

LOK SABHA DEBATES

LOK SABHA

Thursday May 17, 1990/Vaisakha 27,
1912 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

[*English*]

Statutory Development Board for Konkan

+

*860. SHRI VIDYADHAR GOKHLE:
DR. VENKATESH KABDE:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be
pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have decided
to make suitable amendment to article 371(2)
of the Constitution to grant Statutory Devel-
opment Board for Konkan; and

(b) if so, date by which such Board will
come into existence?

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI
SUBODH KANT SAHAY): (a) and (b). The
Government of Maharashtra have made two

proposals—the first one for establishment of
separate Development Boards for 'Vidarbha,
Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra' as
envisaged in article 371(2) of the Constitu-
tion, and the second one for amending ar-
ticle 371(2) (a) of the Constitution so as to
include a specific provision for establish-
ment of a separate Development Board for
Konkan also. However, in deference to the
wishes of the State Government, it has been
decided to defer considering of the second
proposal and expedite action in regard to the
first proposal.

SHRI VIDYADHAR GOKHLE: Mr.
Speaker, Sir, there is a fine couplet in San-
skrit for cunning politicians:

Hastadapi na datuayam, griladapi na
diyate.

Paropakaranārtham vachne kim
dridrata?

MR. SPEAKER: It is for (Vidya learning).

SHRI VIDYADHAR GOKHLE: The
Central Government and the State Govern-
ment have given so many assurances dur-
ing the last six years regarding statutory
Development Boards for Marathwada and
Vidarbha but till now no statutory Develop-
ment Board has been constituted for these
regions...

MR. SPEAKER: You can ask two sup-
plementaries please put the first one.

SHRI VIDYADHAR GOKHLE: My first
question is that if it is the position of Marath-
wada and Vidarbha regions what would be
the position of Konkan? Will they have to
wait for the 21st century?

SHRI SUBODH KANT SAHAY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a State Government's proposal and that is why we are giving priority to it. But in case of Konkan, Constitution has to be amended so we assure you to do it in consultation with the State Government.

SHRI VIDYADHAR GOKHLE: It is the demand of the people of Vidarbha, Marathwada and Konkan region that the Development Boards should be autonomous but the Maharashtra Government has been shrewd to keep a silence in this regard. They have not yet disclosed their draft proposal. However I would like to know what the Central Government is thinking about it? We would like to know whether these Development Boards are going to be autonomous or not? One more thing I would like to know whether Government have received any Private Members Bill seeking to make an amendments in Article 371(2) of the constitution or not?

SHRI SUBODH KANT SAHAY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think the hon. Member is giving priority to the question of Konkan. We shall talk to the State Government on this matter very soon and whatever provision is available we shall take action on it very soon.

[*English*]

DR. VENKATESH KABDE: The background of Article 371(2) has to be understood in relation to this question and this Article was incorporated in 1956 by the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act. It was found, because the Fazal Ali Commission had recommended a separate State for Vidarbha for the sake of linguistic integration of the country, the people from Vidarbha decided to merge with Maharashtra. Also, for Marathwada a guarantee was given that special consideration will be given to Marathwada in terms of employment and other opportunities. So, Marathwada got merged with Maharashtra in 1956.

Now, in the last thirty years the provisions of Article 371(2) have not been followed. What are those provisions? There

are three provisions under Article 371(2). They are, one is that separate development boards for Marathwada, Vidarbha and the rest of Maharashtra—by which we mean Konkan—will be formed to see that every year the report of these boards will be submitted to the state Assembly. But, at no time has the report been submitted to the state Assembly. The second provision is that there will be equitable distribution of the funds of the States in proportion of their population. And the third provision is that there will be an equitable distribution in the training facilities for technical education and vocational training in the services under the control of the Government. But Maharashtra has failed to fulfil all these three conditions. The Maharashtra Assembly has unanimously passed a Resolution on 24th July 1984 for the formation of statutory development boards for Marathwada and Vidarbha. This Resolution has sent to the President of India, recommending that these may be formed. However, the proposal has been shuttling between the Central Government and the State Government for a long time because of some strange reasons. I think that it is high time we think about it and some of the people—our hon. Mr. Sathé knows—have demanded a separate Vidarbha and in Marathwada also a demand for a separate Vidarbha is being made. There is no popular support for these movements but if we have divisive forces it is not good. However, have to request the hon. Minister that they should take a Cabinet decision. My question, have they taken a cabinet decision? The Prime Minister in a conference in Nagpur promised that these boards will be formed in this session. But they have not been formed. My question is when are they going to form them?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED): There is a special provision. After the Reorganisation of the States in 1956 a special provision was made in the Constitution for setting up of a statutory development boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada, Gujarat and Kutch area. This matter has been pending for the last 30 years, because under this provision in the Constitution the Governor has been

given special responsibility for implementing this provision. Anyhow, the respective Chief Ministers have been sleeping over the matter. To some extent it means a dilution of the authority of respective Chief Ministers. So, whatever proposal has been sent by the present Government, the Governor has no powers in that. It is the Chief Minister who will be the Chairman and some of the Ministers will be members. We will again send the proposal back seeking the opinion of the Governor. But the opinion of the present Governor is that it will mean dictum. Who will be responsible for it? However, if we go to the constitutional provision it is the responsibility of the Governor. But the present Government has sent a proposal where the Governor has no say. So, we have been in touch with the Maharashtra Government. I am soon calling a meeting and trying to sort out this matter.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, as the hon. Minister has said, this thing has had a chequered history of the last thirty years. I have no hesitation in saying, irrespective of which Government it has been, that there has been a serious betrayal of the people of Vidarbha, Marathwada... (*Interruptions*)

I say, 'irrespective of'. These people just irritate me.. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You address the Speaker.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I will address the Speaker. But there are some incorrigible people here. They cannot even understand the subject.. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us be serious.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I say, irrespective of which Government, even our Government, that there has been a betrayal. We deceive the people of Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra. Although the Article 371 was specifically introduced to give protection to the rights of the people, particularly of Vidarbha, who were granted unanimously a separate status of statehood

in the States Reorganisation Commission; unanimously by the Fazl Ali Commission; we sacrificed that status only for linguistic unity of the entire Maharashtra. But the leadership of Maharashtra throughout this period and also the Central Government in league with the leadership, had deceived the people of Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra. Even the present Government is trying to dilute the provisions of Article 371. I would beg to this Government—Mufti Saheb, at least you, because you know the whole history—that the Statutory Development Boards are to be independent and it is the Governor, meaning thereby the Central Government, which has to have the supervising power. By diluting it, by depriving the Governor of his authority, by taking it over the Chief Minister, the whole purpose of Article 371 will be defeated. Therefore, I would request the Home Minister and this Government particularly, to kindly take this matter seriously. I am warning, Sir,—a tendency in the country is there—that any day a movement for a separate Vidarbha and other parts will start and nobody will be able to control it. I would like to know from the Government whether they will take expeditious measure to ensure the establishment of Statutory Development Boards according to Article 371 and also to create a provision for a statutory Development Board for Konkan. This is my request.. (*Interruptions*)

Do not take it lightly my friends.. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: They are not taking it lightly. How can anybody take it lightly?

[*Translation*]

It is a very serious matter and nobody is taking it lightly.

[*English*]

SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED: I share the concern of Shri Sathe. As I have earlier said, this special provision of the Constitution has been pending since last 30 years. And if there has to be a Statutory

Development Board, that has to be under the provision of the Constitution. This matter is to be sorted out with the Chief Minister. I am soon calling the Chief Minister here and we will try to sort it out.

[*Translation*]

SHRIMATI JAYAWANTINAVINCHANDRA MEHTA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, whatever has been said by Shri Vasant Sathe, I fully agree with that. Besides I would also like to say that there are certain problems in our country which are kept closed like snakes in the basket of a juggler. That basket is opened at the time of show i.e. elections and it is said that they would set up Development Boards for Vidarbha, Konkan and Marathwada. As soon as the elections are over and votes are pocketed, the basket is again closed. That is the way it has been happening for the last thirty years. Had our hon. Member, Shri Vasant Sathe raised this matter so loudly 15 years back as he is raising it today, he would not have had opportunity to raise it here today. While sharing the sentiments expressed by him, I would like to say that on behalf of the Government, the hon. Home Minister has just now insured that the hon. Chief Minister would be called and a decision would be taken at the earliest. In this regard I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister as to when he is going to invite the chief Minister of Maharashtra? If we, all the MPs from Maharashtra, rise along our political differences to work for a common mission, we would certainly do justice with the people of Marathwada, Vidarbha and Konkan by bringing an amendment in the Constitution. Now the only thing I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister is as to when he is going to invite the Chief Minister of Maharashtra?

SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to assure you that I would be inviting him in next two weeks. Earlier we had fixed a meeting with him in Maharashtra on 26th April. However I would call him as soon as possible and hon. Members from Maharashtra will also be

consulted separately to find out a solution to the problem.

DR. VENKATESHKABDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir when a resolution to this effect was passed in the Legislative Assembly I was present there and Shri Sharad Pawar, the present Chief Minister had said at that time that there should not be a separate state. So now action should be taken expeditiously in this regard. But since then, four years have elapsed. We should first do it for Vidarbha and Marathwada because we have constitutional provisions for the same and the Legislative Assembly has taken an unanimous decision for that. After that steps have to be taken for the development of Konkan. So my question is as to when steps would be taken in this regard?

SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment in the constitution has to be made for Konkan but first of all we should take action in regard to Vidarbha and Marathwada for which there is provision in the constitution and nothing has been done during the last 30 years. We shall also take action in regard to Konkan but let us take the other two first because constitutional provision is already there for them. However I would like to assure that I would look into the suggestions given by the State Government. All Cabinet Ministers are members of that Statutory Board, so they all would be called here and final shape would be given to it.

SHRI PURUSHOTTAM KAUSHIK: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the root cause of the agitation going on there is that there was no scientific basis of the reorganisation of the States. The root cause of these conflicts is the reorganisation of the States on the linguistic basis. Ignoring the social, educational and cultural basis, States were reorganised on linguistic basis only and that is why such agitations are gaining ground. At the time of reorganisations of States, they had envisaged small size states but after the reorganisation, the State like Madhya Pradesh became bigger than its earlier size. Also the State could not achieve the required level of economic development.

If that led to the demand for separate Chhatisgarh and Jharkhand states. There is also a demand for separate Bundelkhand State. These demands are coming up because these regions are gradually becoming economically more and more backward.

Today, the problem is that the Government may face difficulty in raising the matter of reorganisations of States. So the *via media* is the constitution of separate Development Boards for each region under Article 317 of the Constitution. It may also satiate the demands for separate states to some extent. Therefore, I would like to say to the hon. Minister that the question regarding Konkan has been raised here but the agitations for separate states are rocking the entire country. Is the Government thinking to take some positive steps on its own to remove backwardness in those areas where the people have been raised up demands for separate states? Will the Government think over a proposal to get a Survey conducted and set up Development Boards in those areas where demands for separate states are coming up including those for Chhatisgarh, Bundelkhand Vidarbha etc covering such areas?

SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED: He has generalised some areas. Jharkhand and Bodo are tribal areas and they think that their cultural identity is being adversely affected and outsiders are occupying their land. So far as the demand for Bodo and Jharkhand are concerned we have yet to try our policy in this regard but we are not in favour of Statehood. We have to do it within the Constitutional framework of the State. So far as the Statutory Development Boards are concerned we have to formulate a model as we have Gorkhaland Council to which the power has been delegated to seek the involvement of the people in their development. Similarly we shall also take action regarding Vidarbha and Maharashtra very soon.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the reply given by hon. Minister, it is clear that the proposal submitted by the Chief Minister is not in keeping with the constitu-

tion. Much time has been consumed in discussing whether the unanimous resolution of the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly is in keeping with the Constitution. I would like to know whether the Government will take action in this regard within the coming three months after concluding this round of discussion soon?

[*English*]

SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I had already said, either the composition of Statutory Development Board has to be under the provisions of the Constitution or it has not to be. Therefore, we have to interact with the State Governments and the Chief Ministers to find out some *via-media* where the authority of the representative government will not be diluted. At the same time, people of the area will have the involvement in this Board. It should not be a Government Board but, peoples' representatives should be involved in it.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM NAIK: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister did not say anything about the time limit of three months.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot compel the Minister to say. But, if he says it voluntarily, then it is all right.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BANAWARILAL PUROHIT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, since the reorganisation of states took place, the people of Vidarbha and Marathwada, particularly the latter, were assured that the justice would be done to them and the backlog completed by approximately thirty years have passed since then unfortunately there has been a dominance of Western Maharashtra over the rest of the state and its politics and this has caused injustice to Vidarbha and Marathwada. There

are many Committee reports and a backlog of Rs. four thousand crores has reckoned. This is the gravity of injustice done to the backward areas.

The situation even today is that
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Kindly ask the question in relation to the information you wish to seek.

SHRI BANWARI LAL PUROHIT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, justice is denied to the people of Vidarbha as time is being wasted in drafting and redrafting the proposal for the last five years. The Constitution of India is supreme and the Central Government derives a lot of powers from it. The Government should ensure that no more injustice is done to the people of Vidarbha. If the State Government is not in a position to draft the proposal suitably, the Centre should itself initiate the process of making a draft and that way do justice to the people of Vidarbha.

SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED: This is true that at the time of reorganisation of states, there was a provision of separate statehood for Vidarbha under the Nagpur Pact. The issue of Statutory Development Board has remained pending for long. I would like to say that a lot of exchange of correspondence in respect of constitution of the said Board have taken place between the Central Government and the State Government. The Chief Minister of that state talked much about it when he was occupying the portfolio of Home Ministry at the Centre but after taking over as Chief Minister, he preferred to keep silent on the issue. I can only assure you that we will try to put the things right and seek a solution to the matter. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Take your seat please.

SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK: You do not permit me to speak even when this question relate to my area. On the contrary, you are asking me to sit down.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Next question, Shri T. Basheer.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK: I have not been given a chance to put question which concerns my constituency. So, I walk out.

(*Then, Shri Vamanrao Mahadik left the House*)

University for Fisheries

*861. SHRI T. BASHEER: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal to set up a university for fisheries;

(b) whether Union Government have received any request from Kerala Government in this regard; and

(c) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI NITISH KUMAR):
(a) No Sir.

(b) No such proposal has been received in the recent past.

(c) Question does not arise.

SHRI T. BASHEER: Sir, I am very much disappointed at the answer given by the hon. Minister because this is a very important question. Sir, fishery plays an important role in the economy of our country. Adoption of latest scientific management measures are essential to obtain maximum benefit from this sector. So, I strongly feel that there should be a University for fisheries. At present, there is no university for this. So far as Kerala is concerned, I may point out that