

## RAJYA SABHA

*Saturday, the 23rd April, 1960|the  
3rd Vaisakha, 1882 (Saka)*

The House met at eleven of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

## MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

COMMITTEE ON DIVIDEND PAYABLE BY  
THE RAILWAYS TO THE GENERAL  
REVENUES

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that the following resolution has been passed in Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Friday, the 22nd April, 1960, and to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said resolution and further that the names of the members of Rajya Sabha so appointed be communicated to this House:—

'That this House resolves that:

(i) A Parliamentary Committee consisting of 12 Members of this House to be nominated by the Speaker be appointed to review the rate of dividend which is at present payable by the Railway undertaking to the General Revenues as well as other ancillary matters in connection with the Railway Finance vis-a-vis the General Finance and make recommendations thereon by the 30th November, 1960; and

(ii) that this House recommends to the Rajya Sabha to agree to associate six members from that Sabha with the Committee and to communicate the names of the Members so appointed to this House."

RESULT OF ELECTION TO THE  
INDIAN CENTRAL TOBACCO  
COMMITTEE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri K. L. Narasimham being the only candidate nominated for election to the Indian Central Tobacco Committee, I hereby declare him to be duly elected to be a member of the said Committee.

RESULT OF ELECTION TO THE  
INDIAN CENTRAL COCONUT  
COMMITTEE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Bhagirathi Mahapatra being the only candidate nominated for election to the Indian Central Coconut Committee, I hereby declare him to be duly elected to be a member of the said Committee.

THE BOMBAY REORGANISATION  
BILL, 1960

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

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

It is again my privilege, Sir, to commend this Bill, as it has emerged out of the deliberations of the Joint Committee and the discussions in the Lok Sabha, for acceptance by this House. It is hardly necessary for me to speak at any length. In fact, I have already delivered perhaps more than six speeches so far in this connection. So, I have little more to add.

This Bill, as I have just observed, embodies the changes that have been made by the Joint Committee. In fact; the Lok Sabha has accepted the Bill, as sent by the Joint Select Committee, in its entirety. There has been hardly any change since. So, the Bill in its present form may be deemed to carry the wishes, as I have just pointed out, not only of the Bombay Legislature

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]  
and the Joint Select Committee but also of the Lok Sabha.

Before proceeding with the few points that have been introduced in the Bill as a result of the discussions in the Joint Committee, I would like again, as I did in the Lok Sabha, to express my gratitude to the Members of the Joint Select Committee for the spirit of understanding, accommodation and goodwill with which the issues, which arose out of this difficult problem of the reorganisation of the existing State of Bombay, were handled by all parties and their spokesmen.

Sir, the Bombay Legislature, as I have pointed out at an earlier stage, has discussed this Bill threadbare for a number of days. Eleven amendments were proposed by the Assembly and two by the Council of Bombay, and the Joint Committee has incorporated in the Bill the substance of all those amendments in an appropriate form. So, the Bill, as it stands today, fully and liberally represents the wishes of the Bombay Legislature. There is nothing in the Bill today which has not been approved by the Bombay Legislature and it can as well, therefore, be regarded as being a true reflection of the views, sentiments, aspirations and the wishes of the people of Bombay as voiced by their representatives in the Bombay Legislature. Sir, of these eleven amendments proposed by the Assembly, to two, which were the principal ones, I had referred in the few remarks that I had occasion to make when the Bill was referred to the Joint Select Committee. By one, Sir, the Committee has accepted the proposal of the Bombay Legislature that the name of the new State should be 'Maharashtra' and not 'Bombay'. That meets the sentiments of the people of Maharashtra. And the other one relates to the establishment of a permanent Bench of the Bombay High Court at Nagpur. That too has been accepted. The other amendments are of a minor character, such as empowering the Gujarat Government to constitute a Finance Corporation for Gujarat or authorising the Bombay Government, as it exists

today, to reorganise the Road Corporation, and other minor matters. I do not think I need deal with them as they have been dealt with in the Report of the Joint Committee.

Now, Sir, there are a few other amendments to which I might just make a reference. The number of representatives from Maharashtra in this august House has been raised from 18 to 19. This House will, as stated before, be adding to its strength through this reorganisation of the Bombay State. There will be three more Members now added to the present strength of this House, two from Gujarat and one from Bombay. Besides the number of Judges—the minimum number—on the Nagpur Bench will be three and not two, and the Legislative Assembly of Gujarat will consist of 154 Members instead of 132. So there will be seven members to be elected to the Assembly from a Parliamentary constituency instead of six. When the area of a State is changed, the number varies. It, in fact, even now varies greatly, from five to about eight. The Gujarat Assembly will have 154 members.

These, Sir, are the main amendments made in the Bill as it was referred to the Joint Select Committee, and the Bill as it was approved by the Joint Select Committee has also been accepted by the Lok Sabha. I hope the hon. Members of this House will soon have a feeling of satisfaction, combined with a sense of achievement when this Bill is finally passed by this House and finds a worthy place in the Statute Book of our great Union.

Sir, there are three dissenting notes attached to the report of the Joint Select Committee. I do not propose to deal with them. The main issues have been discussed in this House as well as in the other House previously and some of them even when this Bill was discussed in the Lok Sabha.

The fact that stands out prominently has, however, to be borne in mind. This Bill is based on and embodies the settlement reached between the leaders of Gujarat and Maharashtra. But

for that agreement it would, I am afraid, have hardly been possible to have this measure got through the two Houses as rapidly and as expeditiously as has been actually achieved. Sir, it embodies not only the agreement between the two leaders, but it has also the unanimous support of the Bombay Legislature and also the unanimous support, except for a few points, of the entire Joint Select Committee—the overwhelming support of the members who were elected to the Joint Select Committee from this House as well as from the other House. The Bill in its final third reading was passed in the Lok Sabha too almost unanimously but for one dissentient voice. I consider it a happy augury for the future of these two States that this Bill should have been blessed by all sections and should have made this progress in an atmosphere of cordiality and harmony.

In our country we will have now 15 States instead of 14. The two new States will be ushered into existence in about a week's time from today. They will, I hope, not only bring about greater cohesion among the people living within these respective States, but also contribute to the unity and the progress of the country in a still larger measure.

Sir, both of these States have very glorious traditions. They have produced leaders who have made their permanent impression not only in our country but who are also admired and respected in many other countries. These two States have those qualities which will contribute greatly to the further advancement of our own vast Union where in the midst of a variety of languages and regions and other factors of that type we have been able to maintain our fundamental unity. After all, we owe everything to the strength and integrity of India as such. Whatever administrative changes be made, we cannot forget that we have to give first priority to the duty that we owe to the great country to which we have the honour to belong. We have to bear this basic principle constantly in mind, specially as we some

times see new clouds on the horizon which had not been visible previously.

I hope that the birth of these two States will add to the culture, to the strength and the vitality of our nation, and I hope all hon. Members of this House will join me in wishing these two States the best of luck, happiness, progress and advancement in every field in which human spirit has so far advanced and which human mind has produced and human hands have accomplished. Sir, I commend this Bill to the hon. Members of this House again for their acceptance.

*The question was proposed.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: We allotted 3½ hours for this Bill. Today being Saturday we get an hour extra. That is 4½ hours. I have 20 names—15 from the Congress side and 5 from the Opposition, non-congress, not necessarily Opposition. Members till One o'clock will be allotted 15 minutes each. After lunch they will get 10 minutes each.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in welcoming this Bill and supporting its basic features. That feature is the bifurcation of the bi-lingual Bombay State on whose edifice now rise the two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. I am also thankful that the wishes of the people were respected in one point at least and the residuary State is named as Maharashtra. It is just as it should have been. I, for one, and the people of Maharashtra have reason to rejoice that the last act of the British conquest is being scrapped off the pages of history and a new State of Maharashtra is now emerging. Gujarat too had no State of its own. For centuries it was being tossed between that power and others. Now we are having our States on the map and we will have a rightful place as equal members in the great family of our Indian Union. I want to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Home Minister and wish to express my confidence that the new States will prove worthy of the expectations and hopes with which they

[Shri Lalji Pendse.]

are given a rebirth. We had to struggle long and hard. So much suffering and sacrifice fate had ordained us to endure; because in 1956, when the whole country was being reorganised more or less on linguistic basis and each linguistic community was given a State of its own, we were—that was our feeling—discriminated against, not only discriminated against, but we were scorned and scoffed at; we suffered from the inhibition of linguism. That stirred our emotions to their very depths and we prepared ourselves to stand up for the worst. We stood all sorts of privations and sufferings and thousands of men and women of all ages went to jail and 105 of our brave sons and brothers sacrificed their lives. It is wrong, as it has been suggested, that we agitators goaded them to give their lives. We know our limitations and we also know the fact that people are not just goaded to annihilate themselves for fine words or brave words but the feeling was so deep and deliberate that we had to struggle. I am referring to this point because the same is being said with regard to the agitation in Belgaum. How dearly we wish that they were spared to participate in the celebrations, the inaugural celebrations, that the two States will have soon. Maharashtra and Gujarat, and particularly Bombay and Ahmedabad, would be caught up in a frenzy of festivities now from 27th onwards for five days and we wish that these sons and brothers of ours were among us. It is my duty, therefore, to pay my homage to them on the floor of this House and to pass on a word of consolation to the members of their families.

It is also my duty to express my sense of deep gratitude to the Members of both the Houses here. The Members on this side of the House have always stood by us and championed our cause. None the less, the Members on that side also bore sympathy for us, though they could not express that. I am aware that without their sympathies the question of

the reorganisation of the State would not have come up so early as this.

Turning now to the Bill itself, I must confess to a feeling of distress, and even on a liberal assumption. I cannot agree to some provisions pertaining to the transfer of certain territories from Maharashtra and imposing certain financial burdens. If it was merely a question of mutual accommodation and goodwill, I would certainly appreciate it, but there is nothing like giving but everything is taken. There are several amendments moved and they will be taken up at the appropriate time. I will not much argue on them because I know that at this late hour, arguments would hardly bring the results that I expect. Often it happens that arguments provoke counter arguments and the whole affair turns into intellectual acrobatics. I will not argue therefore but I intend to express how deeply we feel about some of the provisions and leave the Members at that. It would not matter to me how they vote but if they carry some impressions out of my explanation and ponder over them at some leisurely moment within their hearts, I suppose I would be more than rewarded. Meanwhile the sponsors of the Bill may go with the feeling of 'Jeetam Maya'—I win. The foundation on which this Bill, the superstructure of the Bill, is raised, as has just been stated, is the mutual agreement between the two contracting Ministers of Bombay. Fundamentally speaking, there is nothing wrong. It is a good way of solving problems speedily and without much recrimination provided they were being based on certain accepted principles. The principles are absent here and therefore we have a strange phenomenon that while these Ministers address their demand to the Mysore State for the transfer of certain Marathi-speaking territories to the State of Maharashtra, they, between themselves, are convinced that what is now popularly known as the Pataskar Formula is the best solution or formula to secure an enduring solution, yet, when they sit down to divide the State of Bombay

between themselves, they scatter this formula or the principle to the winds with the result that they ply a village-wise enquiry in some places, while in regard to others, they transfer the whole district to the other State and so on. This happens because they were not coming to a consummate understanding, but were contracting, haggling, and that is why we are landed into a situation in which in spite of overwhelming evidence on the other side, we are asked to transfer some of the areas which were hitherto adjudged as Marathi. For example there is case of the Umbergaon villages. The villages of the taluk of Umbergaon were looked into on the basis of their linguistic composition. They were roughly divided. But then there were certain villages with Marathi majority which have been transferred to Gujarat. It is not merely give and take. If that were so, then one or two or a few of the Gujarati-speaking villages would have gone on the other side.

**SHRI SURESH J. DESAI (Bombay):** Is the hon. Member referring to the 1951 census or the 1941 census? He might be well aware that the 1951 census of that region was completely manipulated.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** I want to submit to the hon. Member in all humility that the whole problem has been studied by me.

**SHRI SURESH J. DESAI:** Has the hon. Member studied the problem of the manipulation of the 1951 census also?

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** I am coming to that. I know that problem also. Prior to the year 1951 there was no linguistic survey among the backward groups and tribes. They were not studied nor were their languages fixed. It was only after 1948 that those languages came to be described as belonging to this group or that group. That is why the Warli language to which the hon. Member refers or the Ahirani language which is

predominant in West Khandesh were adjudged to be Marathi or akin to the Marathi language and therefore the population speaking those respective languages were counted with Marathi.

**SHRI SURESH J. DESAI:** The . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, no. Not at this stage. You go ahead, Mr. Pendse. You have only two more minutes.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** About Dangs also there was an on the spot enquiry by the two Ministers—the Chief Minister and the Revenue Minister. They enquired into the culture of the people, their habits, languages, methods and so on, and they came to the conclusion that this area was Marathi. It has been suggested that this decision was partial. But there was another occasion when an enquiry had to be instituted, though for a limited purpose. But the Commissioners went into the whole question and into all aspects of the question, cultural and linguistic affinities and also the well-being of the people themselves, and came to the conclusion that they were akin to Marathi and should be attached to Nasik in Maharashtra. This cannot be called partial because none of the members of the Commission belonged to the Marathi or the Gujarati languages. That Commission is known as the Tek Chand Commission. Then again, the 1956 States Reorganisation Bill placed Dangs in Maharashtra. But in spite of overwhelming evidence and data, now Dangs has been mechanically shifted from Maharashtra and attached to Gujarat. Why? The argument advanced this time is that the district board elections warranted it. I have proved in the Select Committee how fictitious and wrong this contention is. (*Time bell rings.*) Is my time over, Sir?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, yes. You have spoken for fifteen minutes. Now wind up.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** We are going to wind up the whole Bill . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . with a sense of satisfaction and achievement, as the Home Minister said. So wind up with that.

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (मुम्बई) :** आदरणीय सभापति जी, आज हम इस बम्बई राज्य विभाजन विधेयक की आखिरी मंजिल तय कर रहे हैं और चन्द घंटों में अपने मुकाम पर पहुँचेंगे और यह कानून बन जायगा।

मैं इस विधेयक के सबध में कुछ कहूँ, उससे पहले मैं अपने आदरणीय श्रद्धेय गृह मंत्री जी को शतशः हार्दिक धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि वे ही थे कि जो इस जटिल उलझन को सुलझा सके, और वह भी किसी को नाखुश न करते हुये बड़ी ही चतुराई और सजीदगी के साथ। आपके इस महान कार्य की गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र का हर भाई बहिन भूरि भूरि सराहना करता रहेगा।

साधारण मनुष्य का यह स्वभाव होता है कि पन्द्रह आना मिल जाने पर भी एक आने के लिये वह भगड़ा करता है, शोर गुल मचाता है और पन्द्रह आने के महत्व को भुला देता है। यही कुछ हालत, यही कुछ स्थिति मुझे यहां दिखायी दे रही है। मेरे भाई अपने पूर्वग्रहों को अलग रख कर इस विधेयक को देखेंगे और यह देखेंगे कि हमें क्या प्राप्त हुआ है, तो उन्हें पता चलेगा कि हमने अपनी बाजी ६५ टका नहीं ६८ टका जीत ली है। आप देखिये, मेरे मित्र इस बात को कबूल करते हैं जैसा कि जॉइंट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में उन्होंने लिखा है : "It is a great event of historic importance that the Marathi speaking people have been brought together in one State".

मैं आपसे पूछना चाहूंगा कि यह अपूर्व घटना कैसे हुई, इस अपूर्व घटना का कारणीभूत कौन हुआ ? यह तो जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य बनने जा रहा है, यह विशाल मन्दिर जो हम बनाने जा रहे हैं इसमें आप चलिये और देखिये कि वहां क्या क्या आपको दिखायी देता है। इस महाराष्ट्र राज्य का मुकुट या कलश बम्बई

शहर होगा। आपको पता है इस बम्बई शहर की वजह से ही आज तक हममें आपस में महा-भारत होता रहा, आपस के झगड़े जितने हुये वे बम्बई की वजह से हुये। यह आप जानते हैं वह बम्बई शहर "गेटवे आफ इंडिया" कहा जाता है। चागला साहब के शब्दों में कहूँ तो जग से, न्यारा, ऐसा बम्बई शहर अब इस महाराष्ट्र राज्य की राजधानी बनने वाला है। आगे चलिये विदर्भ, जो विदर्भ सैकड़ों वर्षों तक मध्य प्रदेश में और निजाम के राज्य में रहा, हालांकि वहां मराठी भाषाभाषी रहते थे और रहते हैं, अब वह प्रथम बार महाराष्ट्र के अपने भाइयों के साथ एकत्रित हो रहा है। आज तक यह घटना नहीं हो सकी। यह ऐतिहासिक घटना है। मराठवाड़ा को लीजिये कि जो शुरू से ही, सदियों से निजाम के राज्य में रहा, आज वह महाराष्ट्र में आ रहा है। खुशी है कि मराठी भाषाभाषी सब एकत्र हो रहे हैं। अब आप देखिये कि आपने कितना प्राप्त किया है। बम्बई शहर राजधानी हो रहा है। विदर्भ जो आज तक हमसे अलग था वह हममें आ मिला है। और वह कैसे आया ? आप जानते हैं कि गत वक्त पं० हृदय नाथ कुंजरू ने यहां कहा था कि कमीशन ने विदर्भ को स्वतंत्र राज्य देना तय किया था परन्तु हमारी मांग थी कि विदर्भ महाराष्ट्र में मिलाया जाय जिससे तमाम मराठी भाषी जनता एकत्र हो जाय। हमारी मांग, यह न्यायपूर्ण मांग, हमारे नेता पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू को पसन्द आई और उनकी दीर्घ कोशिशों से विदर्भ महाराष्ट्र में आने को तैयार हुआ। उन्होंने विदर्भ के नेताओं को समझाया बुझाया, सब तरह की उनकी जो दिक्कतें थीं उनको दूर करने की आवश्यकता मानी तब विदर्भ महाराष्ट्र में शामिल होने को तैयार हुआ। यह सब कांग्रेस के नेताओं की बदौलत हुआ, और किसी की ताकत नहीं थी यह आपको पहचानना चाहिये। आगे चलकर अब जब बम्बई के बाइफर्केशन का सवाल आया तब फिर विदर्भ का सवाल उठा कि विदर्भ का स्वतंत्र राज्य हो। आपको पता होगा कि विदर्भ के बहुत से भाइयों

ने यह इच्छा प्रगट की कि हमारा एक स्वतंत्र राज्य बनाया जाय, परन्तु हमारे माननीय गृह मंत्री और बम्बई के प्रधान नेता और मुख्य मंत्री श्री यशवंत राव चव्हाण की खास कोशिशों से विदर्भ महाराष्ट्र में आने को राजी हुआ और आज विदर्भ महाराष्ट्र का एक हिस्सा बन गया है। इससे ज्यादा और खुशी की कौन सी बात हो सकती है।

इन दो बातों के बाद तीसरी एक और अपूर्व घटना घटी है और वह है नाम की। आप जानते हैं कि मराठी भाषियों की संस्कृति और परम्परा को व्यक्त करने वाला महाराष्ट्र नाम है। आज तक हम बम्बई के नाम से पुकारे जाते थे और बम्बई शब्द कोई खास अर्थ नहीं रखता या किसी खास संस्कृति को व्यक्त नहीं करता। परन्तु अब हमारे मंत्री श्री यशवंत राव चव्हाण की कोशिशों से यह बात तय हुई कि हमारा बम्बई राज्य 'रेसिडुअरी राज्य' जो रहेगा, उसका नाम महाराष्ट्र होगा। मैं आपको यहां यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूं कि विदर्भ के बहुत से भाई इसके विरुद्ध थे, मराठवाड़ा के कुछ लोग इसके विरुद्ध थे, बम्बई शहर के कुछ भाई भी इसके खिलाफ थे, परन्तु उनको समझाया गया, उनको बतलाया गया, प्रेम की भावना, इतिहास की भावना उनके दिलों में पैदा की गई और उनकी सम्मति से यह तय हुआ कि महाराष्ट्र नाम रखा जाय क्योंकि हमारी परम्परा और हमारी संस्कृति इस शब्द से व्यक्त होती है। आप भी इसको मानेंगे कि इस नये राज्य का जो नाम महाराष्ट्र रखा जा रहा है वह हिस्टारिक है। अब मैं आपसे यह सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब आपको इतना मिल गया, जो मिलना सम्भव था और कांग्रेस नेताओं के कारण संभव हुआ, तो फिर क्यों आप छोटी छोटी बातों के लिये इस तरह से शोर करते हैं कि जैसे कुछ हुआ ही नहीं है। इस तरह जो बहुत बड़ी बात हुई है उससे आप जनता को गुमराह करना चाहते हैं और यह मेरी निगाह में ठीक नहीं है, गैर है।

**श्री बी० डी० खोबरागड़े (मुम्बई) :**

जो कुछ नहीं मिला, क्यों नहीं मिला, उसका कारण क्या है ?

**SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:**  
My time is short and, therefore, my friend should speak when he gets his turn.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** "If he gets a turn." He is getting it.

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा, छोटी छोटी बातों के लिये आवाज उठाई जा रही है। व्यवहार चतुर मनुष्य यह देखता है कि हमें क्या प्राप्त हुआ है और जब वह उसके महत्व को पहचान लेता है तो वह छोटी छोटी बातों के लिये नहीं झगड़ता, आपस में किसी तरह की रंजिश नहीं पैदा करता। ऐसी छोटी छोटी बातें हिन्दुस्तान में बाउंड्री के संबंध में शायद होती ही रहेंगी, तो फिर एक बड़े सवाल के भीतर इस तरह से छोटे मामलों को लाना, मेरे ख्याल से, योग्य नहीं है। मैंने दुख के साथ यह सुना है कि इन छोटी छोटी बातों को लेकर मेरे राज्य में विधान सभा से इस्तीफा देने की बात हो रही है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि अगर हमको डांग नहीं मिलेगा या अगर हमको फलां गांव नहीं मिलेंगे, तो हम इस्तीफा दे देंगे यानी हमारे भाई अब भी इन झगड़ों को मिटाना नहीं चाहते और प्रेम से आगे बढ़ने देना नहीं चाहते और लड़ाई झगड़े को कायम रखना चाहते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि इससे कौन सा लाभ होगा, इससे महाराष्ट्र का क्या लाभ होगा। मैं अपने भाइयों से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप लोग महाराष्ट्र की भलाई के लिये इन स्तीफों की बात छोड़िये और सब मिल करके काम करिये जिससे कि महाराष्ट्र का भला हो। आप को क्या नहीं मिला है। आपको जो मिला है उस चित्र के साथ दूसरे चित्र का मुकाबिला कीजिये। डांग का जिला नहीं मिला। जब मैं डांग के संबंध में "जिला" शब्द सुनता हूं तो मुझे हंसी आती है। सारे भारतवर्ष में कोई २८० जिले हैं और कोई जिला ऐसा नहीं होगा जिसकी आबादी ४८ हजार हो। उसको

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

जिला कह के लोगों के सामने पेश किया जाता है और इस तरह से गुमराह किया जाता है कि यह नहीं मिल रहा है। १५० गांव वेस्ट खानदेश के हैं और ५० गांव थाना जिला के हैं कुल मिला कर २०० गांव हुये। अब आप देखिये महाराष्ट्र की आबादी सवा तीन करोड़ होगी। महाराष्ट्र में २६ जिले होंगे और ३० हजार से अधिक गांव होंगे। उनमें अगर ये सवा या डेढ़ लाख आबादी के २०० गांव न मिलें, तो उसके लिये आपस में इस बैर को, और इस रंजिश को कायम रखना या बढ़ाना कहां तक व्यावहारिक अकलमन्दी का होगा, यह आप सोचिये।

मेरे भाई ने डंबर गांव के गवों की बात कही और यह कहा कि डांग में डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड के इलेक्शन किस तरह से हुये। मैं अपने भाई से उनके नेत। श्री एस०एम० जोशी के शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूं। श्री एस०एम० जोशी ने बम्बई असेम्बली में कहा कि वहां के डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड का एलेक्शन, वहां की कांग्रेस में जो दो जमाते हैं, एक गुजराती और एक मराठी, उनके प्रतिनिधियों के बीच हुआ, यानी मराठी वालों ने कैंडिडेट्स खड़े किये और गुजराती वालों ने अपने कैंडिडेट्स खड़े किये। समिति ने शायद नहीं खड़े किये किस मतलब से यह मैं कहना नहीं चाहता। तो मराठी और गुजराती की बिना पर वहां एलेक्शन लड़ा गया, जिसमें गुजराती २६ चुन कर आये और मराठी या महाराष्ट्रवादी ४ चुन कर आये। यह कहना कि वहां मराठी और गुजराती इश्यू नहीं था। गलत है। वहां मराठी और गुजराती इश्यू को लेकर ही एलेक्शन हुआ।

दूसरी बात मैं १९५७ के एलेक्शन की कहना चाहता हूं। सन् १९५७ के एलेक्शन में वहां १४०४१ वोटर्स थे और डांग के दो कैंडिडेट्स थे, एक महाराष्ट्रवादी और एक गुजरातवादी। महाराष्ट्रवादी को वहां ४ हजार वोट मिले और गुजरातवादी को १००१४ वोट मिले। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि आप गलत बातों को आगे करके

इस तरह मे लोगों को धोखा न दें। मैं आप से इसी असेम्बली रिपोर्ट से और कहना चाहता हूँ। बम्बई असेम्बली में वहां के मुख्य मंत्री, श्री यशवत राव चव्हाण, जिम वक्त इस बिल पर बोल रहे थे तो उन्होंने कहा कि मेरे पास कुछ भाई आये थे और उन्होंने यह प्रार्थना की कि डांग का बटवारा ५० टका इधर और ५० टका उधर कर लीजिये। उस पर चव्हाण साहब ने उनसे कहा कि यह सौदेबाजी नहीं है, मैं किसी तरह भी डांग की चीर फाड़ नहीं करना चाहता, सब रहें एक जगह रहें चाहें इधर रहें, चाहें उधर रहें। चव्हाण साहब ने उनसे यह भी कहा कि आपका मुझाव ऐसा है जो डांग का भला करने वाला नहीं है।

एक बात यह कही जाती है कि उकाई डैम गुजरात के हित में नहीं होगा। गुजरात के हित को गुजराती जानते हैं या मेरे भाई जानते हैं। वहां ६६ करोड़ रुपया खर्च होने वाला है। आप कुछ कहें, इतना तो आप को कहना ही पड़ेगा कि गुजराती व्यवहार-कुशल होते हैं, बिजिनसमैन होते हैं और वे ६६ कोटि रुपया पानी में नहीं बहायेंगे।

आखीर में सिर्फ यह कहना है कि फाइनेंशल एडजस्टमेंट के बारे में जो यह कहा जाता है :

"We do not think that the Gujarat State would necessarily be a deficit State."

एक्सपर्ट्स कहते हैं कि वह डेफिसिट होगा और मेरे भाई जो कि एक्सपर्ट नहीं हैं वह ज्वाइंट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में लिखते हैं कि यह डेफिसिट नहीं होगा। आश्चर्य होता है सुनकर।

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That will do.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण Only three sentences. आखीर में हमारे मुख्य मंत्री चव्हाण की जो प्रार्थना है वह मैं आपके सामने पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं :



"I would once again at the cost of repetition emphasize that the measures relating to the areas going to Gujarat are in essence in the nature of a compromise in order to find a lasting and acceptable solution of the entire question of bifurcation. I am sure that hon. Members will realise that in such matters one has to be realistic and a certain amount of give and take has to be there."

**SHRI ABHIMANYU RATH (Orissa):** For this very cause Shri C. D. Deshmukh resigned from the Ministry. As now this has been done, is he going to be reinstalled?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do not bring in irrelevant issues today.

**PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated):** Sir, I must frankly admit that I cannot wholeheartedly support this Bill. When the Home Minister pleaded for a bilingual Bombay, I supported him with all my heart. I cannot say that he has changed his opinion really but he has had to bow down to the political exigencies and since he found himself attacked by both the Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis, this Bill has been the result. Sir, there are certain aspects of the case which have to be mentioned. Sir, 'they are slaves who dare not be in the right with two or three.' I am perfectly certain that I am not in such an unfortunate position as to have only two or three with me. I know Mr. Yajee spoke out very boldly when the Bill was moved here the other day and I know that there are lakhs of Gujaratis and Maharashtrians who do not feel happy about this Bill. Well, Sir, we will make the best of it. The Home Minister as well as the Chief Minister of Bombay have appealed for goodwill and harmony but unfortunately I notice that the spirit of harmony was not found in the discussions in the Bombay Council or the Assembly, nor do I find it in the Report of the Joint Committee especially as represented by the Minutes of Dissent. I agree with Mr. Sugandhi in his Minute of Dis-

sent about the undesirability of changing the name of Bombay to Maharashtra but I am not inclined to quarrel over small things. After all, there is nothing in a name; it is the spirit in which we manage things that counts. Sir, I was really very much upset by the Minute of Dissent signed by six Maharashtrian friends. They forget the whole history of Bombay city; they take for granted that Bombay city belongs to Maharashtrians only. Is it so in actual fact? Let us remember, Sir, that Bombay belongs geologically and geographically to Maharashtra; I am not going to deny it, but who has built up Bombay city? I venture to say that the Maharashtrians slumbered over it. Even in their palmy days of the Maharashtrian empire they never cared for Bombay. Even in the days of Shivaji they never cared for Bombay. When the Portuguese got Bombay, they never cared for it. It was a miserable fishing village consisting of a few islands. It was only when it was given as a part of the dowry of the Portuguese Princess to Charles II and the British came into possession of it that the English with their naval genius saw the potentialities of Bombay and they developed it. They got artisans and master builders from Surat and built the Bombay Dockyard; it was then that the mills and industries started, that educational institutions started, that philanthropy started and I humbly submit that these were not the work only of the Maharashtrians. The Gujaratis, whatever be the communities to which they belonged, whether they were from Ahmedabad or from Cutch, whether they were Gutchi Memons, Khojas, Boras, Parsees or even Jews as represented by the famous family of Sassons.

**DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay):** It is a very wrong thing to say that Maharashtra belongs to Maharashtrians only. It belongs to everybody who lives in Maharashtra.

**PROF. A. R. WADIA:** Please read that Minute of Dissent first and then you will understand it.

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

Sir, this is the history of Bombay city and now they grudge an amount of Rs. 40 crores to Gujarat State. Is forty crores a very big amount in these days when our budgets run into astronomical figures? Bombay city is worth thousands and thousands of crores and it has been built up by all these various communities. Now the proposal is that a sum of Rs. 40 crores for a limited period of ten years is to be given to Gujarat and even that is being grudged by them. Is it fair?

Take again the question of division of various villages and so on. I find that the first Minute of Dissent makes a grievance of it but I admire the ability with which the third Minute of Dissent has been written by Mr. Purshottamdas Patel. It is a brilliant piece of work, not political, but historical, scholarly and very equitable. It goes to show on the authority of such a great linguist as Dr. Grierson and on the authority of Maharashtrian scholars themselves as to what the real linguistic distribution of those areas is and on that basis even Mr. Chavan has had to yield and in his opening speech while introducing the Bill in the Council and in the Assembly he himself has stated that these areas voted for Gujarat and that is the reason why they have been included in Gujarat. There is only one possible doubt about the Ukai project and the surrounding areas and here I would really appeal to the generosity of the Maharashtrians. We know the devastating floods from which Surat suffered last year and I know it is a grievance felt by the people in Surat and by the people in Gujarat that if the Ukai project had been carried out years ago, this great tragedy would never have happened. It is in the interest of these people that the Ukai project has been sanctioned. It is going to come into existence. It is no use saying that there is difference of opinion about its utility. It is going to come and if for the benefit of millions of Gujaratis a few villages are taken over from Maharashtra, what

does it matter? Then there is the other consideration. After all, about all border areas there will always be difference of opinion and these border areas will always be bilingual; there will always be two languages whether it is the border between Maharashtra and Mysore or whether it is the border between Gujarat and Maharashtra. It makes no difference. The people there have necessarily to speak both the languages. Sir, when I supported bilingual Bombay, I pointed out the main reason. I felt proud of it; it was a wonderful exemplification of the fine spirit of co-operation between the Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians. Both these people have got wonderful gifts. The Maharashtrians are the worshippers of Saraswathi and I admire them for it as I myself am a humble worshipper of Saraswathi. The Gujaratis are the worshippers of Lakshmi and they have wonderful commercial genius. And this wonderful commercial genius has not been there only for the last few years or decades; it is as old as the days of Shivaji. Probably in yesterday's Statesman you must have read that even Shivaji was conscious of it. It is said here:

12 Noon

"The Press Note even quotes a historical anecdote and says: 'Shivaji, seeing how Maharashtrians miserably lacked in business acumen, specially invited Gujaratis to carry on trade and commerce in Maharashtra and for centuries they have been doing it, completely identifying themselves with the local people.'"

Well, Sir, that was the great comradeship, that was the great co-operative adventure as I call it which built up the great city of Bombay.

There is another thing that hurts me. We in Bombay have always been proud of leading the country in many ways. We have been feeling that what Bombay does today, the rest of India will do tomorrow. Now, here again we set a good example. When the other parts of the country were clamouring for linguistic provinces we

said: 'Let us be together. We, Gujaratis and Maharashtrians, have been together for centuries and we shall not allow ourselves to be separated now.' But then, later they made a grievance of it that when the other States have been given on the linguistic basis, why should not Maharashtra be given it, why should not Gujarat be given it? It seems to me to be a retrograde step. It means that Bombay has given up its lead. Bombay is now prepared to follow what the other States do and this is most unfortunate in the history of India. As Mr. Chavan himself said in his speech to the Legislative Council, "where is there the precedent of a division of a State like this before?" Where indeed? We have got instances of small States intergrating themselves. Here you have got a big State disintegrating itself. That is the tragedy to which we cannot be blind.

Now, Sir, the Bombay Chief Minister has been particularly keen about mentioning the future policy of the Maharashtra State towards Bombay City. He mentioned its cosmopolitan character and I hope it will be preserved really. He mentioned the case of the University of Bombay, namely, that it would continue with English to be replaced by Hindi, that means not by Marathi, because there are already three other Universities in the State which will look to the interests of Marathi. But there is one other University to which I wish the Chief Minister had made some mention and that is the S.N.D.T. University for Women. Now, that is a splendid example of Maharashtrian and Gujarati co-operation. There was our old veteran Maharashtrian and Indian educationist, Dr. Karve, starting this Women's University and there was a philanthropist, Sir Damodar Vithaldas Thackersey, giving it lakhs of rupees and the University was established. This University has its headquarters in Bombay. It has one college with Marathi as the medium of instruction in Poona. It has four colleges in Gujarat—Surat, Baroda, Ahmedabad and Bhavnagar—with Gujarati as the medium of ins-

truction. What is the position of the S.N.D.T. University in the new set-up? I am aware that the University authorities have published a press note in which the promise of Mr. Chavan is held out that it will be continued, that this University can maintain its various classes in the different mother tongues as the media of instruction. I wish a more definite announcement had been made about this and I for one feel that the S.N.D.T. University is such a unique institution in the whole of India that the Centre itself should take it over, because then there would be no question of any possible misunderstanding between Gujarat and Maharashtra and the legal claims of each to its various colleges. Difficulties might arise about the grants from the Government of Maharashtra and from the Government of Gujarat to this University.

May I, Sir, refer to the question of my own little community? We have never asked for communal representation. We have been sufficiently confident in ourselves. We can afford to stand on our own legs. But we do expect full justice, full opportunities for the practice of our religion, for carrying on our little professions and vocations, for carrying on our educational work which we have been doing to our advantage and to the advantage of India. I think it is the one community which has got practically cent. per cent. literacy in the whole of India. (*Time bell rings.*) I bow down to your judgment. I have heard the bell, but may I point out that there is something unjust in the distribution of time allotted for these important Bills? On an unimportant Bill like the Dowry Prohibition Bill, we have been allowed to talk for hours and hours and on a Bill like this which concerns the welfare of millions of people time is grudged. Anyway, I bow down to your judgment and I shall sit down. There is only one sentence more which you will permit me to say. I feel that I am taking part today in celebrating the funeral of bilingual Bombay. Celebrating funerals does not give anyone

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]  
any joy. But I also feel that there is the birth of two new infants. I think of a mother dying in childbirth. We mourn the death of the mother, but we welcome the survival of the child, and we look forward to the hopes and aspirations of the child. That is the position in which I am today. Sir, I would only say, "If India lives, who dies? If India dies, who lives?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Wadia, 3½ hours we gave. We have added two hours. It is really 5½ hours we are giving to this Bill and you cannot grudge it. There are so many Members who want to speak on this Bill. Mr. Santhanam.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish god-speed to the new States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. It is a matter of regret that they should have been joined together in the year 1956 in the traditional Hindu patriarchal fashion. But, still, I, like many others, hoped that the two great peoples would have accepted the decision and would have tried to work bilingual Bombay in a spirit of goodwill. Unfortunately, the spirit of the times was too much for them and the next step, a friendly separation, has been decided upon. In this connection, I am greatly apprehensive of the notional effects of this continual change in the borders of States. The prosperity of the United States of America is largely due to the fact that the States, big and small, have maintained their boundaries for a long time, without any disturbance. I realise that, owing to historical circumstances and the integration of the Indian States, some reorganisation has had to take place in this country. But I want that this process should end once and for all and I hope the Home Minister will give this assurance that except for the French Settlements and the prospective amalgamation and integration of the Portuguese Settlements, no further changes of the State boundaries will take place hereafter.

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): What about the Punjab?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: That is exactly the implication of what I said. I want him to declare that the boundaries of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamilnad and all other States of India will continue to be as they are and they will not be tampered with hereafter. Otherwise, there is no end to this process. Once you yield to these clamours, the thing will go on and there will be uncertainty. In the small State of Vindhya Pradesh, we took two or three years to integrate the Services and I am sure the integration of the Services of the reorganised States of 1956 is still going on. Probably, it will take three or four years before the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat can settle down to normal administrative processes. Therefore, it is of great national importance that the boundaries of States, now that they have been reorganised more or less on a unilingual basis throughout the country, should continue and they should settle down to proper, good Government rather than clamour about border areas.

It is wholly impossible to eliminate linguistic minorities in border areas, and it is no use saying 'I will take this village because there is a Maharashtrian majority' or 'I will take that village because there is a Gujarati majority'. I suggest that on the passing of this Bill, this Parliament should make it a matter of principle that it will not tamper with the boundaries.

In this connection I also wish to say that it is time that article 3 of the Constitution which enables Parliament to pass these Bills as if they are not constitutional amendments should be amended, and all such Bills should be made constitutional amendments and not merely Parliamentary legislations. Such amendments should also be made subject to the approval of a majority of States and not merely two-thirds majority of Parliament I want some fixity about this matter so that the

continuous quarrels may stop. Today Mysore and Maharashtra may quarrel, and then Mysore may claim something from Tamilnad. I do not say that there may not be some ground for all such claims. There are bound to be such claims so long as there is any possibility of change. When once it is declared that there is no possibility of change, all people will settle down and adjust themselves to existing circumstances and become loyal citizens of the State.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** Would you support a Boundary Commission for resolving all differences?

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** No more Boundary Commissions. I want the States to stay as they are. I want people to adjust themselves to existing circumstances.

It is a matter of regret that the Maharashtra members did not take this opportunity to get rid of the Legislative Council. I do not think that the Legislative Councils in the States are doing any important work.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** What about the Council of States?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** (West Bengal): I support your view, but it is a wrong place to talk about that.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** There is a fundamental distinction between the Centre and the Units. Therefore, though I may not quite agree about the way in which the Rajya Sabha is constituted or how it is functioning, I do think that there is a very strong case for a Rajya Sabha of some type.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I hope it will not be an asylum for defeated candidates

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** Then, I think I should say a few words about the financial provisions. There is no doubt at all in my mind that but for these provisions Gujarat would have been a deficit State. I

presume that the deficit of Gujarat has been properly estimated. A question has been raised whether this deficit should not have been taken over by the Centre and why the Maharashtra State should have been saddled with the liability of meeting the deficit.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** We do not agree with that.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** The bilingual Bombay, we found in the Finance Commission, was quite a solvent State. In fact it was a surplus State, and therefore from the all-India point of view the only principle which should have been adopted, and which has been adopted, was that both the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat must be solvent. I think, on the whole, the provisions enable them to be solvent. But there is one difficulty about clause 52. It provides for a long-term adjustment between Maharashtra and Gujarat. I wish that they had lumped these sums and either deducted it from the debt or given it as capital, because this clause 52 is going to be a great obstacle for the consideration on the merits of the case for these States by the next Finance Commission.

**SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI** (Bombay): Your suggestion has been carried out in the Bill by lumping them together and making provision for payment straightway.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** I am glad about that

Sir, only one more point and I shall have done. I wish that the University of Bombay had been taken over by the Centre as a Central University in the same way as the Delhi University, the Banaras University and the Aligarh University. Sir, Bombay is a cosmopolitan city in which large numbers of people have settled down. All kinds of people, Tamilians, Telugus, etc., people speaking all the fourteen languages are there, and therefore that University should have been taken over by the Centre and converted

[Shri R. Santhanam.]

into a Central University, and the medium of instruction of the University must be whatever medium of instruction may be prescribed for the other Central Universities. My own view is that for a considerable time it should be bilingual, English and Hindi, and ultimately when the whole country has been sufficiently educated to use Hindi as the national language, its medium of instruction should also be Hindi. I hope that some steps may still be taken, because after all this is a matter of arrangement, and it will be a source of great relief to the State of Maharashtra to hand over the Bombay University and all its financial liabilities to the Centre. This will also be a great relief to all other people because, if the medium of instruction of the Bombay University is made Marathi, it will be a serious hardship for all the linguistic minorities, who have settled down in Bombay. Otherwise some Central University will have to be organised for them. I hope this double burden will not have to be undertaken. After all Maharashtra has got the Maharashtra University and there is the Nagpur University, and they can start more Universities if they like.

With these few words, Sir, I wish godspeed to both the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Lunch hour will be from 1 P.M. to 2 P.M.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: Sir, while speaking on the Bill under discussion before the House, I would not like to say a word which might retard the smooth progress of the two States from the 1st of May.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Though personally I would have in the normal circumstances endorsed whatever my learned friend, Prof. Wadia, has said and what Mr. Santhanam has said, I need not go now into the history of this reorganisation. About three years back the non-official Members of Parliament

made a requisition, and the great State was born. As far as I am concerned, I fully support the Bill as it has emerged from the Select Committee as well as the Lok Sabha under the circumstances. Why I say so is because there are both satisfaction and pain at what has happened, pain because a long association of more than 150 years is being snapped. As some of the previous speakers have said, the Maharashtrian people and the Gujarati people were supplementary and complementary to each other, and as such they have built up a beautiful, magnificent and efficient State.

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY: Is it a division of people or division of territory?

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: I am just coming to that.

When the sentiments and the emotional feelings in both parts of the country have been substantially taken into consideration and when these two States as neighbours are coming into existence, we only require the blessings of Parliament and we wish godspeed for these two new States that are taking birth.

I do not want to go into the controversies which have been raised in the two minutes of dissent. In a nature of this division, it does not bring satisfaction to either side. But, however, when the two leaders of both the States have come to an agreed solution, that solution must be accepted by Parliament. It may have given some satisfaction or some dissatisfaction to either side, but this is the best in the circumstances, and I do not think that anybody can make any improvement on what has been agreed to. As Shri Santhanam has said, I do feel that this will be the end of the reorganisation process of the States which had been agitating the minds of people for the last ten or twelve years. I hope and pray that this sort of Reorganisation Bill will be the last, and that this Parliament may not have to consider in future any other Bill of this type.

Sir, as one who has been coming from the Bombay State and who has been proud to be a citizen of the Bombay State—I am, of course, a citizen of the whole Indian State; once I was a citizen of the Bombay State, well, I will now be a citizen of the Gujarat State—I say again that I am pained at the snapping of the association which has lasted for the last 150 years. I fully and wholeheartedly support this Bill and I think this is the best in the circumstances. On behalf of Gujarat and even of Maharashtra, I would like the full-hearted blessings of the Members of Parliament.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I fully echo the sentiments expressed by the hon. Home Minister as to how the Bill has come before the House and the spirit in which the two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat are working. I feel a sense of gratification that the purpose for which the elected representatives of Gujarat, namely the Mahagujarat Janata Parishad in the Bombay Legislative Assembly, chose to elect and send me here, has been achieved just during the two years that I have been here. I was not seeking any election because of differences with the Congress. I have practically . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): You take credit for it?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Certainly I do, Sir. At least in this House, there is no one who has spoken about it as I have. I do take credit for it. I have no hesitation in saying that. Let us remember those people who have sacrificed their lives for the sake of Gujarat—the 35 people who have laid down their lives. The people of Gujarat will remember them while other people go into celebrations because it is their sacrifice—they are the people who have suffered in silence, they are the people who have gone to jail—that has resulted in the coming into being of these two States. Sir, it would have been better if they

had come into being in a spirit of agreement that was coming. During the course of the last Reorganisation Bill, an agreement was nearly coming. Sitting in Bombay as I do now—and have done all my life—I did not know what happened here, and why the 3-State formula that was accepted was suddenly reversed; I have not been able to understand yet. Shri Khandubhai Desai just now told us that it was a decision of the Members of Parliament.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Why do you go into the past history? Does it help?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: History is important. It was the decision of the Members of Parliament certainly. But who were those Members of Parliament who worked for it and sought the blessings they were supposed to carry? That is the point. Being a resident of Bombay, as I said, I fully echo the sentiments expressed in the House by Prof. Wadia.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: You must speak on behalf of Maharashtra, not on behalf of Gujarat.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has been in Gujarat.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I speak on behalf of the State of Maharashtra, and I would like my friends living in the new State of Maharashtra to preserve the cosmopolitan character of Bombay of which not only they but the whole of India is proud. Bombay University is the mother of six universities and I hope that its cosmopolitan character—the character that has taken the lamp of learning not only within the Bombay State but outside—will continue to be there, it will not be smothered and its voice, its light, will not be put out by any consideration of linguism or communalism.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Is there any apprehension in the mind of the hon. Member?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: If there was no apprehension, I would

[Shri Dahyabhai Patel.]

not have been here and particularly the apprehension arises because of the speeches made and because, if I may be permitted to say, of the minutes of dissent that I read. I am not going into the proceedings of the Joint Select Committee. But, Sir, I appeal to both the sides not to append any minute of dissent. Let us put the Bill before Parliament in a spirit of understanding and give and take. After all, when we come upon a certain issue, there are likely to be some people who are not satisfied on all points. I may not be satisfied on all the points about the Bill as it has emerged from the Select Committee. I was one of those who had proposed a large number of amendments like my friends here. But the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Select Committee contains a large number of common agreements and I repeat my appeal to my friends, let them not move any amendments. You know what the fate of the amendments is going to be.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Will the hon. Member . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. You will have your say.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The Joint Select Committee tried to find a large measure of common agreement. I myself am not in full agreement with every word of it but in a measure like this, it is not possible to satisfy every individual, every party, everyone. Therefore, let us accept what is coming before us as the largest measure of common agreement.

Then I come to the assurance that the Chief Minister of Bombay gave on the floor of the Bombay Legislative Assembly. Sir, I welcome the assurance that he gave about preserving the cosmopolitan character of the City. Unfortunately, it is nowhere in the Bill and I do not know whether it has any legal sanction. Sir, I have been in Bombay, as I said before, for a long time. I have had a lot to do with the Municipal Corporation of Bombay. In the City of Bombay we

teach twelve different languages in the primary schools where education is really free and compulsory. I hope that is going to be kept. There is nothing in the Bill said about it. Then, the Gujarati language there is also considered a regional language. In certain schools only English was taught. After independence we said that the regional language or the vernacular must be taught. So the purely English teaching schools started teaching—some Marathi and some Gujarati. Some of us who had our children in some of these schools found difficulty because some of them started teaching only in Marathi and English even though a large number of the pupils were not born of families whose mother-tongue was English—they were Gujaratis. It was because of the official pressure that was put on them. I persuaded them to see the right and to teach Gujarati also as a regional language.

I would like to know, Sir, in the future set-up of the State of Bombay or the State of Maharashtra as you choose to call it, that the assurance of the Chief Minister will be kept and that the present facilities that the different linguistic minorities are enjoying in the State of Bombay will be preserved. Sir, I would also like to point out the example of another institution of learning. Prof. Wadia referred to the two universities and I mention one more institution of learning, which has a reputation not only in India but outside, and that is the Grant Medical College. Surgeons from all over the world come here on behalf of the World Health Organisation—eminent surgeons—and perform difficult and unique operations in this hospital for the benefit of the medical profession, for increasing the knowledge of the medical profession not only in Bombay but in the whole of India. I hope the character of this institution will be preserved and the name of this institution will be added to the Twelfth Schedule. Government have reserved to themselves the right to do this afterwards. I am content with it; I do not insist on



moving an amendment, but I hope Government will take steps to do so.

Sir, I would particularly address the Government of India to turn its attention to the development of Gujarat—Gujarat today feels that she has been sadly neglected during the last few years—after the new State of Gujarat comes about. We have been feeling so, for instance, in the matter of oil—the development of oil has been sadly neglected. I have been mentioning this again and again, and Gujarat feels that as there is no strong Chief Minister of Gujarat to represent this, this aspect of the matter has been neglected. Sir, oil is a thing which affects our very life, and the development of oil resources has very much to do with the Five Year Plans about which they talk so much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Can we send one from here, a strong Chief Minister?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Oil is an industry that is largely in the hands of foreigners. Fortunately we are developing the oil industry on the State-level—I am not against it. I want the oil industry to develop—whether it is in the private sector or in the public sector—I am not dogmatic about the private sector or the public sector, but I want the pace of development to proceed. Unfortunately I am not satisfied with the rate at which things are progressing in this matter particularly when the potentialities of oil are so obviously clear in the whole of Gujarat—experts who have come from abroad at the invitation of the Government of India have been saying so. Oil is not one industry; there are hundreds of ancillary industries which depend on oil. This will give so much of employment.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): On a point of information. Does the hon. Member want some provision to be made for oil here?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I think I am perfectly in order in appealing to the Central Government to turn its attention to the neglect of

the present bilingual Government to certain aspects of development in Gujarat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Especially when the Central Government needs so much oil.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The other thing that Gujarat will need is the port. Development of oil resources will mean that Gujarat will need a port very soon and I hope Government will not be carried away by wrong reports or will not say that there is no possibility for a port. Gujarat was given a port in the name of Kandla which, I believe, is more a defence port than a port for commercial purposes but the port, I see, is ruined in the manner it has been built. What are its connections with Delhi or its connections with Gujarat for which it is supposed to be helpful? It is therefore very necessary that the development of a port at a place somewhere near Cambay should be taken up in right earnest; the urgency is much more so with this find of oil there.

In conclusion, Sir, I would once again appeal to my friends of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and of the opposition with whom I had the pleasure of working to a smaller extent—because I came into Mahagujarat Janata Parishad much later; they had entered into an agreement with Mr. Yagnik on a certain basis and I do not see how they can be going back upon it.

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

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am saying that that agreement is behind the good spirit in which the two States are being formed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway Parliament is not concerned with it; that is what I am saying.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: By referring to that I am supporting my appeal to these friends not to press for amendments even at this stage

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

and to see that this Bill is passed in the good spirit in which it has been moved by the hon. the Home Minister in this House. I would like to see that spirit prevail in Gujarat and in Bombay. I understand there is a move for celebrations for three or four days in Bombay. Bombay is welcome to celebrate the occasion if they like, and in that manner, if Bombay feels that way, but the celebrations will be justified only if we keep in mind the spirit of the assurance given by the Chief Minister of Bombay and what the hon. the Home Minister pointed out to this House now, and particularly he pointed out the danger that seems to confront us in the near future. In the light of this, Sir, I hope the House and particularly the friends on my right will agree and support the Bill in that spirit.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome the Bill as it has emerged from the Select Committee. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had been to Maharashtra very recently and he experienced how every home in Maharashtra was glad over the creation of the new State of Maharashtra. I don't think there was such a gladdening event in the history of Maharashtra in former days. This thing was possible only because we are in a democracy. Democracy has got a right to commit mistakes and to amend. The State of Bombay has passed through various vicissitudes. Once it was a quadrilingual State; then it became a trilingual State; then it became a bilingual State and now we are getting the pleasure of having a unilingual State. We expected that so much controversy about the creation of a unilingual State of Bombay would not be created but, as fortune would have it, we had to pass through tortures, through trials and tribulations.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Misfortune, you mean.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Fortune here means misfortune. Anyway we are thankful to Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and

to the Chief Ministers of Bombay and Gujarat.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: To Shrimati Indira Gandhi particularly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR: Yes, to all of them, but you are taking my time unnecessarily. So I am thankful to them all for what they have done. Now, Sir, as I indicated, Bombay has had a chequered history extending over a period of 150 years. But those days are gone and the curtain has fallen. I am not going to refer to the controversial issues which were raised here by my friends, for instance by Prof. Wadia, Mr. Santhanam and so many others. They were not necessary here. I am prepared to argue with Prof. Wadia as regards what Dr. Grierson has said.

The statement which he quoted is wrong. It was not Shivaji. Surely it was Nana Pharanvis who said that about hundred years ago. So these are things over which we need not enter into a controversy here. I am prepared to argue with anybody regarding the territory which has passed to Gujarat, but I am not going to enter into that controversy just now, though I sincerely feel that injustice has been done to these territories.

Shri Deokinandan Narayan's idea if translated into Sanskrit will read:

‘विक्रीते करिणी अंकुशे किं विवादः’

After having sold the elephant why should there be quarrel about the iron rod.

That is all right. But in democracy we expect justice. And if justice is not done, the feelings of the people are unnecessarily hurt. That should not be the position. Therefore, what has been done with regard to Dangs or Umbergaon or the 150 villages of West Khandesh has been done. After all, what has been done has been done as a compromise. That is our stand, the stand which our Chief Minister, Mr. Y. B. Chavan, has taken. That is

quite understandable. It has come as a measure of compromise. So let us not say that these areas belong to a particular group or particular language.

My friend, Sureshbhai Desai, who is sitting over there, said that the census figures are wrong.

**SHRI SURESH J. DESAI:** I can give clear proofs to show that the census figures were manipulated.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** This is casting an aspersion on the Census Report. I am not prepared to do that. But if the Census figures are manipulated, the area is manipulated, the people are manipulated and everything else is manipulated. Let us better not enter into that sort of controversy; let us drop a curtain over it.

Sir, I am particularly worried about certain fears expressed about Maharashtra. I am not going to trace the whole history, but I am going to refer to certain statements made by the Dar Commission in June 1948. They said that these linguistic provinces will create a sub-nationality. That was certainly shocking to me. There are linguistic provinces all over the country and I have not seen anywhere the feeling of sub-nationality being created. Can you say that there is a sub-nationality in Bengal or Orissa or U.P. or Bihar or in Mysore or Andhra which were recently created? I totally disagree with the fear expressed by the Dar Commission.

Similarly, Sir, a great controversy hanged round the future of the Bombay city. The J.V.P. Report, the Dar Commission, the States Reorganisation Commission, and ultimately the 288 Members of Parliament, with one voice said that Bombay did not belong to Maharashtra. Therefore, there is all the more ground for me to congratulate Pantji for having wiped out all that was stated by previous lithographers or chroniclers. Now the new State is emerging.

Prof. Wadia said that this is the funeral of the bilingual State. I think

on such an auspicious occasion we would not like such a statement—kindly excuse me. We are celebrating the birth of two new States. As such, let us have some good language about them.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Disappearance.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** It is appearance.

I must say that the fears expressed by the Dar Commission or the J.V.P. Report and others must be very vague. We know that the creation of Maharashtra and Gujarat is not going to create any sub-nationality. We are going to be true citizens of India as any other province is going to be or any other province already is. If India lives, these units live and if India perishes, we are also going to perish. Therefore, let us not say that any sub-nationality is going to be created or there is narrow parochialism and so on and so forth. But, Sir, these words were used in 1948 for supporting the stand that unilingual States should not be created. But I am thankful to the J. V. P. Report which has stated categorically that ultimately as democrats we should respect the public sentiment. It says:

“However, if public sentiment is insistent and overwhelming, we, as democrats, have to submit to it, but subject to certain limitations in regard to the good of India as a whole and certain conditions which we have specified above.”

This is the real sentiment and out of this real sentiment this Bombay State has come about.

In one of the speeches delivered by the Prime Minister in the other House in 1956, he said, “goodwill and brotherliness are essential for the advancement of any State.” I reciprocate that sentiment.

**SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:** You are reciprocating in 1960, after four years.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** There is no harm. The upheaval has come just now.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** In any case we are dealing with delayed actions.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** I am not seceding from any principle. If goodwill and brotherliness is considered essential, I can assure the Prime Minister that there is goodwill and brotherliness in Maharashtra and Gujarat for each other and for the whole of the country. There are certain sentimental feelings which are a dominating force for the creation of unilingual States. There is a common language, there is a common culture, there is a common history and there are common traditions and there are common social relations. All these combined together work up to a sentiment which must be respected, and which, I am glad, has been respected in the present Bill.

Sir, I am not going to refer to the conditions to which the Congress organisation was reduced, but I am not going to draw any conclusions from it.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Better not.

**SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR:** Let us drop a curtain over it as well. I would only say that the present policy adopted by our Government as regards solving certain problems by mutual agreement is certainly welcome. I view it from the point of view of non-violence. The policy of the past Government was to divide and rule but the present policy of the Government is to make the parties agree and let them live peacefully. One is non-violent while the other was violent. I, therefore, whole-heartedly accept the policy which our Government has adopted.

Coming to the question of the prosperity of Maharashtra, we are not worried about the future of Maharashtra and Gujarat and I am standing here to seek your blessings and I

am sure you will give those blessings. We are on trial. The whole country is looking up to us as to why these Maharashtrians wanted a separate State. If we do not justify the creation of this State, we will be unjust to ourselves. So, we must evolve a Maharashtra in which there will be economic progress, there will be industrial growth, less unemployment and more prosperity.

Sir, prosperity depends upon two or three things. Prosperity depends upon goodwill, prosperity depends upon co-operation and prosperity depends upon understanding. I hope both the States will prosper with the feeling in their mind that they have created the two States and it is their responsibility to show to the rest of the country that what has been done by the High Command and by the Government is justifiable. If we stand up to that test, the creation of Maharashtra and Gujarat is certainly a welcome thing. I am certain that we will stand that test.

Ultimately, I will conclude with a Sanskrit quotation from the Upanishads:

“ॐ सह नाववन्तु सह नौ भुनक्तु  
सहवीर्यं कर्वावहे  
तेजस्वी नावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहे ।”

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Bill, as it has emerged from the Joint Select Committee, according to me, is not satisfactory. It is rather a disappointing one. The hon. Home Minister has just stated that when we are reorganising the State of Bombay, we should do it with a spirit of goodwill and friendship. I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Home Minister. But for that purpose, friendly and cordial atmosphere is to be created and I am sorry to state that the Joint Select Committee has not created this cordial atmosphere which is very essential. It has been stated that by reorganising Bombay State, the Government has

accepted the principle of linguistic States. But so far as Maharashtra is concerned, what are we getting? It is a mutilated and truncated Maharashtra that is being given to the Marathi speaking people. Vast and large areas are being removed from Maharashtra, from all sides of the borders except in the Western border, namely, in the north, east and the south. You will find that Maharashtra is the only State in India which on all borders is being deprived of its legitimate areas. This is not the Maharashtra for which all the Marathi-speaking people had struggled. This is a maimed Maharashtra, the limbs and legs of which have been cut off from the main body. My friend just now said that when we have got fifteen annas' share, why should we struggle for one anna's share? As my hon. friend from the same Congress benches has pointed out, it is not a question of one anna or fifteen annas' share. It is a question of principle. I want to know, when this territorial adjustment is being made, on what basic and fundamental principle is it made? It is not a question of a few rupees being given to Gujarat, it is not a question of a few acres or a few square miles being given to Gujarat. If it is based on some principle, I can assure this House that the Maharashtrians will never mind giving any amount, any number of areas to Gujarat if it is proved and found to be essential and necessary in the interests of the nation. They will not mind. I can assure this House that Maharashtrians are not parochial and I can also assure that so far as patriotism is concerned, they are second to none in this country and they will do anything and will sacrifice everything for the interests of the nation. Maharashtrians have got in their hearts the interests of the nation. But when we find that large areas are being given away and without any principle, what are we to understand? What is the meaning? What inference are we to draw? The inference is clear that Maharashtra is being done a great injustice. Why should this injustice be done?

So far as the question of Dangs is concerned, it is predominantly a Marathi-speaking area. If we take the census report of 1951, it has been clearly mentioned in the report that the Marathi-speaking population is larger there. Why should not this area be included in Maharashtra? There have been various Commissions and Committees appointed to examine this question. In 1949 Mr. Kher and Mr. Morarji Desai toured this area to enquire whether Dangs should be included in Gujarat or Maharashtra. What was the verdict? The verdict was that it was a Marathi-speaking area and therefore the Government of Bombay issued a communique in May 1949 to declare that Dangs should be included in Maharashtra. What about the other Commissions? As my friend, Shri Pendse mentioned, there was the Bakshi Tek Chand Committee. This Committee was appointed to find out whether Dangs should be included in the Marathi-speaking area or in the Gujarati-speaking area when the question of delimitation of constituencies was considered. What was their opinion? Bakshi Tek Chand is not a Maharashtrian. He is a stranger but even then . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He is not a stranger.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Stranger so far as Maharashtra is concerned. He is an impartial man and an outsider to Maharashtra and Gujarat. He said that Dangs should be included in the Marathi-speaking area. After that the S.R.C. also decided that Dangs should be given to Maharashtra. Apart from that, a Committee was appointed by the A. I. C. C. which included eminent personalities like the hon. Home Minister, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, Shri U. N. Dhebar, and the late Maulana Azad. The Committee consisting of these three eminent personalities had given the verdict that Dangs should be included in Maharashtra and it is strange that when the hon. Home Minister is moving this Bill in this

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]  
House that he should include Dangs in Gujarat. Is justice being done to Maharashtra?

About the Ukai Dam project, they claim not only 50 villages but 150 villages to construct the dam. It is strange if you take into consideration the whole project. It is said that the Ukai dam is a scientific project but in my opinion this scientific project is carried out in a most unscientific manner.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:  
You are more than a scientist.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Yes, I am, so far as the question of this project is concerned and that is my opinion. I will quote what the Chief Minister of Bombay, Shri Chavan, said in the Bombay Assembly. I will quote it for the information of my hon. friend, Shri Deokinandan Narayan. This is what he said:

"What I want to say is that its height has not yet been determined. And the question about how much water Maharashtra should receive is a matter for discussion. We are going to refer it for inquiry to the Engineer."

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:  
These are details.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: He further says:

"We are going to entrust to them on work at fact-finding . . ."

My friend says that it is a matter of detail. The question of distribution of water or the amount of water is not a matter of detail. Until you decide what should be the share of Madhya Pradesh and Bombay, of Maharashtra and Gujarat, how can you start the construction of this project? According to the admission of the Chief Minister of Bombay, the whole project is based on the most unscientific basis. If you want, you can see the map here. They say that they want a 2 mile strip and 100 villages are to be included in Guja-

rat. The nearest village from this Ukai project that they want to be included in Gujarat is about 25 miles away and the farthest is about 80 miles away from the project. Can we imagine that villages which are 80 miles away from the project site should be included in the State of Gujarat? Is this a principle that has been applied when we consider the question of border disputes? Definitely not. This is the most unprincipled adjustment of border areas.

So far as the question of giving financial help to Gujarat is concerned, that is also not based on any principle. Ten crores of rupees have been allotted for the construction of capital. So far as the question of deciding where Gujarat should have its capital is concerned, it is entirely a matter within the jurisdiction of Gujarati people. I do not intend to interfere with that. But I must offer my views on this very important topic. There is already one beautiful and magnificent city and that is Baroda which is in the centre of Gujarat and is connected by fast trains to Bombay and Delhi. Moreover there has been a demand from the citizens of Baroda, irrespective of any caste, creed, religion or language or even party, to have the capital there.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Was that city built by Maharashtrians?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I think it was built by mutual help and goodwill of both the communities.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue at two. The House stands adjourned till two of the clock

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA) in the Chair.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, before the House adjourned for lunch, I was submitting that there are palatial buildings and modern amenities available at Baroda and I learn that the Maharaja of Baroda has agreed to give some of his palaces for being used for office purposes. Therefore, I do not see any harm if the capital of Gujarat is located at Baroda and all this sum of Rs. 10 crores which is proposed to be spent on building a capital should be utilised for development programmes.

So far as the question of deficit is concerned, in my opinion, Sir, this deficit should have been met by the Centre. In my opinion, the question of providing for or meeting the deficit of one State by another State is most unprincipled and unprecedented and so far as Maharashtra is concerned, it is an injustice done to Maharashtra. We do not mind if a sum of a few crores is paid to Gujarat if it is based on some principle and if it is done as a matter of goodwill, as a matter of mutual co-operation, if it is done by mutual compromise with a spirit of mutual assistance and co-operation. But Sir, this controversy becomes more pointed when it is claimed not on the basis of mutual co-operation and goodwill but on the basis of right. Here I would refer to the speech made by Dr. Jivraj Mehta in the Bombay Legislative Council. I am rather grieved to read that speech made by Dr. Jivraj Mehta, particularly as it is the speech of the person who is going to be the Chief Minister of the new State of Gujarat. He claims this money for Gujarat as a matter of right, because Gujarat is now going out of Bombay and Bombay has a surplus revenue. Therefore, he says this should be shared by Maharashtra and also Gujarat. The second reason is given that they are now going out of the city of Bombay which they had all tried to develop and so all the revenue which will be derived from the city of Bombay

should also be shared and a portion given to Gujarat. This, I submit, is a strange claim. If it is a question of mutual assistance, we can understand and give them a few crores. But how it can be claimed as a right, I fail to understand. When we accept the principle of linguistic States, it is but natural that we must accept also all the consequences which naturally flow from that. Therefore when you accept the principle of linguistic States and agree that Bombay must be given to Maharashtra, then naturally it follows that whatever revenue will be derived from the Bombay city must be utilised for the development and benefit of the citizens of Bombay and Maharashtra only. Excuse me, Sir, if I use an analogy to clarify or explain my point of view. Sir, in the year 1947, India achieved freedom from Britain. Would this House consider that England would be justified if she claimed that because the British were going away from India and they would be losing crores and crores of rupees which they used to send back to their mother-country, the Government of India should give a few crores of rupees from her revenues for ten years to England? Would that claim be deemed justifiable? Or would England be justified if she claimed that because she had developed railways, ports and other things in India, because she had helped in India's industrial development and therefore, India should pay crores of rupees every year to England? Will such a claim be justified and will it be proper? Similarly it is difficult to understand this claim made by Gujarat. As I have already stated, if it is considered that being a brotherly State, we should help Gujarat to meet this deficit, that can be understood. (Time bell rings.) Sir, I have taken only fourteen minutes. I will take only two or three minutes more.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA):** Take one minute more and then wind up please.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** So. I say, Sir, this is not proper.

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]  
Sir, next I would like to express my gratitude to the hon. Home Minister for having conceded the demands of the Buddhists and for having accorded to them all the facilities which are being enjoyed by the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. I will only request the hon. Home Minister to see that this policy is implemented throughout the whole country also.

Finally, Sir, as there is not much time, I would conclude by paying my homage to all those martyrs . . .

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ (Bombay):  
Thank Mr. Chavan.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I give my thanks to Bapu Saheb Rajabhoj also. In the end, Sir, I pay my homage to all those martyrs, both of Gujarat and of Maharashtra, who have laid down their lives for this great noble cause, who have valiantly and bravely fought this struggle and sacrificed their lives for upholding and fostering democratic values in this country. Thank you, Sir.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, since the time at my disposal is not much, I would like to refer only to a few points. Sir, from the very first, I have been one of those who have never believed in any kind of linguism. I belong to a State which was bilingual. Then when it became the bilingual Bombay, I whole-heartedly supported Bombay. At the same time, I feel that if pure democratic and administrative conveniences are looked to, then it is not a bad thing to have linguistic States. But there are dangers inherent in the conception of linguistic provinces or States to which I must draw your attention.

Sir, I will take the statement of Mr. Patel which you will find on page 17 of the Select Committee's Report for some comments. There he says:

"Bombay was never built in a day. Gujarat had its large share in building Bombay. Bombay's sur-

plus today is more than Rs. 25 crores a year. For development of Bombay and making it a surplus, large sums had been spent by the Bombay State from revenue expenditure. The large number of Government buildings therein have been constructed from Government revenue."

And then he goes on to submit:

"The Dhar Committee in 1948 also opined that 'In building up this great city, all communities including the British have taken their share, and as a result it has acquired a mixed individuality and is distinctly multilingual and cosmopolitan. Historically, it has never been a part of the Maratha empire.'"

Now, Sir, if I may say so with very great respect, all these remarks are true, as far as they go. It is quite true, for instance, that Bombay has not been built merely by Maharashtrians. It has been built by the Gujaratis. It has been built by the Parsis. It has been built up by the Christians. It has been built up by the Europeans. But from this, does the conclusion follow, namely, that because it has been built by all these communities, it cannot belong to Maharashtra? Sir, if you draw that sort of conclusion, I submit that it will be a very fallacious one. The fact of the matter is that we are not here concerned with sub-nationalities at all.

Maharashtra to my mind is a mere territorial unit. It simply does not belong to Maharashtrians as such. It belongs to every person who lives in Maharashtra or in India. Take, for instance, the question of the Parsis. Now, because the Maharashtrians are in a majority, can it be suggested that Parsi interests will be in danger? If that were the case, I shall be very sorry if Maharashtra is formed. I do not want a Maharashtra of that sort at all. The crux of the problem is this: I was just talking to Shri Dahyabhai Patel, and if he lives in Bombay he has a right to become a Minister in the State of



Maharashtra and not in the State of Gujarat. He has a right to speak on behalf of Maharashtra and not on behalf of Gujarat. That I maintain.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** But nobody has offered to make me a Minister.

**DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:** That is all right. We will do that hereafter.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS):** Give us an opportunity.

**DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:** We must always draw a distinction between a Maharashtrian State and the State of Maharashtra. The State of Maharashtra is not a Maharashtrian State in the sense that it belongs only to the Maharashtrians. In the same way, the State of Gujarat is not a Gujarati State in the sense that it belongs to the Gujaratis only. If I go to the State of Gujarat and live there and be a faithful citizen of that State, I have as much right to take part in the political and other affairs of the State of Gujarat as any other so-called Gujarati.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** And also become a Minister.

**DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:** Well, that will depend upon circumstances.

The other thing that was stated in one of the dissenting minutes was that this particular State should not be called Maharashtra because, according to them, Maharashtra means a big rashtra. That seems to be a very extraordinary argument. From the mere fact that you attach a prefix 'maha' to 'rashtra', it does not follow that the entity to which this prefix is added is more than the rashtra.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** There are some Maharajas who are smaller than Rajas.

**DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:** Exactly. I will give another instance. Take for instance the word pradesh. Just because the prefix 'pra' is attached to the word 'desh' pradesh does not become something bigger than desh.

In the same way, Maharashtra does not become greater than rashtra. This term has become a more technical term and it does not mean that it is greater than rashtra. Marathi is derived from Maharashtra. It is only a species of a linguistic expression, nothing more than that.

**SHRI JASPAT ROY . KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh):** That is, Maha Pandit is not greater than Pandit.

**SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL:** What is the impact of the sentiment? The question of sentiment is there. Bombay State has adopted it and even the Central Government has accepted it.

**SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras):** He is not opposed to that.

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal):** He is accepting that.

**DR. W. S. BARLINGAY:** It simply means that you are bringing together for the sake of political and administrative convenience those people who talk Marathi and who can understand Marathi. If it has got any other implication, then I will have nothing to do with this sort of Maharashtra.

I want to say only one thing with regard to the States' re-organisation. It was suggested by Mr. Santhanam that so far as States' re-organisation was concerned, we must put a stop to that now. I entirely and respectfully agree with him but then it is a very unfortunate thing that so far as the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission are concerned, they have created more problems than they have tried to solve. It will not go into the problem now because it is not proper for me to do so. But even now there are several States which certainly desire to be reorganised. I shall not go into that question because that will only create misunderstanding.

Sir, one word with regard to the division of assets and liabilities. I am in entire agreement with the recommendations of Mr. Bhattacharyya

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]

and Mr. Rangachari; that is, so far as the division of assets and liabilities is concerned, we must, that is to say the State of Bombay must, give to the State of Gujarat a substantial sum to build up its capital. About that there is no question. There is a principle behind this division of assets and liabilities. Formerly these two States had come together in a common State and now it is a case of dissolution of partnership. Therefore, all the assets and liabilities which would fall to the share of both the partners must legitimately go to them. The principle ought to be this: If the State of Gujarat had remained independent right from the very beginning then naturally it would have created some assets for itself and some liabilities. Now, because it became a partner in a larger experiment, it gave away things, which it would have kept to itself, to the State of Bombay. All that now should go back to the State of Gujarat and to that extent I am in complete agreement with the report of Mr. Rangachari but there is one thing which I wish to say with regard to this financial aspect of the whole problem. The way it is put seems to me to be entirely objectionable. The way it is put is that Maharashtra has got to meet the deficit of the other State. If it is to be in that way, it seems to be that there is no justification whatever for that sort of a proposition. There is no justification for the proposition that one State is in deficit and so the other State should contribute to make up that deficit. I do not see that there is any legal or moral justification for that sort of proposition.

**SHRI J. H. JOSHI (Bombay):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, this Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Select Committee marks a very big step in the history of India in the post-independence period.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** It is strange that when we are discussing an important measure like this, the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs is not present in the House.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** And the two other Ministers are gossiping all the time.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** The Minister of Home Affairs is sponsoring this Bill and he should be present in the House.

**SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore):** He is coming just now.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA):** One hon. Minister is here.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs must be here.

**SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS:** I believe that all of us are jointly responsible for any legislation sponsored in the House.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** But they are collectively engaged in gossiping.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA):** Order, order.

**SHRI J. H. JOSHI:** Sir, this Bill is the result of a settlement that has been reached between two great leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat, I mean, Mr. Chavan and Dr. Jivraj Mehta. This Bill has come out of the Joint Select Committee and it has been passed by the Lok Sabha. It is now in the final stage and within two and a half hours we shall be required to put our stamp on it. As soon as it is passed, the wheels of administration of both these separate States will begin to move fast. Sir, at this stage I should pay compliments to our Home Minister whose ability in parliamentary affairs is superb and I should say that he has performed the most painless operation in this connection.

**SHRI N. M. LINGAM:** Vivisection.

**SHRI J. H. JOSHI:** Sir, while we are separating, let us now forget the past, bury the hatchet and start with a new page of cordiality and co-ope-

ration and let us also wish each State peace, happiness and prosperity in all walks of life.

Sir, some points have been raised in the Minutes of Dissent. I wish they had not been raised because this has been stated to be a compromise formula and a compromise cannot satisfy either party to the fullest extent. As has been stated by our Home Minister, an agreed solution is far better than an ideal solution. That way we should accept that this Bill is an embodiment of the agreed solution between the two parties. So I extend my full and wholehearted support to it.

As I stated, some questions have been raised—questions about boundaries and about financial arrangements. I would not touch upon those points but I would merely say a few words about the Ukai project. Let the House, and through this House the people outside, not carry the impression that Gujarat is very rich, that Gujarat has some oil and therefore it does not require to be given financial assistance. I may say that the richness or the prosperity of the State should not be measured by a few chimneys that you find in Ahmedabad or some good parks that you see in Baroda because the chimneys have some smoke and some dust also. It should be measured by the areas in which the administration is to be set up. We have backward areas in Gujarat which had been under the native States for centuries. We have Banaskantha and Sabarkantha; we have Panchmahals and Godhra; we have tracts where lakhs of adivasis live—about 27 lakhs adivasis are there. These are the areas for whose uplift we have to work. I may mention some points about backwardness because backwardness can be measured from the area of the land which is under irrigation. I may cite some extracts from the debates of the Bombay Legislative Assembly:

“Even in the old British regime and pre-Plan period Gujarat was neglected in irrigation. Prior to

1951-52 irrigation works carried out in different regions of old Bombay State have cost in terms of sum at charge Rs. 1.93 crores in Gujarat and Rs. 11.97 crores in Maharashtra.

While in the two plans it was estimated by Shri Jivraj Mehta long back in 1956 that ‘at the end of the first Plan period the total area irrigated would be as under:

$1,25,455 + 1,13,549 = 2,39,004$  Acres in Gujarat.

$7,51,526 + 1,01,416 = 8,52,942$  Acres in Maharashtra.”

Again Dr. Jivraj Mehta stated in 1957 in the Legislature that at the end of the First Plan Maharashtra had 13.5 lakh acres under irrigation compared to 2.8 lakh acres in Gujarat. Therefore speaking about Ukai . . .

**SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL:** On a point of information, is the irrigation potential created with reference to the requirements of the area or is it done on an *ad hoc* basis?

**SHRI J. H. JOSHI:** Sir, I have limited time at my disposal; I have no time to go into these details. I shall just make my point clear. Ukai has its productive as well as its protective value. It is a flood control scheme. The House and the people know what loss of life and what damage to property was suffered by the people of Surat and the adjoining areas on account of the floods last year.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** It is true of the upstream areas also.

**SHRI J. H. JOSHI:** That can be checked only if such schemes like the Ukai for the control of floods are set up. Sir, I was going to say that loss of property to the tune of Rs. 17 crores has been caused to Surat and the adjoining areas on account of the floods.

Then, coming to financial arrangements, it has been stated that Rs. 10 crores is proposed to be given to Gujarat for setting up the capital. I should say that this has to come

[Shri J. H. Joshi.]

out of the common surplus, revenue surplus of the composite Bombay State. Now, if the share of Gujarat were to be taken out, one-third share, then what the new State of Maharashtra has to give to Gujarat is about Rs. 6,66,00,000/-. This is what I have to say. Thank you.

**श्री पा० ना० राजभोज :** उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत तथा समर्थन करता हूँ। अब महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात अलग अलग राज्य बन जाने से दोनों में रहने वाले भाई प्रेम के साथ रहने लगेंगे, इस बात को सोच कर हमें संतोष होता है कि हमें इस बात का हर्ष होता है कि तीन साल के बाद बम्बई राज्य की पुनर्रचना का प्रश्न एक बार अंतिम रूप में हमारे सामने आ रहा है और दो राज्य महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात निमित्त हो रहे हैं। इसका पूर्व इतिहास हम सब जानते हैं और उस पर अब अधिक समय व्यर्थ करना ठीक नहीं होगा। किन्तु मैं यह जरूर कहूँगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में भाषावार प्रान्त रचना का प्रश्न सब से कठिन था और उस में भी बम्बई और महाराष्ट्र का जो सवाल था वह बहुत ही कॉम्प्लिकेटेड था। सब लोग जानते हैं कि दूसरे प्रान्तों का सवाल तो आसानी से तय हो गया लेकिन जहाँ तक बम्बई राज्य का सवाल था वह हल होना बड़ा मुश्किल मालूम हो रहा था। आप जानते हैं कि इसका मुख्य कारण बम्बई शहर था। इस बम्बई शहर का फैसला किस तरह से किया जाय यह प्रश्न अब तक जितनी भी समितियों के विचाराधीन रहा वह तो था ही लेकिन महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात की आम जनता के सामने मुख्य रूप से था। इसका कारण केवल यह नहीं है कि बम्बई शहर में २७ करोड़ रुपये का सरप्लस मिलेगा किन्तु यह कारण भी है कि इस प्रदेश के रहने वाले लोगों का बम्बई शहर एक आशा आकांक्षा, आर्थिक और औद्योगिक प्रगति का केन्द्र बिन्दु है जैसा वह सारे भारत का मान बिन्दु है। गुजराती लोग मानते थे कि बम्बई को बनाने में उनका बड़ा हाथ

रहा है किन्तु महाराष्ट्रीय जनता मानती थी कि बम्बई शहर में मराठी बोलने वाले लोगों की आबादी ज्यादा है और आर्थिक, सांस्कृतिक और भौगोलिक दृष्टि से बम्बई शहर पर महाराष्ट्रीय लोगों का ही ज्यादा अधिकार है।

यह सवाल जब बहुत जटिल हो गया तो हमारे देश के नेताओं ने यह सोचा कि अगर बम्बई राज्य को द्विभाषिक राज्य बनाया जाय तो उस से दोनों जमातों को संतोष मिल सकेगा तथा यह शहर का सवाल उपस्थित न होगा। लेकिन इस अर्रेंजमेंट से दोनों जमातों में संतोष या समाधान निर्माण नहीं हुआ और तीन वर्ष द्विभाषिक राज्य का प्रयोग करने के बाद कांग्रेस हाई कमांड को फिर से इस प्रश्न के बारे में सोचना पड़ा। मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि भाषावार प्रान्त रचना को शुरू से ही कांग्रेस ने बहुत महत्व का स्थान दिया और उन लोगों की ही कोशिशों के कारण हमारे देश में भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना हुई और इसका श्रेय उन को देना ही पड़ेगा। मेरा खयाल है कि इस सवाल को तय करने में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी. हमारे होम मिनिस्टर पंडित गोविन्द वल्लभ पंत और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम किया है। उन्होंने हम दोनों के बीच समझौता करा के और आपसी विचार विमर्श में इस प्रश्न का समाधान ढूँढ निकाला। यहाँ इसी प्रसंग में हमारे बम्बई प्रान्त के जो मुख्य मंत्री हैं श्री यशवंत राव चव्हाण और डा० जीवराज मेहता, इन दोनों का नाम विशेष उल्लेखनीय है। मैं भी इस मौके पर उनको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। साथ ही साथ जो नौ व्यक्तियों की समिति बनी उस ने भी इस संबंध में काम जरूर किया है लेकिन जब तक हमारे नेताओं का सहयोग और सद्भाव नहीं मिलता तब तक यह महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात राज्यों की पुनर्रचना होना मुश्किल होता। कुछ बुराइयाँ भी आ गईं और उन बुराइयों को दूर करने के लिये हमारे नेताओं ने काफी

परिश्रम किया और उसी का नतीजा है कि आज हमें इस बिल के द्वारा अच्छी-अच्छी बातें नजर आ रही हैं और इस प्रकार अब यह वर्तमान संयुक्त बम्बई राज्य दो भाषिक राज्यों में बंटने जा रहा है यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है ।

इस लिये इस अवसर पर हमारा यह कर्तव्य है कि जिन जिन लोगों ने इस समस्या को सुलझाने में रचनात्मक कार्य किया है उनको धन्यवाद दें । क्योंकि उन्होंने जो सहिष्णुता, सहकार्य और समझदारी की वृत्ति और भावना से इस प्रश्न को हल करने का काम किया है । उन्होंने पार्लियामेंट का द्विभाषिक राज्य समाधानपूर्वक चलाया लेकिन जब उनको यह मालूम हुआ कि इस द्विभाषिक राज्य से भावनात्मक एकीकरण नहीं हो रहा है, तब मध्यवर्ती सरकार को उन्होंने यह राज्य विभक्त कर देने की राय दी । हमारे गृह मंत्री पं० पंत जी ने भी जो कि कठिन समस्याओं का हल करने में निपुण हैं इस पर पुनर्विचार करने की सौची । उनको भी इस अवसर पर बधाई देना मैं अपना कर्तव्य मानता हूँ । नेहरू रिपोर्ट में भी यह कहा गया था कि :

"What principle should govern this redistribution? Partly geographical and partly economic and financial, but the main consideration must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned."

जो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यह बिल एक रूप से देखा जाय, अलग अलग रूप से नहीं । और यदि इस को एक रूप से देखा गया तो यह मालूम होगा कि इस में जो कुछ तर-तूदियाँ की गई हैं । उससे हम लोग बहुमत से सहमत हों और इसलिये उसको स्वीकार करके हमें संतोष करना चाहिये । इस सिलसिले में साईमन कमिशन ने जो लिखा है वह मुझे याद आता है । इस वक्त मेरे पास बोलने का समय नहीं

है नहीं तो मैं आपको बताता । मुझे और भी कुछ थोड़ी सी बातें कहनी हैं इसीलिये मैं संक्षेप में चार, पाँच पौइंट आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ ।

यह बात सच है कि कुछ बातें ऐसी हैं जिन पर नाराजी व्यक्त की जा रही है । एक तो फाइनेंशियल प्राविजन्स हैं जिनके अनुसार महाराष्ट्र को दस वर्ष में ४५ करोड़ रुपया गुजरात को देने पड़ेंगे । इस बारे में मेरा यह निवेदन है कि अभी उसको स्वीकृत किया जाय । लेकिन दो वर्ष के बाद यानी १९६२ में जो फाइनेन्स कमिशन नियुक्त किया जायेगा उसके टर्म्स आफ रिफ्रेंस में इस प्रश्न का समावेश किया जाय । उस वक्त इस प्रश्न की खोज होनी चाहिये कि इतना पैसा गुजरात को देना जरूरी है या नहीं ।

दूसरी नाराजी की बात यह है कि डांग, डेंबरगांव तथा पश्चिम खानदेश का कई भाग गुजरात में जाने वाला है । उसके बारे में मुख्य शिकायत यह है कि यह गांव मराठी बोलने वाले लोगों के हैं और उनका समावेश सांस्कृतिक, भौगोलिक और ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से महाराष्ट्र में होना चाहिये । यह बात सच है कि इस पर मतभेद है । परन्तु यह मतभेद तभी नष्ट हो सकता है जब आप एक विशिष्ट नीति के अनुसार इस प्रदेश का एक या दूसरे राज्य में समावेश करेंगे । और वह नीति है पाटस्कर फार्मूला की सिफारिशें । आन्ध्र प्रदेश और मद्रास के बीच में जो झगड़ा चल रहा था उसका हल श्री पाटस्कर ने जो पांच तत्व सुझाये उनका अवलम्बन करके हुआ है । मेरा भी निवेदन है कि आज जो बांडर डिस्पूट है बेलगांव, कारवार और निपाणी के बारे में तथा डांग, डेंबरगांव के बारे में, वह झगड़ा दोनों पक्षों के समाधान से हल हो और ऐसी नीति से यदि हल करना है तो पाटस्कर फार्मूला एप्लाइ करना होगा । जब दोनों

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

पक्ष यह फार्मूला मानने को तैयार है तो इसका अवलम्बन करने में कोई हर्ज नहीं है ।

तीसरी बात है विदर्भ की । भाषावार राज्य पुनर्गठन समिति ने स्वतंत्र विदर्भ की, जो आठ जिलों—बुलडाणा, अकोला, अमरावती, यवतमाल, वर्धा, नागपुर, भंडारा और चांदा से बनता है, सिफारिश की थी किन्तु मध्यवर्ती सरकार को और इस पालियामेंट को यह आवश्यक लगी नहीं । और वही ठीक है । कारण, यह विदर्भ का आन्दोलन जो १९०५ में शुरू हुआ, उसका उद्देश्य महाराष्ट्र से अलग रहने का नहीं था किन्तु उस वक्त जो मध्य प्रदेश राज्य था उस हिन्दी राज्य से अलग रहने का था । जब नागपुर पैक्ट में जो एश्योरेंस दिये गये हैं उसका बिल में समावेश किया गया है तब मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसको स्वीकृति दी जाय । हमारे मुख्य मंत्री श्री चव्हाण साहब ने भी अपनी पालिसी स्टेटमेंट में विदर्भ और मराठवाड़ा को उन्नति के लिये प्रयत्न किये जायेंगे ऐसा निवेदन किया है । संविधान की दफा ३७१ में भी विदर्भ के लिये स्पेशल डेवलपमेंट बोर्ड नियुक्त करने की तरतूद है । तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस आश्वासन के अनुसार यह आन्दोलन रुकना चाहिये । आज सत्याग्रह हो रहा है, जंगल जला दिये गये हैं और ला एंड आर्डर सिचुएशन बिगाड़ने का प्रयत्न हो रहा है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह रोका जाय और विधायक कार्य में हम अपनी शक्ति खर्च करें ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि बम्बई शहर की माइनारिटीज को भी आश्वासन मिले हैं । किन्तु खेद है कि अब जो असली माइनारिटी है महाराष्ट्र में वह शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट लोगों की है । चव्हाण साहब ने जो आश्वासन दिया है वह हमारी जो किताब है उसमें लिखा हुआ है । खोबरागड़े साहब भी इस संबंध में बोले हैं । मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि चव्हाण साहब ने जो पालिसी स्टेटमेंट

दिया है, उस पर भी अनल होना चाहिये । चव्हाण साहब का भाषण मराठी में है जो इस प्रकार है :

“दूसरा एक प्रश्न ज्याचा उल्लेख येथे करून नये असें माझ्या भाषणाच्या सुरुवातीस मला वाटलें होतें कारण या विभाजन बिलाच्या वेळीं तें बोलणें कितपत रिलेव्हंट होईल अशी मला शंका होती आणि म्हणून मी बोललों नव्हतां । हा प्रश्न नवबौद्धांसंबंधी च आहे । ह्या प्रश्नासंबंधी माझ्या बयाच । सन्माननीय सभासद मित्रांनीं उल्लेख केला आहे । त्याबाबत मी या सन्माननीय सभागृहाला जारीहणें असें सांगू इच्छितों कीं नवबौद्धांचा प्रश्न हा नव्या महाराष्ट्रामध्ये समाज जीवनाचा एक अतिशय नाजूक प्रश्न आहे आणि तो प्रश्न जिव्हालयानें, समझोत्यानें आणि समाज जीवनामध्ये एकजिनसीपणा येईल या दृष्टीनें सोडविला पाहिजे असें घोरण आम्ही स्वीकारलें आहे । तसा तो सोडविला जाईल असा मला विश्वास आहे । त्या दृष्टीनें नवबौद्धांच्या मागणीसंबंधी सवलतीसंबंधी पुनर्विभाजनानंतर तांतडीनें विचार करावयाचें ठरविष असून न्यालेंय पद्धती नें तो सोडविण्याचा विचार केला आहे । विशेषतः संयुक्त या महाराष्ट्र परिषदेनें या बाबतीत जो खलिता पाठविला होता त्या खलित्याच्या १४ व्या परिग्राफमध्ये ज्या भावना व्यक्त केल्या होत्या त्या भावना माझ्या विचाराच्य प्रातिनिधिक आहेत अशी चर्चा मी समितीच्या मंडलीशी आणि रिपब्लिकन पक्षाच्या मंडलीशीं केली होती । ती भावना खरी आहे असें मी आजूबून सांगू इच्छितों । मी माझ्या विचाराचें प्रदर्शन एवढयासाठीं करतों कीं जर चुकून रिपब्लिकन पक्षाच्या आणि नवबौद्धांच्या नेत्यांच्या मनांत शंका असेल तर त्यांनी ती काढून ठाकावी मी असें म्हणने कीं संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र

ज्ञाला पाहिजे या त्यांच्या भावना अन्कंडिशनल होत्या आणि तो ज्ञात्यानंतर त्यांनी आपल्या हक्कांचे रक्षण करण्यासाठी प्रयत्न केला पाहिजे। तो करीत असतांना कंडिशनस घालावयाच्या अशी भूमिका त्यांनी घेऊं नये अशी मी नवबौद्ध कार्यकर्त्यांना विनंति करीन।”

चव्हाण साहब ने और भी कहा है :

“त्या त्या गोष्टीचा पुनरुच्चार करूं नये अशी माझी इच्छा होती पण एका सन्माननीय सभासदांनी प्रश्न उपस्थित केला म्हणून मला बोलावें लागतें। सन्माननीय सभासद श्री शिर्के हे बोलतांना असें म्हणाले कीं मराठी भाषिक राज्य होणार कीं कराठा राज्य होणार याची मीति वाटते। अशा प्रकारें बोलून ते स्वतः वर आणि मराठा समाजावर न्याय करीत आहेत। मी असें सांगू इच्छितों कीं तसें होणार नाही आणि आम्हीं तसें होऊं देणार नाहीं या गोष्टीचा पुनरुच्चार मी टालीत होतों पण मी जर बोललों नाही तर बाहेर बोलतों आणि येथें बोलत नाहीं असें म्हटलें जाण्याचा संभव आहे। हया प्रश्नासंबंधी सर्वसाधारण भूमिका मी सभागृहापुढें ठेवली आहे। मला एक विनंति करावयाची आहे ती ही कीं, मराठावाडा, विदर्भ आणि महाराष्ट्र यांच्यामध्ये ऐक्यभावना निर्माण झाली पाहिजे।”

इसी लिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि चव्हाण साहब ने नवबौद्धों के संबंध में जो अपनी राय दी है, उस राय पर होम मिनिस्टर साहब सहानुभूतिपूर्वक विचार करें। नवबौद्धों की समस्या सामाजिक, राजनैतिक, आर्थिक और सभी दृष्टियों से हल होनी चाहिये, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है। चव्हाण साहब ने अपने पालिसी स्टेटमेंट में मराठावाडा, विदर्भ तथा बम्बई के अल्पसंख्यकों को विश्वास में लिया है।

किन्तु शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट और नवबौद्धों के लिये कुछ नहीं कहा है। इसलिये मैं आपका ध्यान इस और खींचना चाहता हूँ। हमारे देश में जो वीकर सेक्शन है उसको संविधान में कुछ हक प्राप्त हैं और उनका जतन करना सब का काम है। संविधान के आर्टिकल ४६ में कहा है इसलिये मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि वहाँ जो वीकर सेक्शन है उसका हर प्रकार से हितसंरक्षण होना चाहिये और सामाजिक, आर्थिक, राजनैतिक और हर प्रकार से उनको ऊपर उठाना चाहिये।

(Time bell rings)

मैं आपकी आज्ञा से एक श्लोक पढ़ना चाहता हूँ :

“सर्वे अत्र सुखिनः संतु.  
सर्वे संतु निरामयाः  
सर्वे भद्राणि पश्यन्तु,  
न कश्चित् दुःखमाप्नुयात्।”

अर्थात् जग में सब लोग सुखी हों, सब को स्वास्थ्य प्राप्त हो, सब का कल्याण हो, किसी को दुख प्राप्त न हो। भगवान बुद्ध ने भी इसी की कामना की थी—‘सब्बे सत्ता सुखी होन्तु, सब्बे होन्तुच खेमिनो। सब्बे भद्राणि पस्सन्तु। मा किच्चि दुखमा गमा।’ तो मैं अपने भाइयों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम महाराष्ट्रीय और गुजराती भाई भाई बन कर देश का भला करें। हमें यह समझना चाहिये कि देश के हित में हमारा हित है और जब तक हम इस दृष्टिकोण से काम नहीं करेंगे तब तक न हमारा भला होगा और न देश का भला होगा। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: Sir, I welcome this Bill before the House. I congratulate the Chief Minister of Bombay as also the prospective chief of the new State of Gujarat for the hard work that they have put in and also for the spirit of compromise which they have shown. I must also express our thanks to the hon. Home Minister for extending his good offices in arriving at the compromise formula on the financial settlement.

[Shri Suresh J. Desai.]

Sir, I will not go into the details of how the bigger bilingual State of Bombay came into being. From the moment the bigger State came into being and the movement for the unilingual States was launched I was in the thick and thin of the movement. I was in Bombay when the events took a violent turn and gradually degenerated into attacks on lives and property. I was also in Ahmedabad the year before last when there was a violent outburst of emotion and there were arson and looting. Happily all this has ended. Throughout these three or four years when I was moving in Bombay, Maharashtra and Gujarat, I saw and read anguish in the eyes of the people and anxiety in their heart. All this has ended, Sir, and we must congratulate the Government also for so expeditiously dealing with this important measure.

At this juncture I do not think it is proper form to talk about the injustice done to Gujarat. I would not have done so, but some amendments are being moved and some questions have been raised, and so I think it is my duty—and I do not want to fail in my duty to Gujarat—to put in a few observations.

Sir, my work has been made easier by the learned Minute of Dissent, my hon. friend, Shri P. R. Patel, has appended to the Joint Committee's Report. First I will take up the question of the border issue—the question of Dangs to which my hon. friend Mr. Pendse, referred.

Sir, I happen to come from the district of Surat to which Dangs have always been attached. From my childhood I learned in geography that Dangs formed part of the Surat Agency. Even historically speaking, over centuries past, they had always formed part of the Rajput Kingdoms and Mohammedan Sultanate of Gujarat. Up till about ten years ago Dangs were always attached to the Surat district. About ten years back there was a deliberate attempt by which the various offices were taken

from Dangs to distant places like Dhulia, and only the offices of law and order and police were kept in Surat. The 1941 Census Report showed that Bhils were 36,260 in number, and the Maharashtrians were only 630.

SHRI D. B. DESAI (Bombay): What was the number of Gujaratis in 1941?

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I have not got the figure now, but I may be able to tell you.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: It may not suit you. It does not matter.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: In 1941 the Bhils were 36,260 and the Maharashtrians were 630. In 1951 the Bhils were zero and the Maharashtrians were 45,017. Now 96 per cent. of these people of Dangs are Bhils, and they speak the Dangi language. Most of the Bhils speak—why most, all of them speak—the Dangi language. Now I must tell you exactly what the Dangi language is. About that I will give a quotation; there are a number of quotations, but I will give only one from the Bombay Government records, New Series, Vol. XXXVI, which mentions about that language. It is said that the language is a mixture of Gujarati and Hindustani. About Dangi, Wasoorna and Amellee, they again mention that the language is a mixture of Gujarati and Hindustani. I can quote any number of other quotations but I do not want to take the time of the House. But I must mention certain other significant things about Dangs. The economic life of Dangs, the social life of Dangs, transport and communication, all of them are connected with Gujarat. Dangs teak wood is sold in Billimora, Bansda and other markets of Gujarat. Even the forest receipts are prepared in Gujarat.

The social life of the Dang people is mostly related to the people of Dharampur and Bansda. Even from the chief town of Ahwa there are only two main pucca roads; one is connected with Billimora, and the



other is connected with Songadh. I myself have been several times in the region. So, taking all these things into account—communications, transport, economic life and social life—in every way Dangs are connected with Gujarat.

I need not give the figures about the 1956 Assembly elections or recent elections to the Local Board. My hon. friend, Shri Deokinandan Narayan has already quoted the figures. All these clearly show that Dangs have always formed part of Gujarat and that Dangs clearly belong to Gujarat and they have been rightly placed in Gujarat in the Bill.

As far as the Umbergaon Taluk is concerned, according to the 1941 census, the Gujaratis were 52 per cent., the Warlis were 41 per cent. and the Maharashtrians were only 4 per cent. According to the 1951 census, the Gujaratis were 49 per cent., the Warlis evaporated and the percentage of the Maharashtrians went up from 4 per cent. to 49.8 per cent., that is, 56,684. Therefore, what I would point out to my hon. friends, particularly to Shri Pendse and Shri Deogirikar, is this. The big population of Warlis and the Bhils there cannot evaporate unless there is some manipulation in the census enumeration. I am not casting any reflection upon the Census authorities. But there must be some manipulation in the census report, by which the Maharashtrians increased from 4 per cent. in 1941 to 49.8 per cent. in 1951. The total number of pupils attending primary schools in the Taluka is about 10,000. Of these 7,000 pupils attend Gujarati schools. Of the pupils attending secondary schools, 85 per cent. receive their education in Gujarati.

The reserved seat of the Bombay Legislative Assembly is held by Shri Thakaria and he recently stated before the 9-man Committee that Dawar Warlis spoke, for all practical purposes, Gujarati and that their children received their education

through Gujarati. Even historically speaking, the Parasees, who came to Sanjan in the Umbergaon Taluka hundreds of years ago, speak Gujarati. The Mohammedans, popularly known as Taidas, who settled in this Taluka as far back as the 12th century also speak Gujarati.

Sir, now I will mention about Navapur Taluk. The Maharashtrian population there has always been about 25 per cent. or so. The population of the Bhils is 3,20,980, while the Maharashtrian population is 1,38,869. As far as the Bhil language is concerned, I will quote from Dr. Grierson, and Dr. Grierson has been quoted by Dr. Kulkarni who submitted a report to the Samyuktha Maharashtra Parishad. Dr. Kulkarni says—

“Dr. Grierson, a linguist, was appointed to undertake the linguistic survey. The work done by this officer reveals that he carried out the duties efficiently. This linguist critically analysed the differences between the dialects of Marathi. The dialect spoken in West and East Khandesh, North Nasik, southern part of the basin of Tapti, etc., particularly the dialect spoken by illiterate villages of these areas, contains many elements of Gujarati. Dr. Grierson, therefore, came to the conclusion that the particular dialect was a specie of Gujarati and not Marathi; and he included them in his volume not under Marathi but under Gujarati. This dialect is known as *Ahirani*. People speaking this dialect have been enumerated as Gujaratis. The census of 1911, 1921 and 1931 counted the *Ahirani* speaking people as Gujaratis.”

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** Give the initials of this Kulkarni so that his identity is known. This Kulkarni is not the philologist.

**SHRI SURESH J. DESAI:** If you want, I will produce the volume.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** You give the initials.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: If you have not read that volume . . .

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I want initials because there are two Kulkarnis; one is the philologist and the other posing as a philologist.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I know it.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Will you give the initials?

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I shall give you the whole volume and you can read it to your heart's content.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: You are having . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): Please let the hon. Member continue.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I only wanted the initials of the gentleman whom he has misquoted, because it is not convenient to him.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: After all, the initials will not change the contents of the book. They are before you to read.

Sir, I will quote from the Census Report of 1901, which is a very significant report. It says—

"The Bhili dialect appears under many names, but they are all, with Khandeshi (Ahirani) and its connected dialects, essentially the same form of speech, which may be described as Eastern Gujarati."

Then there are the words of Sir George Grierson in the Imperial Gazette—

"The Bhils and the inhabitants of Khandesh speak mixed forms of speech which are dialects of Gujarati."

There are many more quotations which I can give. But I do not want to take the time of the House. I would only say that in West Khandesh the Maharashtrians are not more than 25

per cent. According to the 1941 census, the total population of West Khandesh was 9,12,214. According to the 1951 census, the total population of West Khandesh was 11,46,024. The Marathi-speaking population was 2,33,400 in 1941 and 6,72,479 in 1951. While the total population of the whole district increased between 1941 and 1951 by only 2,33,810, while the Marathi-speaking population increased by 4,39,097. This is a clear instance of how the census report of the Region has been manipulated. Even according to the 1951 census, the population of Navapur town was 8,988 out of which 59 per cent. were Gujaratis, 21 per cent. Bhils and only 20 per cent. Marathis. But still Navapur station is in Gujarat and Navapur town itself has gone to Maharashtra because it is outside the two-mile belt. While Taloda town is within the 2-mile belt, it is still kept out of Gujarat. These are things which are unfair to Gujarat.

Sir, I shall now refer to the financial settlement. My hon. friend, Shri Joshi, has given all the figures about irrigation and roads. So, I need not go into the details about them. I only want to point out that generally Gujarat is considered to be a very rich region. But it is not so. Only five districts of Gujarat—Surat, Broach, Baroda, Khaira and Ahmedabad—are rich and well-to-do. There are any number of districts in Gujarat which are very backward. For example, Sabarkantha, Banaskantha and Kutch are as backward as any other backward part of the country. So, we have our problems.

Shri Joshi referred to the large number of Adivasis also. We have 27 lakhs of Adivasis. If we want to smoothen the surface of their life, we have to spend a lot of money and the new State will have to find this money from its own funds. We have been put to a loss of two to three crores of rupees by not including the Amortisation Fund and the Road Fund in the deficit. There is also an amendment about the money for the

construction of the Capital. The Wanchoo Committee gave to Andhra about Rs. 2 to Rs. 3 crores from the residual Madras State. Gujarat has been given Rs. 10 crores for the purpose of the new Capital City. But out of this sum which is to be taken from the funds of the present composite Bombay State, a sum of Rs. 3 crores already belongs to Gujarat. It is not actually Rs. 10 crores which are being given to Gujarat by Maharashtra. A sum of Rs. 3 crores already belongs to Gujarat and only Rs. 7 crores are being given actually by Maharashtra.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** The amount given to Andhra for the establishment of a Capital City was given by the Central Government.

**SHRI SURESH J. DESAI:** It was not so. A sum of Rs. 2 to Rs. 3 crores was to be given by the residual Madras State. I am quoting the Wanchoo Committee's Report. It said that about Rs. 2 to 3 crores were to be given by the Madras State to Andhra which was being carved out from the composite State of Madras. Here a sum of Rs. 3 crores already belongs to Gujarat.

**SHRI D. B. DESAI:** That is a question of assets, not of giving any grants.

**SHRI SURESH J. DESAI:** I have one more point and it is this. Prof. Wadia mentioned about the S.N.D.T. University. I am not going to suggest anything detrimental to the interests of my friends from Maharashtra. What I say is, when this University was started by Dr. Karve, he wanted it to be a national university. He did not want it to be only for Maharashtra or Gujarati or Bombay women. He wanted it to be a national university for Indian women. It is doing very good work and it would be a nice thing if the Centre takes over that University and makes it a Central University. The dream of Dr. Karve will be fulfilled. Not only the people of Gujarat or of Maharashtra but all the people of the country will feel glad about this and it

will be a matter of pride to the new State of Maharashtra to have this big Central University for women. Financially it will be a lesser burden on the new State of Maharashtra.

3 P.M.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I do not know, Sir, whether that can be incorporated in the present Bill or not, but if the hon. the Home Minister can impress upon the Government the necessity of bringing fresh legislation for that purpose, I hope it will be very useful.

So this is the case for Gujarat. An injustice has been done to Gujarat—I should say a rather grave injustice has been done to Gujarat, but we in Gujarat are not going to nurture this injustice. We are going to devote our energies to the building up of the new State of Gujarat. We are not going to dissipate our energies in kicking up border disputes and taking out morchas. We want to build up the new State of Gujarat. I reciprocate fully the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend, Mr. Deogirikar, and I would suggest: Let us both, Maharashtrians and Gujaratis, build up and develop the two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. After all this is a compromise and a compromise, in its very essence, cannot satisfy completely both the parties. If this compromise had not come about, a settlement would have been extremely difficult and both Gujarat and Maharashtra would have found themselves in one of the *cul-de-sacs* of history from which there would have been no escape except through a tragedy. Sir, I wish all prosperity and success to the new State of Maharashtra as I wish all prosperity and success to my State of Gujarat and I wish both Maharashtra and Gujarat would be prosperous parts of a prosperous mother land.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr. J. K. Modi.

**SHRI SATYACHARAN** (Uttar Pradesh): Before the hon. Member rises

[Shri Satyacharan.]

to speak I would respectfully submit that we who are neither Gujaratis nor Maharashtrians nor are intimately conversant with the topography of these two States find it very difficult to understand why the Warli-speaking areas, in spite of the fact that the Warli dialect has linguistic affinity with Gujarati, have not been ceded to Gujarat. So I would like to suggest that any of our hon. Members may shed light on it, and if not, then I would request the hon. Minister to bear it in his mind while winding up the debate, and explain.

SHRI J. K. MODI (Bombay): Sir, I welcome this Bill as it has emerged out of the Select Committee. I do not concede that it is the outcome of some sufferings or some sacrifices by the other party, as mentioned in the House, but it is the outcome of a compromise formula, and when it is a compromise, as was just now said in the House by some of the Members the principle of give and take is always there and border adjustments have necessarily to be made in that spirit of give and take, and I cannot understand when they say that a great injustice is done to Maharashtra. If so, I would like to ask the question, Sir, whether their leader, Mr. Chavan, when he was there as the Chief Minister of Bombay, committed this injustice being himself a Maharashtrian. As a matter of fact, when he is there, and when on the other side Dr. Jivraj Mehta is there and both have agreed, then it must be presumed that there is no question of injustice. The particular district of Dangs given to Gujarat really belonged to Gujarat. Similarly some villages of Umbergaon taluk and some villages of Nawapur taluk also belonged to Gujarat and they were rightly given. Where is the question of injustice? The case is rather otherwise. Some of the villages are Gujarati-speaking and yet they are kept back in Maharashtra. The point is that when there is a compromise then we have to respect it. Therefore what I submit is this. When this compromise formula is there, there is

no question of any injustice being done to any party and the House also must not feel that injustice is done to Maharashtra. When I heard my friend Deogirikar say that injustice is done to Maharashtra, I felt really very sorry that such words came, of all persons, from his mouth. As a matter of fact, if you want that discussion should still take place, that all the cards should be placed on the Table, if you want to discuss them, certainly we are prepared to discuss for days together and convince that really this is not the case, that no question of injustice arises. It is all now past history and we need not go into this thing at this stage. About other things, about the Adivasis, about the area inhabited by the Adivasis my friend, Mr. Desai, has very clearly, quoting facts and figures, explained that the Advasi area does not belong to Maharashtra. Unfortunately Adivasis have been included in the Marathi-speaking head in the census of 1951. How it was put in the Marathi-speaking head, I do not know. But something must have been done at the time of census to see that Adivasi are not included in the Gujarati speaking head. Adivasis are not Marathi-speaking and there are documents as are referred to in his dissenting note by Mr. Patel very clearly. Mr. Kulkarni and some other gentlemen have said that the Adivasi dialect is akin to Gujarati, that for all practical purposes they are Gujarati-speaking people. Taking all these facts into consideration Shri Chavan and Dr. Jivraj Mehta rightly agreed that Dangs should go to Gujarat and it was rightly done. As to Ukai Project, Sir, objection has been taken, I do not know why when Rs. 66 crores are to be spent over this project, objection after objections have been taken from the very beginning, and up till now practically no beginning has been made for the construction of the Ukai Dam. After all, when the Ukai Dam will be constructed, Sir, it will irrigate lakhs of acres of land. It will also give us a great bulk of electric power. It will benefit a part of India

which will be good to the whole of India and I do not see why objection is taken to it. My friend, Shri Deogirikar, also referred to the Dar Commission and said that by creating unilingual States no sub-nationality will arise. But we see it from the speeches here, from the speeches in the other House, from the objections taken here that the position of sub-nationality which was feared in the Dar Commission Report is coming up here also and on one ground or the other the Ukai Dam has been objected to knowing full well that it will benefit a vast part of India. As a matter of fact, because according to the objectors, some villages in the Marathi-speaking areas will be submerged, therefore it is objected to. If they were not Marathi-speaking areas, they will not object to it. But it is not a fact that all the villages that may be submerged will be Marathi-speaking areas. There are some villages that are Gujarati-speaking. Also, as you know, Sir, whenever any big Dam is constructed, some villages are bound to be submerged, and here is a case where some villages in the Marathi-speaking areas and Gujarati-speaking areas will be submerged. For the construction of the Dam some 5,400 square miles of the area will be catchment area and some villages are bound to be submerged. Therefore there should be no objection theoretically. Practically, it will benefit a vast part of India. Some parts of Gujarat are affected and some parts of Maharashtra are affected, and why there should be objection? I see the objection is due to the poison of sub-nationality, of parochialism and of provincialism that has taken hold of some people. Again, objection is taken about the sharing of water. I regret that objection should be taken at this stage. It is funny to hear these things. On the one side it is said that the lower area will be flooded if the Ukai Dam were constructed. On the other side it is said that it will remain empty. These are conflicting statements made by the objectors themselves. I wonder how the Central Water and

Power Commission would have supported such a big project if it were not for the fact that the Dam would not remain empty. Also it is not a true statement to make that there will be no water in the reservoir and that the construction of the Ukai Dam will not be useful. I say, Sir, that the Ukai Project will benefit not only Gujarat, not only Maharashtra but India as a whole.

Sir, something has been said about the sharing of waters. I think at this stage this question should not be gone into in any detail. But I say that sharing of water also will be done taking into consideration the capacity of the dam to irrigate the lower part of this area. It has been calculated that something like 11 lakh acres of land will be irrigated by this dam on the Gujarat side while 17 lakh acres of land will be irrigated on the Maharashtra side. But that distribution will be done at a later stage when the dam is completed. What I mean to say is that my Maharashtra friends should not have objected to the construction of this dam itself which will benefit India. But as we know, Sir, even when the foundation-stone laying ceremony was being performed, a 'morchā' was organised against this construction. It was not a very healthy move on their part.

About financial adjustments, it was said that Bombay should not be burdened with it and my friend gave the example of England. Well, Sir, England spent so many crores of rupees in India only at the cost of India. This Bombay City was developed at the cost of Bombay people. It were the people of Bombay who paid this money. Therefore the example of England is not relevant here.

About other agreements, I need not go into details. I only say that this question of compromise was based on the principle of give and take. This principle of agreement is a much greater principle than any other principle. The agreement must be

[Shri J. K. Modi.]

accepted and I wish that this House passes this Bill unanimously.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is my unpleasant duty today to lend support to this measure against my better judgment. I think, it will do no good to any one of the parties who seem to be jubilant today. May, I think, Sir, it is fraught with dangerous consequences and I am afraid we may have to regret the wrong step that we are taking today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then why do you support it?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: My hon. friend asks me why do I support it. I have already said that I am supporting it against my better judgment. To me the occasion is not one for feeling jubilant at the birth of two States. It is an occasion for mourning over the death or, shall I say, the murder of the beautiful, well-administered and dynamic State of the United State of Bombay and Maharashtra. In the otherwise dark horizon of linguism in the country, this one State was there to serve as a bright star to guide the other States and other parts of the country, to adopt the right track.

Sir, this measure, I am constrained to say, is a triumph of linguism, and is an ugly example of what pressure, threat and violence can achieve and how forces of disorder can undo a good thing and make us surrender. Through this measure, we are going to sow seeds of disunity afresh and inviting new troubles on our heads, for this is not going to put an end to linguistic troubles in the country. It is fanning and inviting more trouble. Agitation in Vidarbha is already there and it may assume big proportions any day for the people of Vidarbha know by experience elsewhere that they have only to make a big nuisance of themselves to be heard and achieve their object; and communalism-cum-linguism is raising its ugly head in the border State of Punjab demanding separate Punjabi Suba. Then, Sir, have we not received only this morning a petition from the people of

Mysore, a well-reasoned and well-argued petition, claiming certain portions of Maharashtra which have been allotted to the latter? Sir, it was a said day when we opened the question or reorganisation of States. It was ill-conceived and ill-timed, and what is worse, mishandled. It has led to troubles one after another. Still we do not seem to learn the lesson.

This measure, I dare say, is against our better judgment, against our agreed convictions, against the declared policy and decisions of the Congress in the past—not, of course, the recent past—and against the well-considered decisions of the three learned Commissions, viz. the Dar Commission, the J.V.P. Committee and the States Reorganisation Commission, and more particularly against the declared views of our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, which he expressed in very emphatic terms, in very clear terms, in unambiguous terms on two occasions in the Lok Sabha on 7th July, 1952 and 21st December, 1955. How I wish we had acted accordingly, firmly and boldly.

I will, Sir, hurriedly and briefly take the House through all these various stages. First of all, we had the Dar Commission Report on 10th December, 1948. I need not go into it for the hon. Members are well aware of what the recommendations were. Those recommendations were to the effect that we should not have linguistic States essentially in the interest of the country. Particularly so far as the Bombay city is concerned, they had specifically recommended that it should not be given to Maharashtra and it must remain as a separate State.

My hon. friend, Shri Deogirikar, while speaking this morning had said that none of these Commissions or Committees had suggested that the Bombay city should not be given to Maharashtra. I should say that it is completely a misreading of the recommendations of the Dar Commission. I have the Report here with me, but I have not the time at my disposal to

read the relevant portions relating to it. The Dar Commission had specifically and in unambiguous terms said that the city of Bombay should on no account be given to Maharashtra.

Then, Sir, we have the resolutions of the Indian National Congress from 1953 right up to 1956, when at the Amritsar session of the Congress, the Congress in unambiguous terms declared that bilingual and multi-lingual States were in the interest of the country, that unilingual States would lead to disunity in the country. In that resolution it had been clearly said that the proposal of Bengal and Bihar being united into one State was a welcome proposition, and this proposition was being put before the country and it was expected, they said, that the other States would follow the good example. But, Sir, hardly had the ink, with which this resolution had been written, dried up when came before us the Bengal-Bihar Reorganisation measure according to which a little stretch of land which was bilingual in Bihar was sought to be given and in fact was given over to Bengal because it was a Bengali-speaking area.

Then, Sir, we come to what our revered leader, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, said in 1955.

I will read only one or two portions of it. He said:

"We talked about linguistic provinces and some people said that this principle of linguism should be extended more and more, some people criticised my colleague, the Home Minister, because he did not quite make that the final test. May I say quite briefly and precisely that I dislike that principle absolutely 100 per cent, as it has tended to go?"

When he said this, his statement was received with thunderous cheers from the House. He also said:

"Thinking as I do, in this matter, I personally welcome the idea of bilingual or multilingual areas. For

my part, I would infinitely prefer living and my children being brought up in bilingual and trilingual areas than in a unilingual area. Because of that, I think I would gain wider understanding of India etc."

Again he said:

"The Congress Working Committee, after considerable discussion, suggested three States, but speaking for myself I hate them..."

Yes, he hates them. He goes on:

"...and believe that the recommendation made by the States Reorganisation Commission was the best in the circumstances."

That recommendation, as we know, was that we should have a bilingual united Bombay and Maharashtra State. This was the view of Pandit Nehru. I have no reason to think that he does not continue to hold that belief even today. I therefore submit that all that we are doing today is against our conviction . . .

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: On a point of clarification.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I will give all the clarification after I have finished. Obviously therefore, what we are doing today is contrary to our convictions, contrary to the Congress Resolution, contrary to the recommendations of all the Committees on this subject. But why are we doing it? Of course, obviously it is because we think that the people of Maharashtra and the people of Gujarat want to separate. Well, Sir, in a democratic State, under democratic conditions, we have to submit to the views of the masses.

(Time bell rings.)

I am closing and I will not tax your patience. But I have reason to believe, as I had been in Maharashtra during the course of the last general elections, that the masses do not want it. The leaders and the politicians do want it as they will have much to gain. There will be more Ministries, more Memberships in the Council,

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.]

more Memberships in the Assembly and more offices for them. Only if the people had been given the right lead, I have no reason to doubt that they would not have supported this measure of bifurcation.

I can only say, there are higher forces that govern the destiny of things, of all of us and I think it is the will of Providence that we must have these two separate States. They are inevitable. Let us bless these two States to function properly and efficiently. I wish them all good luck.

**SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa):**  
Sir, I stand to welcome the Bill as the result of the joint deliberations, in a process of compromise. I have always pleaded for a linguistic division of the States and I stand by it. My friend stated that it interferes with the oneness of India. I join issue with him. I am, speaking for myself, an Indian first and an Indian last, everything Indian. If I plead for a linguistic division of the States, it is for convenience of language communication of thought and intercourse with the people to bring them to have an interest in the administration and have a real and effective voice in the administration. Therefore I am delighted and I welcome this.

Recollecting Mahabharata, Vyasdev had stated that destruction and construction are eternal processes in the world. So it is manifest in the case of Bombay. It is the creation of Britain and Britain had seen fit to break a part of it in 1935 by creating the province of Sind and thereafter it was left to the National Government of independent India to add more areas to Bombay. Now we see that cakes are made to be broken and we have broken the State, broken probably for good. In this process of breaking, you find Mahagujarat and Samyukta Maharashtra coming in. My friends, the Congressmen of Bombay, those of Gujarat and Maharashtra, have suffered more in this breaking up, have suffered more in this deed than anyone else. They

have silently pocketed all the insults that they got and today this is a red letter day both for Maharashtra and Gujarat. While speaking in favour of and welcoming the two States of Gujarat and Maharashtra, let me also warn my friends the Maharashtrians that history, let me hope, will not repeat. The Maharashtrians are always capable, skilled and useful in fighting an opponent but the moment they are called upon to discharge a responsibility, then comes disruption. That has been the history of Maharashtra, and let me hope that by the training that they have received under the guidance of Gandhiji, they have washed away all the sins and let us hope that they stand to prove the myth of this apprehension. Apprehensions have been created about the multilingual areas and about the city of Bombay. Let me hope and pray, as we do in Prayer, "Let God bestow wisdom on Maharashtra and Gujarat." so that the administration should be for the benefit of all. As my friend rightly pointed out, it should be in Maharashtra, for all those who will be living in Maharashtra and in Gujarat, for those who live in Gujarat. In this process of reorganisation, I bless Maharashtra for having got all she wanted, namely, she wanted Bombay, she got it, she wanted Vidarbha and she got it and she wanted the Maharashtra State by name and she got it. Therefore, three blessings she got. This reminds me of the three blessings which Philip of Macedonia got. Along with the three blessings, he got also Alexander the Great. Similarly Maharashtra got Bombay. I hope that will be its ideal and I have no hesitation in saying that the present generation in Maharashtra will falsify all past history and will do justice to the great trust that they have been entrusted with.

My hon. friend Mr. Santhanam has made a definite contribution to this discussion by suggesting that the University of Bombay should be converted into a Central or Union University. I also join him in applauding this



suggestion. I applaud this suggestion of his and I join him in making this suggestion. If there was any justification for converting the Osmania University into a Union University, there is every reason for the Bombay University being converted into a Union University and I have no hesitation in believing that the Union Government will view this suggestion with favour.

Sir, the States Reorganisation Bill came and it was passed. But the position of India remains the same and the agitation for realignment and readjustments of the States remains. My hon. friend Mr. Santhanam suggests that it should be decided now that nothing of this kind will be entertained hereafter Sir, knowing our history and our performances, who on earth will believe that this idea will be given up once and for all and for all times to come? It is not possible. Speaking for myself, I know there is very strong feeling in my own State on this matter. Sir, a Commission of very enlightened men was appointed. But why did the Government of India poke its nose into it? They could have said, 'Well, here is the Commission and here are the decisions. Let us accept them and work them.' That was the best thing to do. But having interfered once, having interfered twice and having interfered ten times, what justification is there now to say, "Thus far and no further?" Sir, there will be no end to this unless and until the justifiable and reasonable demands of different States are satisfied. In this view of the question, I am not prepared to agree with my hon. friend, Shri Santhanam. Sir, what has the Commission done? Has it taken care of the enclaves? Today there are enclaves in Orissa which are administered by officials. (*Time bell rings*). Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should like to welcome this Bill. This is really a happy occasion when we are finalising the formation of the Maharashtra State and the Gujarat State. This Bill terminates an unhappy controversy which all patriotic men have deeply deplored. This

House passed a measure four years back, giving to the people of Gujarat, Maharashtra and Vidarbha one united State. Today, we are, in a way, dissolving that union, hoping that the new States that we now create will add to the vitality of our Indian Union, will further enable these two great peoples to live happily together. I do not propose to criticise any parts of this Bill. It is for the people of Gujarat and of Maharashtra to accept the Bill in a joyful spirit. This Bill represents their wishes, as can be gathered from a perusal of the Bill. Almost everything that was said, almost every amendment, every suggestion that was made by the Bombay Legislative Council or the Bombay Legislative Assembly, has been incorporated by the Joint Select Committee, presided over by our distinguished Leader, Pandit Govind Balabh Pant. Sir, I should like to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to the constructive statesmanship which that worthy daughter of a great man, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, showed during her presidency of the Congress. I think it was on her initiative and under her presidency that this important decision to bifurcate the Bombay State was taken. I would also take this opportunity to pay my humble tribute to Mr. Chavan who on all counts has proved himself to be a great statesman. I have read the speech that he made in introducing the discussion on this matter in the Bombay Assembly and I read it with great admiration. I often find people in this country ask, 'Is democracy going to succeed in this country?' Well, if they want to know whether democracy is going to succeed or is not going to succeed in this country, let them go to the State of Bombay. It is an admirable State as well governed as any West European State is or can be in these democratic days.

Sir, both the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis are great people. They have contributed very greatly to the culture and thought of this country. Maharashtra gave us Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Gopala Krishna Gokhale, Mahadev Govind Ranade, and in the world of

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

scholarship the great Bhandarkar. I am only mentioning a few of the great names which come to one's mind when one speaks of Maharashtra. Maharashtra gave us Poona, a city of great beauty and of great culture and it is always a very pleasant experience to spend a few days in Poona. Gujarat gave us the greatest Indian, the Father of our Nation. It gave us also Dayanand Saraswati, the two Patel brothers, that Sardar Patel who has created this new India, who cemented the unity of this vast country. Sir, they have rich and growing literatures and they have in Bombay University a very big centre of learning. I do not know whether Centralisation will help the development of this university. I am rather sceptical about Centralisation and I think Bombay University has very high traditions which Maharashtra will be able to maintain.

I would like to say a word about Vidarbha. My sympathies are to a certain extent with the people of Vidarbha. I quite understand that financially Vidarbha would not be a viable proposition but . . .

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: It is a viable proposition.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Very well, but we have decided that there shall be no Vidarbha and, therefore, we should accept that decision in a large-hearted manner. I would say that Mr. Chavan has given very definite assurances as to how he will approach his task or how the Bombay Government will approach their task so far as Vidarbha is concerned. That should go far to satisfy the apprehensions of the people of Vidarbha.

I would like to congratulate the Government on their decision to maintain the Bench at Nagpur. Nagpur was a good legal centre in the old days. It gave us some good Judges and it produced some good lawyers. It had a flourishing Bar. Nagpur had a legal atmosphere, and I think it still has that atmosphere. The All India Reporter is published in Nagpur.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): It is in the centre of the country.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And it is in the centre of the country. We must think that it is the centre of the country. Anyway, it is a wise decision. I am glad that the Bench there is going to have three Judges instead of two because two really do not make a Bench, three do, and from time to time, I suppose, Judges from Bombay will go and sit in the Nagpur Bench. I hope it will be possible to have a strong Bar at Nagpur hereafter.

On the more important question as to whether we should have unilingual States or not, I am clearly of opinion that the dangers of a unilingual State are very much exaggerated. I come from a unilingual State and I do not think that we are proving an obstacle to the maintenance of the unity of this country.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: You are yourselves a country.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I think, Sir, we must give all the people in the country a stake in the fortunes of this country. Therefore, I have always been in favour of a largehearted settlement so far as the border areas like Manipur, Tripura, and even the Naga lands are concerned. If we give the people a stake in the fortunes of this country, we shall be strengthening the unity of this country. Therefore, Sir, I would without reservation welcome the formation of these two States. I am glad to see that these two new States are going to be called Maharashtra and Gujarat respectively. Bombay disappears. Bombay has a warm place in our heart but Maharashtra reminds us of the glories of the days of Shivaji, and Gujarat of course is sacred to us because it is the land of birth of the Father of the Nation.

Sir, with these words I give this Bill my whole hearted support.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wel-

come this Bill. On this occasion, I want to pay my tribute to the hon. Home Minister who has dealt with this question very patiently from the beginning in 1956. It is due to his patient efforts that we find that this Bombay Reorganisation Bill is going to become an act very shortly.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** In 1956, it was in a mess. We are correcting it today.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order, order.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA:** I want to thank the Members of the Joint Committee who have done their job expeditiously.

I wanted to make one point. I want to thank the people of Gujarat for not demanding an Upper House for their State. That point has not been made by anybody. I am one of those who believe that there should be no Upper Houses in the various States. (*Interruption*). The Centre can be thought of later on. Let the States abolish them and we can think about it here. I want to thank the people of Gujarat on that particular issue.

**SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, coming from the eastern sector of India, I extend my most hearty and sincere greetings to the two new States which are on the eve of formation.

Sir, this Bill for the re-organisation of the State of Bombay is of remarkable significance from several points of view. First of all, the circumstances leading to its introduction are fresh in our minds, then the reasons which have influenced the provisions of this Bill are the result of a spirit of co-operation and goodwill and mutual understanding among the leaders of the two prospective States. Thirdly, Sir, the Government of India have stood firm for a number of years to give a fair trial to the will of Parliament expressed in an earlier enactment. Finally, the responsiveness it has shown to public opinion and which

has inspired the introduction of this Bill is an object lesson in democracy. All these factors have acquired for this particular measure a very definite place in the constitutional history of India. These are some of the general considerations which have induced me, coming as I do from the eastern part of the country, to take part in this discussion, but, Sir, there is also a more intimate reason why I have taken the floor on this occasion. May I disclose to this House, although it is a personal matter, that in the early part of this century I had occasion to pass two formative years of my life at Nagpur participating, in and in some ways helping to build up, the cultural and intellectual life of that great city? I have since been a fairly frequent visitor to that ancient city. I have seen the province being transformed from a Chief Commissioner's Province to a Governor's Province with all its attendant dignity and authority. I have seen coming up before my eyes noble buildings and structures to house the Legislatures, the Secretariat and the High Court as well as a great University in an expanding State. It was again from Nagpur, that I made a pilgrimage to another part of Vidarbha to sit at the feet of Mahatmaji at Wardha, Sevagram, which was hallowed and sanctified by his long residence. All these associations and memories came crowding to my mind when I was considering some of the provisions of this Bill.

I can, therefore, fully realise the depth of feeling which had inspired some of the Members trying to seek statutory recognition and provision for the city of Nagpur and an administrative adjustment for Vidarbha. I would, however, appeal to my friends from Vidarbha to bring about this administrative adjustment by mutual goodwill and discussion after the formation of the separate Maharashtra State which is to be based on the unity of language, culture and history. Goodwill and mutual understanding is the keynote of this measure and I would appeal to all concerned to set up the edifice of the

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.]  
new State on that solid foundation. I feel sure that the leaders of the new State of Maharashtra will fully utilise the resources afforded by the city of Nagpur by holding a session of the Legislature in that city and by the Governor making Nagpur his second head-quarters. This city is extremely pleasant and bracing in autumn. I also hope that the High Court at Nagpur will continue to function as a full-fledged unit of the High Court of Bombay. Nagpur has got a stately High Court building, and a very strong Bar. Sir, I wish the two new States god-speed and prosperity.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Seeta Parmanand; five minutes.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Although it is very difficult to speak in five minutes, I will try to say whatever is possible within that time.

Sir, I greet this Bill with mixed feelings because though there is reason to rejoice for the people of the two States who wanted to have separate States and who have been very uneasy over the joint State which they had after the States Reorganisation Act of 1956 since the factor that had kept even people of the same parties apart will be removed now, yet this Bill—as also the various speeches—indicates that in our own country though we have been saying that whatever State we belong to we are children of the same country, we feel that we are not able to trust each other simply because our languages are different. So I was very sorry to hear that, now that Bombay has been made into a linguistic State, a demand has been made that the University of Bombay should be centralised as if everything that is with the Centre is very satisfactory. It was also said that the Women's University founded by Dr. Karve should also be centralised. It is rather a sad commentary on our avowed and professed feelings of one-nation idea that because our language happens to be different, because our province happens to be different, we view each

other with suspicion and I find that the amendments that have been given notice of—a Member from Vidarbha is asking from Maharashtra certain guarantees; I do not want to go into the details now but the amendments . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are not before us just now.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: . . . also go to show that unless there are statutory guarantees, we are not prepared to trust each other. I feel also sorry because that the bone of contention has been left as it was; I am referring to the Belgaum area. Some areas which were in Madras and the Andhra States have been settled with the Pataskar formula but some have been left as they are; in spite of our experience, I do not know why we have not become wise. On the basis of language we have not given the territories like Dangs etc. to the State to which they belong on linguistic basis if these States had to be formed on a linguistic basis. I would also like here to refer to the demand, that is voiced not so much in the House at present as outside in the Press, that there should be a separate Vidarbha State. There is also a report in the Press—everybody knows about it—that since Vidarbha will not be a viable State as the State of Gujarat which would also not be viable but for the port of Kandla, it is proposed to join it with four districts of Mahakoshal. In that case, in what way it will be unilingual, I do not know. Sir, as was rightly pointed out by Mr. Kapoor, I would like to State here that these divisions that are being demanded again and again for smaller and smaller States are not so much with reference to the real wishes of the masses—as is sought to be made out in the demand for Vidarbha—but to satisfy the political ambitions of the leaders of different groups who want to carve out a niche for themselves in the power politics of the country, who do not care what happens to the people, who do not care what happens

to the economic conditions of the people so long as they get into power. So I hope that, though this Bill is going to set at nought the controversy that had been raging for the last four years which had set brothers against brothers and people belonging to the same party against each other, they will not raise again a new hare in the form of a demand for a Vidarbha State. Nobody would think that it is in the interest of the common people of Vidarbha but for a few people, trouble-makers and agitators I would call them, who would be demanding it for their own ends.

Sir, I would like to say that if the Bombay State is really to be happy, the Government will have to take into consideration the wishes of the people of Belgaum. If it is really going to be a linguistic State—Mr. Datar is looking at me because he comes from Belgaum and I am referring to Belgaum—unless those people come back to the State to which they belong, the people will not really feel that happiness which this Bill should give.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with this Bill.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was very happy to find today the largest possible measure of approval; except for two or three Members, from both sides we have had a chorus of approval regarding the formation of the two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. Certain hon. Members naturally gave vent to their own difficulties or apprehensions. My friend, Prof. Wadia, stated that his support was with some mental reservations. He went to the earlier stages and described the conditions existing in Bombay city at present. He wanted to know whether they would continue as they are. I may point out to him that once the State has been formed then all the communities, either linguistic or otherwise, will be entitled to the same measure of care and attention as the community which speaks

the principal language of that State. Therefore let there be no misgivings at all on the score that something is going to happen to the great city of Bombay. This city has been developed by the joint labours of a number of people speaking different languages and coming from different States and it was on account of this circumstance that the Chief Minister of Bombay made what is known as a policy statement, because he wanted to remove all misapprehensions and feelings of nervousness, all feelings of uncertainty as to what is in store for Bombay. So far as this question is concerned, may I add that the policy statement made by the Chief Minister of Bombay has the greatest importance attached to it? It has a great sanctity. That was the reason why in the Bombay Legislature, when this Bill was under consideration, he made a policy statement for the purpose of satisfying the feelings of all classes of people. Therefore, I would point out to my friend, Prof. Wadia, that there is no ground for any misapprehension or any uncertainty. Bombay will continue to develop as it has developed now and there will be no change whatsoever so far as the very bright future of Bombay City is concerned.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Will the hon. Minister of State for Home Affairs state what value in law the statement has?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: May I point out to my hon. friend that when a policy statement is made by the chief Minister of a State it has the greatest sanctity? It was not found practicable to incorporate them in this Bill because in certain respects certain matters have been incorporated in the Constitution already.

An hon. Member wanted to know what is going to happen regarding primary schools attended to by students of different linguistic minorities. May I say that when this question was considered at the time of the States Reorganisation Bill, it was pointed out that actually a provision

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

was there in the Constitution, according to which provision will have to be made for education at the primary stage to students in their own respective mother tongues? This applies not only to Bombay, but to other States, to other regions as well. Therefore, on that score there ought to be no nervousness at all. It is extremely good that the Bombay Municipal Corporation has been having schools in different languages, because in Bombay there are people from all parts not only of India but of the world as well. Therefore, whatever is there will not only be continued, but better measures, wherever they are necessary, will be taken by the new Maharashtra State. Let there be no misgivings on that ground.

Then, Sir, another hon. Member made a suggestion that this process of States reorganisation should be put an end to. My hon. friend, Shri Santhanam, who is now happily a Member of this House, made a suggestion that this process of reorganisation should be put an end to. I do not know why there has been such a feeling, because it was in 1956 that the States Reorganisation Bill was passed and thereafter this is the first occasion when, on account of agreement between the leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat, a proposal has been made for the creation of two States. It is true, as it was rightly pointed out, that all our attention has to be given to the development of the State and not merely to the proposed reorganisation of States or change of boundaries. So far as that question is concerned, the States Reorganisation Commission made certain recommendations or proposals. These were accepted in respect of certain changes which had to be made. But so far as the general structure in this respect is concerned, we have followed the States Reorganisation Commission's proposals. Now, in addition to it, it was pointed out then and it was also pointed out during the discussion on this Bill that in case there is agreement between two States or Governments regarding

any changes considered necessary and advisable by them, then such an agreement will have to be duly taken into account. Therefore, the Home Minister in the other House rightly pointed out that the principle that we followed was not again the establishment of a roving boundary commission. That question is entirely irrelevant now. All that has been assured was to the effect that in case the two State Governments concerned came to an agreed solution, then that agreed solution would have to be considered by the Central Government.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Is the hon. Minister aware that much pressure from above, below and the sides is brought to bear to bring about such an agreement?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I am afraid the hon. Member is rather uncharitable. Now, there was an agreement between Andhra and Madras.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He does not seem to share the pressure that you are getting.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: May I point out that just as there was agreement between the two Governments of Madras and Andhra Pradesh and that agreement was duly given effect to by passing of a Bill by Parliament in that respect, similarly here in this case the hon. Member will kindly note that there were other parties in the field who wanted to see if they could succeed where nothing was done already. They tried to meet together. They tried to settle it, but they could not come to any conclusion and the matter remained infructuous at the earlier stages.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: On this basis, you will separate Vidarbha also after some time.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Let the hon. Member allow me to continue. When it was found that it would be in the interests of the two States themselves to consider this question democratically and when this question was opened before the Government of

India or the Congress organisation by the Chief Minister of Bombay, naturally it had to be duly considered. The matter was taken through a number of processes and ultimately agreement was reached. That agreement, may I point out to my hon. friend, was a perfectly voluntary and enthusiastic agreement by the two parties concerned, Shri Chavan as well as Dr. Jivraj Mehta. They did their best to evolve an agreement which is the best under the circumstances. May I point out to my hon. friend further that whatever was done by these two Ministers in the present Bombay Government was ultimately put before the State Legislature? There were speeches, rather critical in some respects. But ultimately will he kindly accept the position that both the Houses of the Bombay Legislature accepted unanimously the present Bill making certain suggestions which are about 13 in all?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: If the same thing happens between Mr. Kannamwar and Mr. Chavan, what would you do?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I cannot answer any hypothetical question. What I am pointing out is this. So far as this process of continual reorganisation is concerned—that was what he hinted at—may I point out to him that this question was once settled so far as the whole of India is concerned? All that was allowed was that whenever there has been an agreement—the word agreement is an important one—or an agreed solution suggested by two States, that itself constituted a principle which had to be duly taken into account. There is nothing more and nothing less. Therefore, let not my hon. friend feel . . .

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Just one question. Has the non-acceptance by the Mysore Legislature been accepted by the Central Government or is more pressure being brought upon the

Mysore Government and the Legislature?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: That question is irrelevant here.

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

SHRI B. N. DATAR: But there it was found that the Bombay Legislature passed one Resolution and the Mysore Legislature passed just the opposite Resolution. In the circumstances naturally the two Chief Ministers could not come to an agreement at all.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: Either of the Chief Ministers is adamant to enter into an agreement.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: Let not the hon. Member go further. The hon. Member asked a direct question and, therefore, I am replying to it. Unless there is an agreement between the two administrations or ultimately the Legislatures, the Centre will not be in a position to consider any such questions.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: The hon. Minister is propounding an astounding proposition . . .

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The hon. Member has played today a very peculiar role. Last time we had another hon. Member from this side, and he stated that this was an entirely wrong thing, and he advised us to throw this Bill into the wastepaper basket. I am afraid my hon. friend is treading the same ground.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I may assure the hon. Minister that I have no wastepaper basket. I have only a basket for keeping good files.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: We are far from being restrained. He said something like 'murdering' Bombay City, if I remember correctly. I wish the hon. Member had not used such unrestrained expression as far as the very important Bill which is before the House, is concerned.

**SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:** That is a correct statement of the existing position.

**SHRI B. N. DATAR:** If the hon. Member insists, I cannot do anything. But I would point out to him that the statement was far from correct, was highly undignified and most unrestained as well.

**SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:** I protest against the use of the expression 'undignified'. Dignity is not the monopoly of the hon. Minister. That expression is unparliamentary. Whatever I said was supported by what the hon. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said in 1955.

*(Interruption.)*

**SHRI B. N. DATAR:** I take the strongest exception to his statement of 'murdering' of Bombay City. That is most undignified. I purposely did not use stronger expression.

**SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:** Sir, is it proper for any hon. Member, even if he is holding the position of an hon. Minister, to say 'undignified'? It is for the Chair to say whether it is dignified or not.

**SHRI B. N. DATAR:** I am entitled to put it to the Chair. You cannot stop me from saying "undignified".

**SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:** I can only appeal to the Chair to see that every Member is stopped from using such expressions.

**SHRI B. N. DATAR:** I do submit, Sir, for your consideration that this expression was most unfortunate and highly undignified. I would submit to my hon. friend that it is true that the reorganisation of States had to be undertaken because there was considerable desire expressed about it, and therefore we appointed the States Reorganisation Commission and we accepted their principles in general. There also they did not go completely by the language as the only criterion. A number of criteria had to be taken into account. We have

been following them to the fullest extent, and wherever there is any difficulty in that matter or if anything wrong is likely to happen, we have laid down certain rules in the interests of the linguistic minorities. Therefore, I would appeal to my hon. friend to consider the whole matter properly against the present background. It is not necessary to say further so far as this question is concerned. He is entitled to his own opinion, but I am pointing out the circumstances in which Government had to take into account the realities of the situation, take certain steps and provide for certain safeguards. That is what the Government have done formerly, and that is what the Government have done at present.

Then, Sir, another hon. Member, Shri Deogirikar, while supporting the Bill has also agreed that in all such cases what is most important is the agreement. As another hon. Member has rightly pointed out, when there is that agreement, naturally both the parties have to follow the principle of 'give and take'. Under these circumstances, after we come to an agreement, it would not be proper to say that Maharashtra has been smarting under a sense of injustice. When the two great leaders, the Chief Minister, Shri Chavan, and Dr. Jivraj Mehta, the Finance Minister, have come to a certain conclusion, naturally we should not in any way use expressions which are likely to be misunderstood or, may I add, which are likely to take the grace out of such an important and unique agreement. My friend stated that there was a sense of injustice. Now, that was counterbalanced by other friends from Gujarat who stated that there was also a sense of injustice. Now, the question that arises is: Is there injustice either to Gujarat or to Maharashtra? Now what has been done is that the parties most concerned have tried their best successfully to hold the scales evenly between these two peoples, and if in the course of the negotiations, as a part of the organic agreement, certain concessions have to be made, naturally we should stick to them, and we should



stick to them with a sense of gracefulness. Therefore, I would submit to my hon. friends that Maharashtra is in the unique and happy position of having its dream realised after a number of years. I fully reciprocate their sentiments, because it is only now that Maharashtra has come into its own, after a number of centuries. Therefore, if it has not got something here or there, or if something more than what some hon. Members feel proper has been given, that is a matter which ought to be forgotten altogether, in any case that has to be accepted with full grace. Therefore, I would appeal to both my Gujarati friends and Maharashtrian friends not to say anything that is likely to take away the grace, that is likely to take away the credit from the unique achievement that has been had in this connection. Where others could not succeed, certain other great leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat have succeeded, and therefore on this very important and happy occasion let us not look at a little that we have lost or at something else that we should have gained. In any case there is absolutely no substance in the expression used by my hon. friend there which was thoroughly wrong, namely that Maharashtra is truncated. Maharashtra is not truncated at all. Maharashtra is full to the brim, and whatever has been given to Gujarat has been given under what can be called an agreement, a compromise, and for this reason, Sir, it is not necessary for me to go into the points that have been made by various hon. Members.

May I also point out one thing? An hon. Member, I believe it was Shri Santhanam, suggested that the formation of these States was likely to lead to feelings of what he called sub-nationalities.

**SHRI K. SANTHANAM:** I do not think I said anything like that.

**SHRI B. N. DATAR:** Somebody said about sub-nationalities. So far as that question is concerned, I should like to point out to the hon. House that India is one, India's nationality is one, India's

citizenship is one. It is only for the purpose of facility of administration, it is only for the purpose of allowing full scope for self-expression and development in various States that these administrations have been separately formed. All of them form the great Indian Union. Therefore, all steps have been taken and will be taken to see that nothing subversive is done, nothing anti-national is done, and no provincial feeling is allowed to be set against the national feeling. I hope that assurance will be sufficient to the hon. Member.

So far as the financial adjustments are concerned, I am very happy that here we have the approval of the former Chairman of the Finance Commission. He stated that the arrangement that has been arrived at was under the circumstances a satisfactory one. So, it is not necessary for me to go into the whole question because on a previous occasion it has been pointed out to the House that when two people are going to separate, when something like a joint family is going to be split up, naturally that party which is likely to be weak—it is common ground, it is not disputed, that the Gujarat State is going to be a deficit State—should be helped. Under these circumstances for instance, if certain sum of money has been given from the present Bombay State, they ought to be taken into account for the purpose of developing a sister State which is to be newly formed out of the larger Bombay State. Therefore, I believe that it is not necessary to go either into this question or into the question of the boundaries, which question has been settled after full consideration. Every party examined and re-examined the whole question of Dangs. So far as the other taluk is concerned the dispute arises only with respect to a few villages—seventeen or eighteen—and not with respect to others. In respect of Umbergaon, it is admitted that there are areas therein which are predominantly Maharashtrian and other areas which are predominantly Gujarati. If there is a small area which has gone

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

somewhere, which ought not to have gone on merits or on certain criteria, may I appeal to both sides by saying that that was done as a matter of compromise and agreement? Therefore, we should not take exception to these small differences of opinion.

So far as Ukai Project is concerned, there also the same principle has been followed, and I might point out that what was stated by the States Reorganisation Commission on this point was placed before the Bombay Legislature by the Chief Minister. He explained the whole position saying that for certain reasons these things had to be done. It is not necessary for me to go into all these things, but I may point out that what has been done has been properly done and all of us have to support it because it is in the larger interests not only of these two people—the Marathis and the Gujaratis—but of the whole nation.

I need not now refer to certain things which were said. I am confident that after the passage of this Bill into law, the Maharshtrians, the Gujaratis and all others will forget whatever has been said one way or the other and that all of us will try to see that the two new States develop as best as possible in an atmosphere of perfect harmony and cordiality between them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 3—Formation of Gujarat State*

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Sir, I move:

1. “That at page 2, line 20, the word ‘Dangs’ be deleted”

2. “That at page 2,—

(i) in lines 23 to 26, the words ‘the villages in Nawapur and Nandurbar talukas of West Khandesh district and the villages in Akkalkuwa and Taloda talukas of West Khandesh district, respectively’ be deleted and

(ii) in lines 26-27, for the words and figures ‘Parts I, II and III’ the word and figure ‘Part I’ be substituted”

3. “That at page 2, lines 35 to 37 the words ‘and the villages specified in Parts II and III of the First Schedule shall respectively be included in, and form part of, Songadh taluka of Supet district and Sagbara taluka of Broach district’ be deleted.”

(These amendments also stood in the name of Shri Lalji Pendse)

The questions were proposed

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Sir, I am trying, at the last stage of the Bill, to persuade the Government and the House to change their mind. I hope that I will have at least some audience—some thoughtful audience. I want especially to say something regarding Ukai villages—156 villages—that are going to be transferred to Gujarat. These villages are proposed to be transferred not because they are Gujarati-speaking villages. As the hon. Home Minister and the Chief Minister of Bombay have specifically stated, they are going to be transferred due to the Ukai project. Sir, the smooth working of the project is essential. May I point out, in this connection, one similar instance—the case of the Tungabhadra Project? When the Tungabhadra Project was there, there was also a question from the Andhra side. The Government of Andhra and its leaders were anxious that the area of Bellary should be included in Andhra for the smooth working of the Tungabhadra Project.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with this. Tungabhadra itself is in Mysore territory.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Yes. But I would like to refer to

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any way, it is past history. You need not go into that.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Sir, it is only to make out a point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please speak on it on merits.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: The hon. Home Minister, Shri Pant, referred to this question at the time of the States Reorganisation Bill. He said—

"Again, I think the question has not been posed in the light of the circumstances which have resulted in the decision that the Government has taken. Bellary has been the subject of adjudication, if we may say so, of investigation previously, and certain proposals had been made. In accordance with those proposals certain territorial adjustments were made and Bellary was transferred to Mysore. Well, the Commission said that for the implementation of the Tungabhadra project it will be desirable to have certain talukas of it transferred to Andhra. The main purpose was to ensure the smooth working of the Tungabhadra project. The matter was considered in consultation with the leaders of the States concerned, and after adequate guarantee had been obtained for the implementation and smooth working of the Tungabhadra project it was considered proper to maintain the existing arrangement."

That is, to keep Bellary in Mysore.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That argument goes against you.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: It definitely supports me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: These villages must be given to Gujarat.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: For the implementation of the Ukai Project, these areas are proposed to be transferred. Was it not proper or right for the Central Government to see that the two leaders of the proposed States agreed and gave any guarantee necessary for the implementation of the Ukai Project? But that was not done.

On the contrary, it was said that the two leaders of the two proposed States had agreed that Ukai or Ukai villages should be transferred to Gujarat. This implies a discrimination or an element of bias and I think the Central Government at least should be prepared to reconsider the question of Ukai and Ukai villages. We are definite that that project is for the purpose of national reconstruction. We do not oppose any scheme which is beneficial or helpful to national reconstruction—whether it is in Gujarat or in Maharashtra or in Andhra or in Mysore. We want all national schemes to be implemented. So it is not that we have objected to these schemes. One hon. Member said that the Ukai Project was always objected to. I do not think that the Maharashtrians or their leaders as such have objected to the implementation of the project. On the contrary, the technical experts have always been against this Ukai project. I do not want to give . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not go into that.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: The technical points of the project . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not go into that. Speak on your amendments. You have already taken five minutes.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: This is the point about the Ukai Project.

I now come to the question of Dangs and of Umbergaon. The hon. Minister just said that these were very small tracts, some villages, here and there. And these villages are proposed to be transferred on the basis of an agreement or a compromise. But Sir, I am not convinced till now that only the give and take principle is followed because we only have given everything. Perhaps one may say that we have been given Bombay city—somebody said it—that we have been given Vidarbha and that our State has been given the name of Maharashtra. It comes to something like this, that I take everything from you, then give

[Shri D. B. Desai.]  
to you that which is yours and for that too I take something from your pocket' . . . Is this the way of compromise? Perhaps it may be that the two leaders have agreed. No doubt. But perhaps this agreement was forged by a central iron hand—I fear. So at least this agreement should be open for the future Government of Bombay, I mean for the future Government of Maharashtra, so that they can try and make necessary adjustments in the proposed Zonal Council. That is my only submission and I want the hon. Minister to consider this and give a specific reply to this issue.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: This question has already been replied to. In the Bombay Assembly also the Chief Minister pointed out the reasons so far as the Ukai Project was concerned.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: My question is about the guarantee to be obtained from the proposed States of Maharashtra and Gujarat.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The question of guarantee is entirely premature at this stage. When the Ukai Project is executed, then all proper precedents will be followed.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: When it is premature, I mean the Project, then what is the necessity to transfer the areas to Gujarat for the same purpose?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

1. "That at page 2, line 20, the word 'Dangs' be deleted."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

2. "That at page 2,—

(i) in lines 23 to 26, the words 'the villages in Nawapur and Nandurbar talukas of West Khandesh district and the villages in Akkalkuwa and Taloda talukas of West Khandesh district, respectively' be deleted; and

(ii) in lines 26-27, for the words and figures, 'Parts I, II and III' the word and figure, 'Part I' be substituted."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That at page 2, lines 35 to 37, the words 'and the villages specified in Parts II and III of the First Schedule shall respectively be included in, and form part of, Songadh taluka of Surat district and Sagar taluka of Broach district' be deleted."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 4 to 40 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 41—Permanent Bench of Bombay High Court at Nagpur*

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Sir, I move:

13. "That at page 12, line 30, for the word 'three' the word 'four' be substituted."

Sir, I offer my hearty congratulations to the Members of the Joint Committee for at least having conceded one demand of the Vidarbhaites, to incorporate in the Bill, at least one provision of the Nagpur Agreement, that of establishing a permanent Bench of the Bombay High Court at Nagpur. But then the number of Judges that has been fixed by this Bill is not adequate enough—this Bill has fixed the number of Judges to be three only.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** A minimum of three.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** It states "not less than three" which means that the Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court will always post only three.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** "Not less than three". It may be any other higher number also.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** If the hon. Minister agrees that the Chief Justice will always post four, then what objection is there to incorporate the word 'four' instead of 'three'. The very objection to the word 'four' shows that there is something in the mind of the hon. Minister indicating that the Chief Justice will never post four.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan):** Sometimes more than four also may be needed.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** If more than four be needed, we will always make the demand, but today there is necessity for at least four Judges, and therefore I urge on the hon. the Home Minister . . .

(Interruption.)

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order, order. The Minister will reply. Dr. Barlingay.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** Therefore, Sir, I urge upon the hon. the Home Minister that there should be provision in this Bill itself that at least four Judges of the Bombay High Court will be appointed to decide the cases arising in the eight districts of Vidarbha. Sir, it may rather be mentioned here by certain Members that there is not sufficient work at present for the Nagpur Bench of the Bombay High Court. This contention is not proper. Two years back there were a number of cases, but all these cases had been decided summarily. Most of the appeals that were pending in the Nagpur Bench were summarily

rejected. Judgments were delivered by writing only one word, and what was the word? 'D' for dismissal. Not even a word, only one letter 'D' and the case was dismissed. Sir, there was some sort of . . .

**SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS:** This criticism is not permissible, what the Judges do while deciding cases.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** I could not follow the hon. Minister.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No criticism of the High Courts.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** What I mean to say is, there was some sort of talk going on between some Judges of the Bombay High Court and some Judges of the other High Courts and one of the Bombay High Court Judges was explaining how efficiently the High Court functioned and how speedily they decided cases . . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order, order. I do not know how the hon. Member gets all this information. Such allegations should not be made on the floor of the House.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** It is not an allegation, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** It is.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** It is only a sort of an anecdote that I am mentioning, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I am sorry; it is much worse.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** It was said, Sir, . . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Please finish your speech.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** In summary disposals the Judges are not bound to give reasons.

**SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE:** No doubt. What I mean to say is this. Cases in the Bombay High Court are not decided properly. \

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: They are summarily rejected.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are a member of the legal profession; you should not make such remarks on the floor of the House.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Cases are disposed of but not decided—that is the criticism of the members of the Nagpur High Court Bar. And therefore I would . . .

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: May I remain my hon. friend that it is good for lawyers to remember that they are not always sitting in the Bar room?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Therefore, Sir, I would like to urge upon the hon. the Home Minister to accept this amendment.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Sir, I am personally and vitally interested in this question because I happened to be a practising member of the Nagpur Bar. Now the question is . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are not a practising member now. Otherwise how can you be a Minister?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I was and I look forward to joining that bar again after the present interlude comes to an end.

Now, Sir, this matter received very sympathetic consideration at the hands of the Home Minister. He was anxious that a maximum number of Judges should be statutorily guaranteed for the Nagpur permanent Bench. Figures were obtained and it was revealed as a result of going through the figures that if four Judges continue to sit throughout the year then disposals are much more than institutions, and if three Judges sit, then the institutions are somewhat larger than the disposals. To balance the

two it was found that three and a half Judges were required, I mean, three Judges working all through the year and a fourth Judge sitting for about six months in the year. If this were done, then institutions and disposals will balance. Then there is another difficulty which was pointed out by the Chief Justice, namely that if we statutorily provided for four Judges, then if one of the Judges went on leave even for a short while, it would be incumbent upon the Chief Justice immediately to fill that vacancy in order to comply with the law. Four Judges are sitting. They will very probably always sit, and I am quite sure that the expression 'not more than three' will meet the demand of the Nagpur Bench.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: In view of the assurance given by the hon. Minister that four Judges will continue to sit, I do not want to press my amendment.

†Amendment (No. 13) was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 41 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 41 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 42 to 50 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 51—Credits in certain funds*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 4 is out of order since it requires the sanction of the President.

The question is:

"That clause 51 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 51 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 52 to 79 were added to the Bill.*

†For text of amendment see col. 1804 *supra*.

New Clauses 79A, 79B, 79C and 79D

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Sir, I move:

14. "That at page 29, after line 34, the following be inserted, namely:—

**PART VIIA**

**Provisions as to Vidarbha**

79A. The principal seat of the Government of Maharashtra shall be Bombay and Nagpur shall be the second capital of the State of Maharashtra.

79B. One of the sessions of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of the Maharashtra State shall be held at Nagpur.

79C. The State of Maharashtra shall, by suitable legislation, promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the people of Vidarbha and Marathwada.

79D. The State of Maharashtra shall, by suitable legislation, make provision for giving adequate representation to the people of Vidarbha and Marathwada in all services under the control of Government and semi-Government institutions."

Mr. Deputy Chairman, this amendment regarding the addition of new clauses, 79A, 79B, 79C and 79D, pertains to the same subject-matter, viz. educational and economic facilities to Vidarbha and Marathwada. Therefore, I would deal with all these amendments at this moment.

Sir, while speaking on my first amendment, I congratulated the members of the Joint Select Committee on having incorporated one provision of the Nagpur Agreement. All these four amendments are regarding the incorporation of other provisions of the Nagpur Agreement. Sir, hon. Members of this House will recall that an agreement was entered into between the representatives of Vidarbha and Maharashtra to provide

certain facilities for the people of Vidarbha. This agreement was signed, among others, by Mr. Y. B. Chavan.

Moreover, in a policy statement made by the Chief Minister in the Bombay Assembly, he said that he would abide by all the terms of the Nagpur Agreement. When the hon. Chief Minister of Bombay in a policy statement agreed to abide by the terms of the Agreement, I do not understand what difficulty is there to incorporate the provisions of the Nagpur Agreement in the Bill here.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: What need is there?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: What was the need to incorporate the provision regarding a permanent Bench of the High Court at Nagpur? Did we not have a Bench at Nagpur already? Where was the necessity today to incorporate that provision in this Bill? If you find the need to incorporate that provision in the Bill, and by incorporating that provision here you are establishing a permanent Bench of the Nagpur High Court, why should not other provisions also be incorporated in this Bill? If you say that you do not want to do that, it means that you want to do injustice to the Vidarbha people. Having incorporated the provision regarding a permanent Bench of the High Court, I say that all other provisions must be incorporated in this Bill.

Sir, the first part of my amendment says that Nagpur should be given the status of a second capital. We all say that there should be decentralisation of administration. The reason for our demand is obvious. There should be decentralisation of administration. Sir, this House will be surprised to learn that even for very trifling matters people of Vidarbha have to travel hundreds of miles; they have to travel 700 miles.

Sir, I may be allowed to quote one or two instances. I am running a

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]

Backward Classes hostel, and just to get recognition I had to make at least half-a-dozen trips to Poona and Bombay. Fortunately, I am a Member of Parliament and I have got a Railway Pass and I could afford to go and come back, but what about other people? Can they always go to Bombay or Poona? Of course, we can use the Railway Pass for public work, but can any other person, who has not got that facility, always go to Bombay to get things done?

Sir, I am trying to get one trade union registered for the last two years. For its registration I had to go so many times to Bombay. Can any other trade union leader or any other worker afford to go to Bombay always? It is not possible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please come to your amendment.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: That is why I urge that Nagpur should be given the status of second capital.

My second amendment is about the provision that at least one session of the Bombay Assembly should be held at Nagpur. The Chief Minister of Bombay has agreed to this proposal. Why should it not be incorporated in the Bill? The hon. Law Minister is here. Let him tell us what are the legal difficulties in incorporating this provision in the Bill.

The other two parts of the amendment are vitally important not only to the people of Vidarbha but to the people of Marathwada also. Both these regions—Vidarbha and Marathwada backward regions. They are backward economically as well as educationally. Therefore, these provisions are very essential.

Very recently the Bombay Government had decided that they would abolish all the educational facilities that were being enjoyed by the Vidarbha people. Sir, when Vidarbha was part of Madhya Pradesh, there were more educational facilities,

enjoyed by Vidarbhis but last year the Bombay Government decided to discontinue these facilities. There was agitation and the Bombay Government had to concede the demands of Vidarbha. Now, what happens? Again this year the Bombay Government has declared that no educational facilities would be allowed. In view of this experience gained by the Vidarbha people, in spite of the respect that they might have for the Chief Minister of the Bombay State, how can they believe in his words? A man is believed by his deeds and not by his words. Therefore, I would urge the House to accept my amendment.

The question was proposed.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT:

Sir, the policy statement of the Chief Minister of Bombay has been endorsed by us as well as by the Lok Sabha and I hope it is also accepted by this House. So far as the merits of the issues are concerned, we have not much of a difference with the mover. He has, however, suggested that all the provisions should be embodied in the law. As a practising lawyer, I think he knows that there is no provision anywhere about the capital of any State in any law so far. Nowhere is it provided . . .

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: What I wanted to know was whether there was any legal difficulty. Whether there is provision in other State Government or not is not the question. I want to know whether there is any legal difficulty.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT:

You have to be a little patient if you want to know or to learn something. Well, so far as that goes, that is a novel suggestion which is unknown to our law.

Then, what does 'first capital' or 'second capital' mean? What is going to be the definition of these terms? We can use terms in a law provided their meaning is well-defined and all



people understand them in the same sense. If we use these expressions, one may interpret them in one way and the others, the other way.

Then, as to certain offices being located in Nagpur, again there is no law anywhere saying where the offices of a particular Government will be located, in no State whatsoever. So we cannot have legislation to that effect. Article 371 in the Constitution already contains the main parts of the amendment. Then, he must know one thing at least, that Vidarbha already forms part of the residuary State of Bombay. So, if anything with regard to Vidarbha, that is not contained in the law today, is to be now introduced in this Bill, then it cannot find place there. You have to amend the Constitution, because it is not an arrangement for bringing a new State or a new area within the State of Maharashtra of excluding any existing area from the State of Maharashtra. It forms part of the State of Maharashtra today. So if any provision has to be made, then it has to be made in the Constitution and not in this Bill, and he will perhaps not like the passage of this Bill to be delayed so that a provision, even if it were otherwise permissible, might be made in the Constitution.

About the holding of the session of the Legislature and other allied matters, the Maharashtra Legislature, will have full jurisdiction on all other matters that are of a local character and the Maharashtra Legislature can, if it so chooses—again that will be something which is not known to our law so far—hold a Session in Bombay, another in Nagpur and a third in Poona or wherever it chooses to hold—do like that because there is provision in List II about matters pertaining to the Legislature. So a law to that effect can be passed perhaps by the Maharashtra Legislature but not by Parliament in this Bill. So I hope the hon. Member will be satisfied that we have throughout appreciated the sentiments of the people of Nagpur and we wish to do everything that is

reasonable in order to see that their interests do not suffer because of the inclusion of Nagvidarbha area in Maharashtra and we have taken care to do that. The Chief Minister of Bombay has also made his statement of policy which, I think, is fully satisfactory and he gave every assurance to the people living in these areas.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you press your amendment?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: The Home Minister has not referred to the educational facilities and service facilities. I think these provisions can be incorporated in the Bill. I press my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

14. "That at page 29, after line 34, the following be inserted namely:—

#### PART VIIA

##### *Provisions as to Vidarbha*

79A. The principal seat of the Government of Maharashtra shall be Bombay and Nagpur shall be the second capital of the State of Maharashtra.

79B. One of the sessions of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of the Maharashtra State shall be held at Nagpur.

79C. The State of Maharashtra shall, by suitable legislation, promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the people of Vidarbha and Marathwada.

79D. The State of Maharashtra shall, by suitable legislation, make provision for giving adequate representation to the people of Vidarbha and Marathwada in all services under the control of Government and semi-Government institutions."

The motion was negatived.

Clauses 80 to 85 were added to the Bill.

*Clause 86—Amendment of Act 37 of 1956*

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Sir, I move:

16. "That at page 32, line 17, for the words 'Gujarat and Maharashtra' the words 'Gujarat, Maharashtra and Mysore' be substituted."

17. "That at page 32, lines 18 and 19 be deleted."

(The amendments also stood in the name of Shri B. D. Khobaragade.)

*The questions were proposed.*

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Sir, I want to make a few observations. This clause proposes to reconstitute the Western Zonal Council. Till today Mysore and Bombay were the members of the Western Zonal Council. I may state that when the States Reorganisation Act was passed in 1956, it was with a specific reason that Mysore was included in the Western Zonal Council. I may well quote the Home Minister. He gave reasons on the floor of this hon. House. He said:

"When the present recommendations were made, then the bilingual Bombay State was not there and so much against our will we had to put Karnataka in a different zone, but the opportunity came and we availed ourselves of it. Then, there are also their reasons. Karnataka and Bombay have many outstanding problems to be settled even after this thing has been launched and for that it will be necessary for them to be in close contact with each other. Again, as hon. Members are aware, there are certain boundary disputes between Karnataka and bigger Bombay State and for the settlement of those disputes which have caused considerable worry to some of our friends, it is desirable that the two should form part of one unit and they may be able to discuss things between themselves."

This was the specific reason given when the Western Zonal Council was formed with Mysore as a member. There were again some other reasons like some ports, Krishna waters etc. but I think not a single problem has till now been solved by the Western Zonal Council. One may therefore say that the Council has failed but I think the partnership of Gujarat, Maharashtra and Karnatak in the last 100 years will solve some problems which are affecting their territories, their well-being, their economic developments and the national reconstruction. I hope the hon. Home Minister will give thought to my amendments and he will be pleased to accept them.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I will only refer to the States Reorganisation Act according to the provisions of which the Zonal Council was formed. Let us see what are the functions of a Zonal Council. It has been mentioned in section 21 that the Zonal Council may discuss and make recommendations with regard to any matter of common interest in the field of economic and social planning and (b) any matter concerning border disputes, linguistic minorities or inter-State transport. As my hon. friend

Mr. Desai has pointed out 5 P.M. already, there are many outstanding problems and outstanding disputes which could not be solved. Particularly, Sir, there is the dispute about the border areas between Mysore and Bombay. Both the Chief Ministers, Chief Minister Shri Chavan and Chief Minister Shri Jatti have been trying to settle these disputes. But I am sorry to say that unfortunately, due to the adamant attitude adopted by the Chief Minister of Mysore, they were not able to solve these disputes. If we reconstitute this Zonal Council, there will not be any opportunity for the two Chief Ministers, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra and the Chief Minister of Mysore, to come together and discuss matters and find out a

via media or to find out some solution. The present arrangement at least gives the two Chief Ministers of these two States some opportunity to come together. At least there is that one provision. Therefore, we should not remove even this one opportunity. When the people of Belgaum want to redress their grievances their agitation is suppressed. (*Time bell rings.*) One minute more, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken three minutes.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: This opportunity should be left to the Maharashtrians to settle these border disputes, if the intention is to get them solved. These people are agitating by democratic ways and peaceful methods. But their agitation is being repressed and suppressed

\* \* \* \* \*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. This has no relevance here.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: But I have got a large number of complaints

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: These remarks will be expunged. This has nothing to do with present Bill. Any reply?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Sir, just one sentence more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, please sit down.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Sir, I request that the present arrangement should be continued and there should be no change at all.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Sir, Mysore was included in this Western Zone as it was called, consisting of the bilingual Bombay State and Mysore and the main reason for putting Mysore in this Zone was the ex-

istence of some border differences between the two States. We had expected that perhaps if both of them were placed in one Zone, then that might facilitate the solution of that problem. But three years have passed and our efforts have not succeeded. Mysore has its affinity with the other States in the South—Andhra, Madras and Kerala—and Mysore has been invited to the meetings of the Southern Zone several times and it has taken an active part in the deliberations there. So the place of Mysore so far as its interests and so far as its natural tie with other States are concerned, is in the Southern Zone. So we are now making an arrangement which is more appropriate and which, I hope, will serve the interest of Mysore and all the country better than the arrangement which was originally introduced in the States Reorganisation Act.

SHRI D. B. DESAI: Just one question, Sir. What agency does the hon. Home Minister propose to have for solving these border disputes now? This Western Zone was a sort of an agency.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a different question. It does not concern this Bill now. I am putting the amendments to vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

16. "That at page 32, line 17, for the words 'Gujarat and Maharashtra' the words 'Gujarat, Maharashtra and Mysore' be substituted."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

17. "That at page 32, lines 18 and 19 be deleted."

*The motion was negatived.*

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is:

"That clause 86 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 86 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 87 to 96 were added to the Bill.*

*Schedules 1 to 13 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Sir, I am happy . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I thought the hon. Minister would reply later.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: I thought there would be nothing to reply to.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants to make a speech. Well, you may make a speech.

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thought the hon. Home Minister would be good enough to make his reply after hearing some other voices. It is a great event today that we are passing this Bill which, in due course, perhaps in a few days' time, will be a fact of life. The significance of this event, Mr. Deputy Chairman, lies in the fact that not only are we having the establishment of two linguistic States after upsetting a wrong principle, but the significance of it lies also in the fact that in the years that followed since 1956, the great people of Maharashtra and of Gujarat never accepted this imposition and they always fought in order to unsettle a settled fact. It is, therefore, clearly a victory of the forces of democracy and when I say democracy I mean broad, popular forces of democracy, against the forces of arbitrariness and imposition. We do not grudge the compliments that are due to the Government even for

this belated wisdom and action. It would have been perhaps graceful on the part of the Government and perhaps their wisdom would have been seasoned with manliness and grace, had they at the same time, while sponsoring this Bill, paid a tribute to the people of Gujarat and the people of Maharashtra for striving all these years to bring this Bill into this House and to unsettle an old settled fact.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, it will be remembered that however great may be those who are in power, greater are the people. Always it is the people who have prevailed upon the ruling powers and the ruling powers have had to bow to the will and wishes of the people, and I think it would have been excellent if the Home Minister, wise as he is, had acknowledged the error he committed in 1956, had admitted his mistake and had said that he had learnt from the people. Democracy gets strengthened when he says such things and when statements of this kind are made.

Sir, let me pay a tribute to the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat but for whose struggle and sacrifice, whose defiance and heroism, probably this Bill would have never come to this House. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I shall make it clear that this step of the bifurcation of the State of Bombay and the formation of two linguistic States is unquestionably a big and commendable step, a step that we have all cherished to be taken and is being taken today. At the same time, let it be said and remembered also that by itself the formation of linguistic States does not mean prosperity and happiness. It only means new opportunities; it only means a beginning; it only means more new vistas being opened before the people in order to make these two States prosperous and happy which we all wish. As this old chapter is coming to a close we also know that it would be necessary for these people, the people of Gujarat and Maharashtra, to fight against injustices, exploitation, social evils and assert themselves remem-

bering their past struggles and traditions in order that there emerge two glorious States of Maharashtra and Gujarat. Taking into account the forces that they have got, I have no doubt in my mind that should the people assert themselves in their just fight and endeavours against the forces of tyranny and exploitation, there will emerge out of the present situation two great States which will more and more be under the control of the people. We ask for linguistic States because it opens the gate way to democracy. But by itself we do not get it. Therefore, it is essential today, as the two new States will come into existence, to extend and expand democracy to the popular forces that remain in the villages, factories and fields because until and unless we draw them into the affairs of the administration of States, democracy cannot get nourishment and what we get really without doing this is a form of democracy when the substance is not there. Therefore, it will be the task of the leadership of these two States—and when I say 'leadership' I mean broad democratic leadership; I have no particular party in my mind at this moment—to look into this matter. Remember that the whole of India supported them when they fought against an imposition. They can get confidence from this fact, and in the coming years when these two people will be fighting for justice democracy, better life and happiness again the country will rally round them. We wish them all success in the coming days in making the two great States as great as possible.

Sir, I do not want to say anything more, I think that the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat should get the best wishes of the people of the whole of India belonging to all parties.

**SHRI N. M. LINGAM:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am happy that the passage of the Bill has done one good thing. It has created a new passion for democracy in the Members oppo-

site and I hope before long that they will be total converts to the principles of democracy.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** We have made you converts so far as this Bill is concerned.

**SHRI N. M. LINGAM:** Sir, this occasion is historic and solemn, Historic not only because it marks the final stages of the passing of this measure for the bifurcation of the bilingual State of Bombay into two new States but also because we are at the last stages of the process which began in 1953, the process of re-organising the States in the country on a linguistic basis. Sir, the significance of this occasion may not be known immediately because of the din and bustle created over petty controversies arising out of the re-organisation of States but the future historian will record our achievements, especially the labours of the hon. Home Minister, in letters of gold because our achievements have been as great if not greater than the integration of the States during the last few years. We know that during the last so many years the hon. Minister has given his very life to see to the integration of this country. He has said that the entire re-organisation has been based on mutual co-operation, accommodation and goodwill, and this Bill which we are about to pass is based on those principles as they emanated from Chief Minister of Bombay and other leaders of Gujarat. Sir, there may be petty disputes still hanging over but they are to be solved in the spirit in which the Home Minister commended this measure, in the spirit in which disputes between States like Madras and Andhra were solved and ultimately the welfare of the people has to depend not on petty concessions or settlements of small boundary disputes or financial concessions but on hard work which the creation of new States will create for the people by creating new opportunities. So, Sir, we have to remember on this occasion that our strength is based

[Shri N. M. Lingam.]  
on unity in diversity, and in that spirit let us bid godspeed to the newly created States for the greater glory of the country.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Only one sentence, Sir. Tributes have been paid—no doubt they have been due—to the Home Minister but here I would like to pay a tribute to the person with whose imagination, foresight and understanding of this question the whole aspect changed and this Bill came up, the whole aspect of the Congress Party changed, and that is the imagination of a woman, the then President of the Congress. I am quite sure that unless she had understood the position in the way in which she understood it, this question, even in spite of the wishes of the people, would not have taken the turn that it has taken now. I would like to pay a tribute to her.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Sir, I do not think at this late hour I should attempt any reply to the remarks made by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. He would have been false to himself to his party and to his principles if he had not struck a dismal and discordant note at a time when everyone here seems to be in a way overwhelmed with a sense of satisfaction, joy and achievement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am fully satisfied because of the victory of the people. I am very much satisfied.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: It is because the people have been victorious that we as the representatives of the people occupy the place that we do and will continue to do so so long as the people remain victorious.

So far as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta goes, everyone knows that he has an invincible inveterate faith in democracy but in a democracy which does not admit of any freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of ex-

pression, freedom of association or of parliamentary government. So, when he pays homage, I hope there is some return of good sense perhaps in individuals if not in the party. But this is a solemn occasion and I am really delighted that we have reached our destination. The principle which has guided us throughout has been essentially democratic. Even when the bilingual State of Bombay was formed, it was in response to the spontaneous wishes and initiative of the vast majority of Members of Parliament.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the Lobby.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: that we accepted their proposal and the bilingual State formula was mooted in the States Reorganisation Act.

I had said then and I had repeated it more than once that whether the State is bilingual or unilingual was a minor consideration for me. What I had wished was complete understanding and harmony between the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat; any solution that would be acceptable to them would be acceptable to us. And it is because of the agreement reached between the leaders of Gujarat and Maharashtra that we have been able to place this Bill before the House and to achieve these results as speedily as we have succeeded in achieving them. So it is through understanding, tolerance, patience, goodwill, a spirit of cooperation, a right approach to problems, a correct sense of perspective that we can solve problems and not through violence. Violence, if anything, comes in the way of a solution of problems and I hope that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will at least learn this lesson.

Sir, I want the Members to accept my motion in a spirit of hope and faith. I wish that all of us may join in praying for the success of these two States which will be two of the 15 jewels in the Union of India. They will be ushered into existence in about a week. I hope that they will

make very rapid progress and they will be in the vanguard of our constructive movement as they have been in our struggle for independence. So let us not mar the magnificence and the solemnity of this occasion by petty, parochial or party considerations which are of a very ephemeral character. We are doing something which we hope will lead to the advancement and progress not only of these two States, not only to greater cohesion between these two States but also to greater strength and more of that spirit of accommodation and emotional integration which should be part of our political and social system. I hope life will be better, fuller and nobler in each of these two States and that, as history unfolds itself, the steps that we have taken from time to time will be proved as having been inspired by the best spirit and traditions of democracy and by our faith in our own people. Let us retain the great traditions of culture of our country and let us hope that the

brothers who have lived together for ages, though they will now be administering their own States in separate units, will continue to strengthen the bonds which have been built up in the course of ages and this spirit of brotherly and neighbourly comradeship will bring them still closer. May Providence help both the States and may they be a source of strength to our country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at twentyfive minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 25th April 1960.