रहा हूं। इस बिल की बुराई पंजाब में जा रही है। मैं इस बिल की मुखालिफ़त कर रहा हूं और उसके लिये रीजन्स दे रहा हूं और सरकार को आगाह कर रहा हूं कि इस तरह की गलती जो हो रही है उसको नहीं करना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं कह रहा हूं कि जिस तरह दिल्ली के साथ हम ने चुनाव लड़ते समय जनता के सामने इस बात को रखा था कि द्विभाषी स्टेट बनने से जो गुजरात की और महाराष्ट्र की जनता है उसकी भलाई हो सकती है, उसी तरह आज भी हम अपनी बात पर डटे रहें। आज

* "Expunged as ordered by the Chair."

समाजवाद का और प्लानिंग करने का जमाना है। हमें समाजवाद के आंदोलन को आगे बढ़ाना है, प्लानिंग के काम को तरक्की देनी है जिससे जनता की हालत खुशहाल होती है और भाषावाद से उसकी समस्या हल नहीं होती है। लेकिन जब हमारे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और पी० एस० पी० के लोगों की दुकान में न समाजवाद है और न कोई दूसरी चीज जो बिकने वाली है, और हमारी प्रगतिशील नीति होने के नाते हम ने रूस और चीन से दोस्ती का रुख रखा है तो ऐसी हालत में उनके पास बिकने वाली कोई चीज नहीं रह गई, तब उनको खुश करने के लिये चव्वाहन साहब यहां आये और उन्होंने फिर द्विभाषी राज्य महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात को अलग अलग कर दिया। लेकिन इस पर भी आगे झगड़ा रुकने वाला नहीं है और छुटपुट बार्डर के मामलों को लेकर कुछ चंद लीडरान झगड़ा करने वाले हैं। जैसा मैं ने कहा : डिमोक्रेसी की जीत नहीं हुई, माँबोक्रेसी की जीत हुई। सारी दुनिया जानती है कि यह बेलगांव क्या है, कारवाड़ क्या है, लेकिन उसको लेकर धमकी दी जा रही है। तो सरकार खुद प्रब्लम क्रिएट करती है। इसलिये मैं हाउस से, खास कर के मंत्रिमंडल से और गृह-मंत्री जी से अपील करूंगा कि इस पर पुनर्विचार करें। जिस वक्त सूबों का निर्माण हो रहा था उस समय सी० डी० देशमुख ने इसी इश्यू को लेकर रिजाइन किया था कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बनना चाहिये लेकिन बाद में उनको बुद्धि आई, इल्हाम हुआ और उन्होंने समझा कि मैं कुछ गलती कर रहा हूं। तो सिग्नेचर कैम्पेन की जो गलती होने जा रही थी वह रोक दी गई। परन्तु आज हम फिर एक महान् गलती करने जा रहे हैं और उस गलती की बीमारी पंजाब में आ जाने वाली है और वहां पर उसका बुरा असर होगा। पंजाब एक बार्डर प्रान्त है और मास्टर तारासिंह के प्रति जो शब्द मैं ने कहे उनसे शायद मेरे साथी घबरा गये होंगे। लेकिन मैं यह कहा रहा हूं कि यह बीमारी हमारे सूबों में

भी जाने वाली है। हमारे सूबे में छः भाषा बोलने वाले लोग रहते हैं। वहां पर मैथिली, भोजपुरी, मगधी, हिन्दी, बंगला और उड़िया भाषा बोली जाती है। मैथिली एक भाषा है और उसकी अपनी लिपि है। वहां पर कई डायलेक्ट हैं और हिन्दी किसी की मातृभाषा नहीं है। इस तरह से हमारे प्रान्त में छः सात लैंग्वेज हैं। जिस तरह की बीमारी इस समय सारे देश में फैल रही है, अगर वह हमारे सूबे में भी फैली तो हमारा सूबा छः भागों में विभक्त हो जायगा।

पंजाब में आंदोलन शुरू होने वाला है और जैसाकि मैं ने कहा, हमारे विरोधी दल के नेता श्री राजगोपालाचारी मास्टर तारासिंह से मिल चुके हैं। श्री अशोक मेहता और श्री एन० जी० गोरे भी वहां पहुंच चुके हैं। इसी तरह से इन्दुलाल याज्ञिक कलकत्ता पहुंचे हैं, वहां पर कान्फरेन्स किये हैं और बिहार और बंगाल का झगड़ा खड़ा करेंगे। इस तरह से वे लोगों को उकसायेंगे कि इस सूबे का वह जिला उस सूबे में जाना चाहिए। आसाम का वह जिला बंगाल में जाना चाहिये और बंगाल का वह जिला बिहार में जाना चाहिये। इस तरह से यह बीमारी सारे देश में फैलती जायगी। जब किसी बीमारी का इलाज किया जाता है तो उसमें वैद्य, डाक्टर मिल बैठ कर और सोच समझ कर इलाज करते हैं। इसलिए मेरा सुझाव यह है कि बम्बई को विभक्त करने का पहले भी प्रयास किया गया था और उसको उस समय रोक दिया गया था। इस समय भी हमारा यह काम होना चाहिए कि इस काम को बन्द कर देना चाहिए और मैं समझता हूं कि इस बारे में हर एक सदस्य को स्वतंत्रता दे देनी चाहिए ताकि वह बिल को वापस करने के बारे में अपनी राय दे सके। अगर हम ने इस तरह का कार्य किया तो इससे सारे देश का कल्याण होगा और साथ ही समाज का कल्याण होगा। अगर हम यह चाहते हैं कि सारे देश में राष्ट्रीयता का और समाजवाद का प्रचार

[श्री शीतभद्र याजी]

हो तो हमें देश को टुकड़े-टुकड़े होने से बचाना चाहिए और साथ ही इस बीमारी को भी रोकना चाहिए जो सारे देश में फैलने जा रही है ।

यह बात कही जा रही है कि बम्बई और गुजरात के अलग-अलग प्रान्त बनने से अलग-अलग भाषा बोलने वालों के प्रान्त बन जायेंगे । मेरा यह कहना है कि हर एक प्रान्त में एक ही भाषा नहीं बोली जाती है । हर प्रान्त में दो या तीन भाषा बोलने वाले लोग मौजूद हैं । मैं इस बिल का इसलिए विरोध कर रहा हूँ क्योंकि हमारे सूबे में छः भाषा बोलने वाले लोग रहते हैं । पंजाब में मास्टर तारासिंह जिस चीज की मांग कर रहे हैं अगर वह मान ली जाती है तो यह बीमारी हमारे प्रान्त में भी आ जायेगी और इसका असर सारे देश के लिए खराब होगा । मास्टर तारासिंह तो यहां तक कहते हैं कि अगर हमें पंजाब का प्रान्त नहीं मिला तो हम पाकिस्तान से समझौता कर लेंगे । इस पर हमारे राजाजी उनसे मिलने जाते हैं । हमारे गृह-मंत्री जी राजाजी की बड़ी तारीफ कर रहे थे और कह रहे थे कि वे बड़े देशभक्त हैं । यह बात ठीक है कि वे देशभक्त हैं और बार-बार गांधी जी का नाम लेते हैं । हम ने यह कमी नहीं कहा कि वे देशभक्त नहीं हैं, लेकिन जिस तरह से वे सारे देश में भाषावाद का प्रचार कर रहे हैं वैसा इस तरह के व्यक्ति को नहीं करना चाहिए । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा ही ऐसा मुल्क है जो इस तरह की चीजों को बर्दाश्त कर लेता है । आज हमारे देश में लोग कांस्टी-ट्यूशन के विरुद्ध वकालत करते हैं और हिन्दी के विरुद्ध बातें कहते हैं ।

* * * *

जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में कहा कि इस देश में कोई भी कुछ बोलता है उस पर जनता तालियां बजा देती है । इसलिए आप जिस बीमारी का इलाज करना चाहते हैं और

आज इस सदन में बम्बई पुनर्गठन बिल लाये हैं वह इस बीमारी का उचित इलाज नहीं है । इससे तो हमारे देश में भाषावाद की बीमारी और भी बढ़ जायेगी और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि हमारा देश टुकड़े-टुकड़े में विभक्त हो जायेगा । इस तरह की प्रवृत्ति देश में जो फैल रही है वह बहुत गलत है । इस तरह की बातों से देश में भेद फैलता है और अगर यह चीज बढ़ती गई तो हमारा देश टुकड़ों-टुकड़ों में बंट जायेगा । अगर हम भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने के मामले में झुक जायेंगे या समर्पण कर देंगे तो इससे हमारे देश को बहुत हानि पहुंचेगी । इसलिए मेरी सरकार से यह दख्खस्त है और साथ ही साथ शासक पार्टी से भी है—क्योंकि मैं शासक पार्टी से आता हूँ और मुझे इस बात में गर्व है, शासक पार्टी इस समय हमारे देश में रूलिंग पार्टी है—कि वह इस मामले को अच्छी तरह से सोच विचार कर तय करे । यह एक ऐसा मामला है जिससे हमारे देश के टुकड़े टुकड़े हो सकते हैं और टुकड़े-टुकड़े होने से बच भी सकता है । इस समय देश के सामने बहुत सी समस्याएँ हैं जिनमें आर्थिक समस्या सब से मुख्य है । हमें देश में से गरीबी और जहालत को दूर करना है । हमें संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र और महामुजरात परिषद् को खुश करने के लिए या वोट हासिल करने के लिए इस चीज को नहीं मानना चाहिए था और न हमें इलेक्शन तक इस चीज के लिए इंतजार करना चाहिए था । आज हम बेलगांव, कारवाड़ और धारवाड़ की बातें सुनते हैं । इसलिए मेरी सरकार से और कांग्रेस के मेम्बरों से यह प्रार्थना है कि वे इस मामले पर गंभीरता से विचार करें और ऐसा कोई कार्य न करें जिससे देश के टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायें । हमारे किसी बड़े नेता ने इस चीज का विरोध किया यह मुझे पता नहीं लेकिन जिस तरह से श्री जयपाल सिंह और श्री देशमुख ने उस सदन में सारे हाउस को अपने साथ लेकर जो कार्य किया था उससे जो महान् गलती की जा रही थी उसको उन्होंने रोक दिया था । आज मास्टर तारासिंह

*****Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

पंजाब में यह नारा लगा रहे हैं धोती-टोपी जमुना पार । वे इस नारे को बुलन्द कर रहे हैं । इसी तरह से इंदुलाल याजिक कलकत्ते के मैदान में यह कह रहे हैं कि बंगाल, आसाम तथा बिहार में यह झगड़ा होने वाला है । बेलगांव में प्रजा सोशलिस्ट वाले बैठकें कर रहे हैं और बहा पर आंदोलन चलाने को बान कर रहे हैं । हमने केवल उन विरोधी लोगों की बात मान ली जो यह कहते थे कि अगर हमारी बात नहीं मानी गई तो हम सत्याग्रह करेंगे । संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति का यही ध्येय है और उनको खुश करने के लिए हम ने बम्बई प्रान्त का दो हिस्सों में विभाजन करना मान लिया है । अगर हम जनता की इच्छा को जानना था तो हमें जनरल इलेक्शन तक इस बात को नहीं मानना चाहिए था भले ही हमें कुछ वोट न मिलते । इसका नतीजा यह होता कि यह बीमारी और प्रान्तों में नहीं फैलती जैसे कि अब फैलती जा रही है । हमने संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति वालों की बात इसलिए मान ली कि उसके सदस्य सत्याग्रह करेंगे और हमें जनता से कम वोट मिलेंगे जिस तरह से हम ने साम्प्रदायिक लोगों की बात मानकर देश के टुकड़े करा दिये उसी तरह से अब हम भाषावार प्रान्त की बात को मान कर सारे देश को टुकड़े टुकड़े में बाट देना चाहते हैं

* * * * *

जिस तरह की संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति और गुजरात परिषद वालों ने मांग रखी थी उसके बारे में आपको वोट करने की पालिसी अख्तियार करनी थी, आपको जनता की राय मालूम करनी चाहिये थी । आप ने कुछ सीडरों की बात को मान लिया । यह तो डिमोक्रेसी नहीं हुई; बल्कि मॉबोक्रेसी हुई । यह कोई बुद्धिमत्ता

*****Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

की बात आपने नहीं की । इसलिए मैं सदन से जिसे एलडर्स का सदन कहा जाता है, प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह इस बिल को ठुकरा दे । राज्य सभा के कुछ लोग ज्यादा अक्लमंदी रखते हैं और सब सदस्यों को एक राय से लोक सभा से यह कहना चाहिए कि वे ठंडे दिल से इस बात पर फिर विचार करें । यह बिल जो हमारे भूह-मंत्री जी लाये हैं इसे रद्दी की टोकरी में फेंक देना चाहिए । जब यह किया जायगा तब ही देश का कल्याण होगा और भाषावाद की बीमारी दूर हो सकेगी । अगर आप

5 P.M. -

हिन्दुस्तान की इंट ने ईट बजाना चाहते हैं तो आप इस बिल को मंजूर कीजिये । पार्टी का हुक्म होता है, द्विप होता है, तो दूसरी बात है । लेकिन अगर मचमुच हिन्दुस्तान में भाषावाद की बीमारी से लड़ना है तो मौजूदा द्विभाषी अरेजमेन्ट जिस तरह से चल रहा है उसे उसी तरह से चलना चाहिये, धरना यह बीमारी ऐसी फैलने वाली है, जिसका कोई इलाज नहीं होगा ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का सख्त विरोध करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि तमाम जो राज्य-सभा के बुद्धिमान सदस्य हैं, एलडर्स हैं, दुनिया को अच्छी तरह से राय देते हैं, वे इस बिल को जरूर ठुकरा देंगे ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDU S. S. N. TANKHA) : The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow, the 7th April, 1960.

The House then adjourned at one minute past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 7th April 1960.