

If the hon. Member's objection is that the suspension of the rule would violate the provisions of the Constitution, I have already said that it is not so, since the other House has got the jurisdiction to appoint a Select Committee of their own. We are only trying to appoint by this motion, a Joint Committee of both the Houses, instead of having separate Committees in respect of the same matter. In view of that, there cannot be any objection. This House, if it is so inclined, can allow suspension of the first proviso to rule 74 which prevents its reference to a Joint Committee. There is provision under rule 388 for this.

The question is:

"That the first proviso to Rule 74 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion for reference of the Bombay Reorganisation Bill, 1960, to a Joint Committee of the Houses be suspended."

The motion was adopted.

13.45 hrs.

BOMBAY REORGANISATION BILL

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

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely:—Shri Shripad Amrit Dange, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Bhaurao Krishnarao Gaikwad, Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi, Shri Narayan Ganesh Goray, Shri Arun Chandra Guha, Shri R. M. Hajarnavis, Shri H. C. Heda, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain,

Shri Gulabrao Keshavrao Jedhe, Dr. Gopalrao Khedkar, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri Balvantray Gopaljee Mehta, Shri Narendrabhai Nathwani, Shri Ghanshyamlal Oza, Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar, Kumari Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Shri Manubhai Nichhabhai Patel, Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel, Shri Uttamrao L. Patil, Shri Shivram Rango Rane, Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi, Shri M. Shankaraiya, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh, Shri M. S. Sugandhi, Shri N. R. M. Swamy, Swamy Ramnanda Tirtha, Shri Balkrishna Wasnik and Shri Indulal Kanaiyalal Yajnik, and 15 members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 14th April, 1960;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion that I have made for the reference of this Bill to a Joint Committee of both the Houses is a simple one. All the same, I deem it a privilege to commend this Bill to the consideration of this House.

The problem of Bombay and Bombay State, as I will state later, has so far not been solved in such

[Shri G. B. Pant]

a way as to give satisfaction to all concerned. I personally attach greater importance, as I stated more than once in the course of the debate on the States Reorganisation Bill and matters of allied type which came before the House later, to agreement, to the willing consent of the parties concerned than to any other solution that may ideally be otherwise considered by some, or even by many, desirable, because in unity lies strength.

So far as this particular Bill is concerned, it has the stamp of approval, the blessings of the entire legislature of Bombay. It was discussed for five days in the Bombay Assembly, and I think, for four days in the Bombay Council, and the following resolution was passed in either of these Houses, or in both the Houses, as you may prefer to call it:

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

I shall not say much about the amendments at this stage, but I may just observe that I would myself advise the House to accept the name of Maharashtra in place of Bombay, for the new State, in accordance with the wishes expressed by the Legislature.

I would also ask the Joint Committee, though it may not be necessary, to make a provision in the Bill about the permanent location of a High Court in Nagpur. I have my sympathy also with other amendments. How far they or any of them can be embodied in the statute is a question that will have to be considered by the Joint Committee, but I would place all these amendments

before the Joint Committee for its consideration.

I beg your pardon. I made perhaps a slight error in saying that the amendment that had been made there was to the effect that a permanent High Court will be located at Nagpur; it is not permanent High Court, but a permanent Bench of the High Court. The difference is not very great, but one has to be careful in using even a word here. Otherwise, sometimes, people get excited over little, trivial, petty things.

Shri Goray (Poona): This time we are not excited.

Shri G. B. Pant: The hon. Member is not. I am not referring to him. Why should he wear this cap which was never meant for him?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): They were happy that they were having a permanent High Court.

Shri G. B. Pant: But the Bill, have so far as its framework, so far as its fundamentals, and so far as its basic principles are concerned, been accepted by one and all. I regard this Bill as an embodiment of the spirit of accommodation, of appreciation of each other's aspirations and difficulties, and of a desire, even at the time of parting, of promoting harmony and goodwill and of a desire on the part of each of the members who may be thus divided from their age-long colleagues, to further strengthen the indissoluble ties which had bound them together for generations. It is because of the settlement in a way, on which this Bill is based and the goodwill that it carries with it of almost, I would not say even almost, of all sections of the people in Maharashtra and Gujarat, that I deem it a privilege, as I said, to introduce it in this House.

By this Bill, the number of autonomous States in our country will be raised from 14 to 15.

This principle of reorganisation of States, although it had certain drawbacks, was accepted, because it was hoped that it would lead to greater solidarity, greater unity in the country and greater cohesion, within the States concerned. I have every hope that this supreme objective of reorganisation of States will be served by this step that we are taking today.

In the past, this vexed problem of Bombay and Bombay State, so far as problems connected with reorganisation are concerned, had eluded our grasp. We once thought that we had reached a solution which would commend itself to everyone. There were many stages through which we had to pass in the early days of the implementation of the States Reorganisation Commission's proposals. The State Reorganisation Commission had suggested that the State of Bombay as it exists today should continue but that Vidarbha which formed part of this State should remain a separate unit. This proposal of the States Reorganisation Commission did not receive a warm reception or even a cold one. It was almost rejected.

Shri Goray: It received a hot reception.

Shri G. B. Pant: I agree.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It is still receiving it.

Shri G. B. Pant: I do not use the word 'hot' when there is very little of heat in me.

So, we thought whether we could devise something else, and we devised the three-unit formula, as it is called, under which Bombay was to form one unit, and the position was to be reviewed after five years, and it was also accepted on the floor of the House and also decided that Bombay form part of Maharashtra. But even this solution was not in a way heartily accepted. I cannot say it had a hot reception or a cold one, but it

had not that wholehearted approval which we sought.

14 hrs.

Then, luckily, we thought one day, when 180 Members of Parliament wrote a letter to the Prime Minister, that we should have the bigger bilingual State of Bombay, that there should not be these units, that all these should unite together, and the greatness, the eminence which Bombay State and Bombay city had achieved in our country, and the reputation that they had acquired in the world, might be maintained. It came almost as a god-send at that time. It seemed to be the spontaneous wish of the Members of this House, and we readily accepted it, accepted it in the hope that it would lead to the main basic purposes which we had in view, that is, unity and cohesion within the State and solidarity and strength of the Union of India.

The bilingual State of Bombay has functioned satisfactorily. The Chief Minister of Bombay by his suave manners and also understanding attitude towards all problems and towards all classes has not only maintained but further raised the standards of efficiency of the State of Bombay. The reputation that it had has been enhanced in that respect. Bombay has served the country well and, whether it be in the field of administration or of industry or of culture, it has remained almost in the vanguard of the many States we have in our country.

So, so far as these achievements are concerned, I hope we all have reason to be grateful to the Chief Minister and his team for what they have done. But while all this has been achieved, the Chief Minister felt that the cohesion, the greater unity which was to be forged through reorganisation had not been achieved in the Bombay State. That was, after all, our main purpose. So he suggested that the question should be reopened and should be given further thought.

[Shri G. B. Pant]

We agreed to look into the matter again. The Congress which bears the burden of running the State today through a Government formed by it, leaving the Governments free to act according to the Constitution, also agreed to consider this problem, this complex problem, this problem relating to a big State, a State which deserves the respect, gratitude and affection of every one of us. So the matter was taken up again and what has been called a 9-man Committee was appointed. I had the privilege of being associated with that Committee. But for me, though I claim to be the representative of both Maharashtra and Gujarat and also of every other State in the country—but that may be regarded as too tall a claim; so if it is a tall one, then excluding me—every one else belonged to the Bombay region, and every region of the bilingual State was represented on this Committee.

This Committee gave thought to the problems. The first was whether really it was necessary to reorganise the Bombay State. There were many aspects of the problem, but the Committee unanimously agreed that reorganisation was desirable. Having agreed to that, it had to give thought to various other matters which arose out of the principal decision. There was the question of Vidarbha. There was, no doubt, a section of opinion in Vidarbha—and some of our revered leaders shared the views of that section—which favoured the separation, if I may call it, from the bilingual State of Bombay or the formation of an independent unit by the name of Vidarbha State. We had to face that problem. There were also other problems relating somewhat to Marathwada and also to the cosmopolitan city of Bombay, as it has been called and accepted by all.

So we gave thought to these matters, of course, apart from the various questions that confront Gujarat and Maharashtra as such.

We consulted the people—not all of them, but some of them—and many representatives of several organisations were good enough to meet us. Having given very earnest thought to the matter, we reached the conclusion that it would neither be in the interest of Vidarbha nor in that of the country to keep Vidarbha separate from Maharashtra. So we decided to make Vidarbha part of Maharashtra. I hear that some sort of satyagraha is going on there because we took this decision. I am sorry that it should be so, but that is something which is not altogether unusual these days. So we have to bear with it, as we have to bear with many other things. But we felt that Vidarbha, all the same, should be given all such help and such scope for progress as we could possibly provide for it. There had been the Nagpur Agreement previously. Shri Chavan and other members agreed that they would not only accept the Nagpur Agreement, but would go even beyond it.

Similarly, there was the question of the Bombay city, not serious but one which, in certain respects, called for consideration. Those aspects of the matter were also given full thought. And, as hon. Members may be knowing, a policy statement relating to Vidarbha, Bombay city and Marathwada was placed on the Table of the Assembly and also on the Table of the Council, I presume, in Bombay. That policy statement forms part of the record of proceedings which had been circulated to all Members of the Lok Sabha. So, it is not necessary to refer to it at any greater length. I will, however, advise my Ministry to place some copies of it in the Library, though, I do not think there is any need for that, because everyone has got it.

Similarly, I once thought of placing a copy of these amendments that are approved there and to distribute them. But, I felt they are in the

proceedings and nothing will be gained by placing copies of a document which is already with the hon. Members on the Table of this House. So, that, in a way, clears the ground so far as Vidarbha, the Bombay city and Marathwada are concerned.

Then, the other and somewhat ticklish matter affecting the relations of Gujarat and Maharashtra, the two States to be formed out of the present bilingual States, had to be given very careful consideration. I am glad that not only was the basic principle accepted but also the details—I mean the salient ones—that are contained in the Bill were also accepted by the members of the nine-man committee and the report of the committee was in a way endorsed by the Working Committee.

This matter was then taken up by Government and the Government have proceeded on the basis of the agreement reached between the leaders of the two States. They have all through dealt with the question in a brotherly spirit. In the Bombay Legislature, repeatedly, it was said that it was a settlement between brothers. It was the desire of everyone to assist the other where assistance was needed. The Bombay State rose to great heights through the joint endeavours of all those who had been partners in this State so far. So, it was felt by those who were now parting company, so far as administration is concerned, that the harmony and goodwill, the indissoluble ties that have been built up in the course of generations should be further strengthened and nothing should be done that would in any way disturb that great spiritual achievement by which the brothers have lived together as brothers. And, while parting, they were determined to promote the spirit of neighbourly fellowship and also of mutual reliance and active desire to be of use to each other. In that spirit, these problems were tackled and in that spirit the solutions were reached.

I cannot say that in human affairs what is evolved will necessarily be the ideal thing. Our country has reached its high place in the comity of nations and elsewhere and had been able to maintain the unity and the basic fabric of life, because in spite of the various cultural and other varieties, the spiritual urge of maintaining the bonds which have grown through the ages of our association may be further developed and nothing done to disturb that. That is our heritage, the heritage of tolerance, of accommodation, of necessary adaptation and, if it becomes necessary, even of sacrifices borne by a brother for the sake of another brother. This problem was approached in that spirit; and I am very happy that I feel that now an abiding and satisfactory solution has been reached.

As hon. Members are aware, the Bill deals with the various aspects of this problem. I wonder if it is necessary for me to refer to them at any great length. As they know, the population of this State is roundabout four crores and a half or a little less than that, as it exists today. Thereafter Maharashtra will have almost double the population of Gujarat. The ratio will almost be 2:1. The area of Maharashtra will be much more extensive than that of Gujarat, one being about 73,000 square miles and the other 1,20,000 square miles or something like that. That is but natural because Maharashtra is a big State and it has from very ancient times been the centre of great dynamic activity. So also Gujarat made its mark in many fields in our country and we owe the progress that we have made in a large measure to the great leaders of revered memory which these two States produced along with the others, while we were encircled in gloom. They shed light when there was nothing but darkness. So, we have reasons to be grateful and if a solution is, as I hope, has been devised which will ensure to the credit of all of us and enable Gujarat and Maharashtra to rise to still

[Shri G. B. Pant]

greater heights for their own glory and for the glory of the country, then we have really reasons to congratulate ourselves.

Now, Sir, I gave you the figures of population and said something about the area. The smaller State of Gujarat that will be carved out of the bilingual State will consist of 17 districts including Dang, 50 villages, I think, of Umbergaon and 127 villages which now form part of Khandesh district. I need not enter into any argument about some of these matters. I understand that there are some differences of opinion but I can only appeal! let us view these problems in the spirit in which an attempt has been made to appreciate and to solve them. If that spirit is there, these minor little things will not be allowed to disturb the even and smooth surface which we have been able luckily to evolve out of disturbed conditions. That is all that I would say about the territorial part.

14.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Maharashtra consists of the rest of the bilingual State and as I have said it is naturally bigger in size and also in population. It has more districts and it will also include the State of Vidarbha.

I shall refer to the financial arrangements that have been made. About these financial arrangements too, in principle, there seems to be no difference. The desire that on the reorganisation of the two States, each one should be able to stand on its own legs and receive such co-operation and help from the other brother as may be necessary has been accepted. There were certain stages in this matter. It was accepted by this committee and the details were looked into by Shri Chavan and Dr. Jivraj Mehta, the two who have borne the brunt in this matter mostly. They decided that the deficit of

Gujarat, it being admitted by all that there was a deficit, should be met for six years and after that it would gradually taper off so that at the termination of ten years, nothing would be paid by Maharashtra to Gujarat.

Well, there was at one time, some difference about this deficit: as to what it actually came to. A committee was appointed consisting of experts in a way, under the chairmanship of Shri Bhattacharya to work out this deficit. The committee went into this matter and they were of different views. The Chairman did not express any opinion; he did not consider it very safe to be involved in the controversy, I think, while the members were evenly divided, so that, according to one sect the deficit came to something more than Rs. 9 crores while according to the other, the deficit would be about 4.32 crores in 61-62 and so on. As they could not agree, I had also to render such little assistance as I could in getting the matter examined by some other expert. So, we requested Shri Rangachari who was the Finance Secretary for a number of years and who has now gone to Bombay to look into the matter.

As the hon. Members may be aware, the main difference was over two items: amortization charges and the road fund. Shri Rangachari went into the whole matter and he said that the whole of the amortization charges could not be taken into account and the whole could not be included as a revenue deficit but the part for which contribution was essential under the terms of the loans might and should be treated as such and out of the road fund what was really spent, year by year, should be treated as being part of the revenue expenditure and that the rest should not be taken into account. On this basis the figures were revised, and according to the calculations made—the paper has already been circulated—the figures for the eleven months of 1960-

61 come to Rs. 601 lakhs, Rs. 613 lakhs for 1961-62 and so on, the figures tapering off later from 1963-64 to Rs. 585 lakhs, 1964-65—Rs. 561 lakhs, 1965-66—Rs. 526 lakhs, 1966-67—Rs. 432 lakhs, 1967-68—Rs. 339 lakhs, 1968-69—Rs. 208 lakhs, 1969-70—Rs. 113.8 lakhs. So the total for the first two years, rather the eleven months of the coming year and twelve months of the next year, comes to about Rs. 12.16 crores and that for the remaining period to Rs. 33.80 crores. But it was settled that so far as this assistance for the first two years was concerned it might be paid out of the amount that the Bombay State or the Maharashtra State would receive hereafter on account of income tax, customs etc., and for the remaining period the amount should be divided into two parts, one being paid in the form of securities and the other by way of reduction of liabilities of Gujarat. All this was to be settled on the appointed date. So fresh calculations were made so that interest might be deducted from the amounts that would be due later, and this amount was reduced from Rs. 33.80 crores to Rs. 28.39 crores. The total amount, net amount thus being payable would come to Rs. 40.55 crores.

These figures were based on the calculations of experts and the parties were good enough to accept them. Then, it was also agreed, and I think there has been no difference of opinion about that, that Gujarat would have to build a new capital and it must be helped there too. So about Rs. 10 crores would be given for that purpose.

So far as assets and liabilities go, the arrangement that was made by the Bhattacharya Committee was accepted by both States, or by the representatives of both, and so far as this payment is concerned it will be made out of the assets. So far as liabilities go, I think, perhaps, though no exact calculations have been made, 40 per cent would have to be borne by Gujarat—roughly round about that figure; I have asked an expert to look

into that—and 60 per cent. by Maharashtra. That is the rough outline that I can give of the financial arrangements.

Now, I have referred to the special features which called for mention here. There are other things which are always a normal accompaniment of all such measures; that is, the setting up of new legislatures, the provision for their representations in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. Well, hereafter the Maharashtra State will have 18 Members in the Rajya Sabha while Gujarat will have 11 Members. Maharashtra will have a Second Chamber too, but Gujarat will have only one House; it will not make any provision for any Second Chamber. As to the number of members of the Assemblies there, there will be 264 members of Maharashtra Assembly and 132 of the Gujarat Assembly.

The High Court of Gujarat will be set up as soon as the new State is formed, and judges will be provided for that purpose by the existing High Court of Bombay. So far as the Public Service Commission is concerned, Bombay will retain its Public Service Commission and Gujarat will have a Public Service Commission of its own.

I do not think, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that I should refer to other details. I feel that the whole Bill being in the hands of the hon. Members they can examine every proposal that is contained there. I can only say that so far as we are concerned we will try to implement the provisions of the policy statement that have been accepted by the Government of Bombay. We will also try to be of such service as we can be.

I can only again appeal to the hon. Members to apply themselves to this question in a spirit of brotherliness, comradeship, remembering that they had lived together for centuries, and even now no State can consist exclusively either of the people of Maharashtra or of the people of

[Shri G. B. Pant]

Gujarat. And, after all, what we all are and what we all have been able to claim for ourselves, is due to our being citizens of this great Union of India. So, let us all remember that these administrative arrangements do not affect the basic fundamentals on which we should stand. And while thinking of convenient arrangements for administration, let us remember that it is only through a spirit of comradeship and fellowship, through our giving the supreme and first place to the needs, to the demands, to the aspirations of India and of the common man, that we can really rise higher to do good to ourselves and to the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the State of Bombay and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely, Shri Shripad Amrit Dange, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Bhaurao Krishnarao Gaikwad, Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi, Shri Narayan Ganesh Goray, Shri Arun Chandra Guha, Shri R. M. Hajarnavis, Shri H. C. Heda, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, Shri Gulabrao Keshavrao Jedhe, Dr. Gopalrao Khedkar, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri Balantray Gopaljee Mehta, Shri Narendrabhai Nathwani, Shri Ghanshyam al Oza, Shri Shamrao Vishnu Parulekar, Kumari Maniben Vallabhbai Patel, Shri Nanubhai Nichhabhai Patel, Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel, Shri Uttamrao L. Patil, Shri Shivram Rango Rane, Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi, Shri M. Shankaraiya, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh, Shri M. S. Sugandhi, Shri N. R. M. Swamy, Swami Ramananda Tirtha, Shri Balkrishna Wasnik; and Shri Indulal Kanaiyalal Yajnik and 15 members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the

quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 14th April, 1960;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

Let me make it clear that those hon. Members who have been put on the Joint Committee should not ordinarily try to catch my eye, though perhaps exceptions might have to be made in the case of leaders of some groups.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): May I request that an exception be made in the case of Shri Goray?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he comes forward as a leader of a group, certainly, I shall do that.

So far as the time for this discussion is concerned, what is the desire of the House? We will be sitting up to 5 O'clock, or we might rise ten minutes earlier.

Some Hon. Members: 15 minutes earlier.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. I hope that hon. Members who have the opportunity to speak will be very concise because the Bill is being referred to the Joint Committee, and we will have further opportunities to discuss the Bill at the Joint Committee as well as here.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): Sir, this is a day which is a day of joy and pride for us in Maharashtra, for us in the Communist Party and should be such for all of us in this House. For Maharashtra it can be understood, for the simple reason that a linguistic State of Maharashtra is being born. For the Gujarat people also, it can be understood; for them a linguistic State of Gujarat is born. But when I mention about us in the party, I make reference to the fact that at one time we were accused of fomenting a strike which was unjustified and others following us were also abused as Communist, though the actual fact was that everybody in Maharashtra was united on this problem.

I said it should be a joy and pride for all of us here because for five years the fundamental principle of organisation of States stood violated most blatantly in the Constitution of the bilingual State. When I first entered this House in 1957, while speaking on the President's Address, myself and many of my friends did raise the problem: "What about linguistic States of Maharashtra and Gujarat?" At that time, I was most cruelly told that it was the law of the Parliament and "you just accept it and shut up shop". I said, "No, I will plead with you; I will argue with you and request you to change your mind and see that this fundamental principle of linguistic States' organisation is accepted by you." Then they said they wanted to know what the opinion of Maharashtra was, the opinion of the people of Maharashtra. Then we gave them the opinion. The elections were won under the auspices of an organisation called the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and a sort of plebiscite was taken which proved that a bilingual State was not wanted by anybody. Yet, unfortunately, three years have passed until the justice of our cause was accepted and until the leaders of the Congress Party came to the conclusion that it would be better to change the law as was passed and establish the

two States of Maharashtra and Gujarat.

I refer to that because it is always claimed that we should forget the old things. Well, I am not trying to dig up the quarrels, because, when these two States are being born, it is good to forget some of the quarrels and to begin a sort of a new page in history. But the past has been referred to, and sometimes a reference to the past helps our conduct in the future. In this case, it will be of help to the Congress Party to make them realise that all their acts, even, when they get the sanction of Parliament, are not always infallible or wise or in conformity with the interests of the people. By bringing in this Bill, my proposition has been proved, and I hope this sort of realisation will govern their conduct in the future also on other problems.

To call this Bill as the *Bombay Reorganisation Bill* is peculiar. It is a peculiar name. Perhaps under the Constitution that may be necessary, but here, the constitutionality or procedural matters hide a great fact that two States are being born, and not merely re-carved by putting, say, Ahmedabad this side and Kathiawar that side or Vidarbha this side or that side and so on. No. This Bill gives birth to two new States and justifies the principle that if democracy has to develop, then, to enable it to develop, the administration or the Statehood of that democracy must function on the basis of the language of the particular group of people. This principle was applied more or less consciously and sometimes unconsciously to other States, and we were certainly glad that other States like Uttar Pradesh, Bengal, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh, for instance, had their own linguistic States. But we had the misfortune of having a city amongst us whose wealth belonged dominantly to the members of a certain community and they had the fear that if this city was put in Maharashtra they would lose all their gains. Now, at least it is clear that these fears were un-

[Shri S. A. Dange]

founded and they have now reconciled themselves to the fact that Bombay city, by remaining in Maharashtra, does not deprive them of their wealth or trade or opportunity, because it is their national trait to trade. I do not call it as a sort of bad trait. It is good trait. One should learn to trade. They learnt to trade and they dominated trade. What is wrong?

But on the basis of that trait, on the basis of that art or craft, which they inherited from history—I do not know how they inherited—they made that craft and that trade, and that power of money to dictate to the powers that be to prevent the city from being aligned with its natural hinterland of the linguistic State of Maharashtra. That was what was undemocratic and dictatorial. The worst thing was that money dictated to Parliament the fate of Maharashtra and Gujarat for the last five years.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): May I know whether it is proper to say that money dictated to Parliament?

Shri S. A. Dange: Certain Members are not able to understand literature, comparisons and similies; what can I do?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even if certain Members do not understand, it is not proper to say "money dictated to Parliament". It would not be fair to say like that, whatever may be in his mind.

Shri S. A. Dange: Money dictated to those who made the policies, because the Reorganisation report itself says that certain people had certain anxiety about what would happen to their commercial interests in the city of Bombay if it went to Maharashtra. There is a reference in the States Reorganisation Report, of which, of course, my hon. friend must have some knowledge. In any case, so far as parliamentary language and etiquette are concerned, I will accept your ruling, though the sentiment is

correct that the policy was not so to say governed by any considerations of principle, but considerations of certain commercial interests. Now I am glad that that fear has vanished and the two States are now being born, with Bombay city in Maharashtra. Therefore, it is really a good day when Parliament ultimately comes to the conclusion of accepting that principle in practice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why should he anticipate what Parliament would do in this matter?

Shri S. A. Dange: When the hon. Home Minister puts it for acceptance, I am quite sure about that.

Therefore, I say it is the victory of a principle. But it would have been better if this principle would have been victorious without all the suffering of the people in Gujerat and Maharashtra. I hope we would later on forget the scars that were inflicted in Ahmedabad and Bombay and various other parts on the people who fought for the two different States being established and for the bilingual State being destroyed, constitutionally, of course.

But was all the suffering necessary—105 people being killed in Bombay and several being killed in Ahmedabad? I must say that though he belonged to a particular group or a community, the Home Minister was quite impartial in killing both Maharashtrais and Gujeratis. At least that impartiality was shown by him. However, with all that, was it at all necessary?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he forgetting all those things or remembering them?

Shri S. A. Dange: Remembering for future lessons.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): The Prime Minister of South Africa has referred to it.

Shri S. A. Dange: The motion by the South African Government of that incident is totally wrong, because this was not shooting by white imperialists against black labourers. The South African shooting which we denounced has no comparison with the shooting in Bombay and Ahmedabad. I may denounce Ahmedabad and Bombay shooting, but for that matter, I shall not allow it to be compared to the shooting in South Africa. So, the South African Government is totally wrong and what we did in this Parliament was perfectly correct. That is how I look at it.

When I welcome this Bill, I am only mentioning this fact that all the sacrifice and pain could have been avoided if this principle had been realised earlier and if that interest which led to the policies of the Congress Party would not have been allowed to run riot in the past, as it was allowed to do.

Coming to the Bill itself, I would, of course, reserve some more point for later discussion when the Joint Committee report comes, but I hope it is really a sign of fortune that the appointed day for the birth of the two new States is the 1st of May. Bombay city is in Maharashtra. The Bombay city's past and its reputation have been referred to by the Home Minister. I do not know what reputation he refers to, but I know Bombay city. Since 1908 the working class of Bombay has been fighting for independence and for its own rights and socialism, against the power of foreign domination and the power of native capital, both. The working class of this city is proud of its May days and it will certainly be very proud and very thankful to the Congress Ministry, if they do not later on change their opinion, that the State is being born on the international day of the working class, the 1st of May.

Referring to the Bill itself, so far as details are concerned, I might reserve for the Joint Committee, because I hope to argue with my friends and convince them about certain things which are incorporated here

and being done in a wrong way. I would not go into that. When this happy event is taking place, my sorrow is, even now it is not being done in such a way that no scar is left, no legacies of bitterness shall be continued in the relations of the two new States. It is not being done that way. I refer to nearly four points on which things are being done in a way which, in spite of our desire to forget things and develop the two States in a proper way, will lead to some trouble. They are already leading to some trouble. I do not know why it is being done.

I am glad the question of name has been resolved and the Bombay Assembly unanimously adopted the name of Maharashtra. But from the very beginning of the drafting of the Bill, the proposal to call the State of Maharashtra by the name of the city of Bombay was itself wrong. They on that side misinterpreted it or interpreted it as an attempt to deny the people of Maharashtra the memory of the history and culture of the Maharattas, their role in the literature and history of Maharashtra. But fortunately, the Bombay Assembly and the Chief Minister of Bombay were persuaded to see that the adoption of the name of Maharashtra was just and necessary and if it is not done, it might unnecessarily lead to a misunderstanding about the motives of reorganisation.

The second question was finance. I would not go into the intricacies of that. We in the Samiti itself were not averse to giving help to the Gujerat Budget, but it was conditioned by two things, that it should be a normal budget. We said, if there is a deficit, because you are a separate new State, for a normal budget, we would be prepared to share our things with you, as an elder brother might share something with his younger brother, when he sets up a new family. That sum was more or less agreed but was never put in a joint agreement. It was said it would

[Shri S. A. Dange]

not be more than Rs. 10 crores and that also if the States were established before 1960.

Shri P. R. Patel: May I know whether Rs. 10 crores was settled in the negotiations?

15 hrs.

Shri S. A. Dange: The negotiations did mention an amount. One condition was it should be a normal budget, not a budget which has got fantastic schemes. Another condition was that no flight of capital takes place from Maharashtra. We already hear rumbles of "All right; you have your city. We will see who runs your finances". That sort of thing was to be done away with and, therefore, we said that it should be a normal budget and there should be no flight of finance from the State of Maharashtra, and that was how it was to be settled. This provision for deficits and financial contributions ignores both these things. If you tell a man that "if you run into debts in your family, we shall meet all the debts", that man will never be without debts. If you tell a State "if you run into deficits, for the next ten years we will meet all the deficits" that State will never show a surplus budget for the next ten years. This is actually an invitation to start deficit budgets. This is fundamentally wrong in economics. I am not charging the Gujarat State or any particular community for it. No. It is inherent in the economic system that if one State is told "any deficit up to so much we will meet", it is finished and deficit is bound to occur. In fact, they will make it more. So, this in itself introduces a wrong notion in the formulation of the budget of Gujarat and will be harmful to them. Because, they will then be guided by this, that so many crores of rupees are always guaranteed for their deficit. Therefore, from their point of view, it is wrong. From our point of view also it is wrong. Therefore, this provision is not good.

Then there is the question of certain villages. We want to observe a

principle that villages having Marathi-speaking people should go to Maharashtra and that villages having Gujarati-speaking people should go to Gujarat. But this principle is being violated. And violated for what purpose? Sheerly for the purpose of taking away certain territories which some people want for their forest wealth, mineral wealth, this and that. This idea has very nicely, and perhaps unwittingly, crept into the description of this Schedule. Villages are claimed either for land, or people and so on and so forth, but naturally and fundamentally because they have got Gujarati people. Surely, take them away. But here in this list we find a village described, not because it has some people or anything, it is described because it has got forest coupes. I am referring to Dev Mogra-Gabi Umber in Nandurbar taluka. It is in that list, for what? Not because it has Gujarati people. Because, it has got forest village Coupe Nos. 1, 2 and 20 of felling series XX and Coupe Nos. 1 to 9 of felling series XXI." Is this a description of a linguistic division or grabbing of forest area despite the fact that it might contain Marathi-speaking people? The whole intention is revealed on page 33, in the description of one of the villages of Nandurbar taluka—Forest village coupe Nos. 1, 2 and 20 of felling series XX we want. This principle of re-allocating villages irrespective of the languages of the people but consideration being given to forest village coupe felling series is certainly not a democratic principle, nor in the spirit of any principle. Therefore, I would say this question of villages be re-considered on the basis of a principle that Marathi-speaking villages should go to Maharashtra and Gujarati-speaking villages should go to Gujarat.

Then there is the question of one district about which there is dispute whether it is Marathi or Gujarati. We think it is Marathi but they think it is Gujarati. We both may not be able to settle it. All right. Shri

Morarji Desai and the late Shri Kher settled it as a Marathi-speaking district and it was allocated to Maharashtra. Now it is allocated to Gujarat. What I propose is: appoint a commission if you want to reopen the question whether it is part of Maharashtra, as it was decided by Shri Morarji Desai. And Shri Morarji Desai is certainly not a protagonist or a lover of Maharashtra. May be he is a lover of Maharashtra in the sense he loves all India, but when it comes particularly to Maharashtrians, he may not be very much in love with them. But even he had to say that this is a Marathi-speaking area. If the question is to be reopened, reopen it through an impartial tribunal or some commission, give some principle to it and on the basis of a principle allocate it to Gujarat or Maharashtra and decide it. But no principle is being observed here for the simple reason that Dang has got wonderful forests and most of the forest wealth is in the hands of contractors coming over from the other side, that is, Gujarat, Surat and so on. That should not be the consideration for allocating villages or districts. Therefore, on this question of Dangs I am submitting the view-point which we hold and which many of us in the Samiti hold, or perhaps the whole of the Samiti hold. You might say the question of Dang was decided on the basis of an election. I do not think the Congress Ministry follows the verdict of elections, so far as re-allocation of territory is concerned. My hon. friend, Shri Datar, might jump but I cannot help mentioning Belgaum is a Marathi tract and it has been proved in a number of elections.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug): On a point of order. Maharashtra cannot intimidate Mysore like that. This Bill purely aims at the re-organisation of Bombay on the basis of the existing tracts of Bombay. It has nothing to do with the regions that are comprised now in the State of Mysore or what is happening there. So, any reference to

Belgaum or Mysore-Bombay dispute is outside the purview of this Bill and cannot be referred to.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think even the hon. Member who was speaking ever contested that position. He has only referred to re-organisation and nothing beyond it. But when he is making a mention of anything cursorily, though it is not strictly pertinent to it, if he briefly mentions it, we ought not to be allergic to it. It is not very material.

Shri S. A. Dange: I thank the hon. Member for giving me a little rest. I mentioned this question only in relation to the acceptance of verdict of elections. I am not raising the question just now of Belgaum or anything. That we might, later on. If the question is of the verdict in the Dang local board election, then I would tell them that this principle should be applied elsewhere also. They should have applied that principle to Maharashtra three years ago. Therefore, they should not stand by the claim that they are guided by the verdict of the electorate, so far as Dang district is concerned.

Fourthly, they are doing injustice to us by claiming villages in West Khandesh which, later on, are supposed to be submerged under irrigation water. Before water has sunk them, this Bill sinks them. There is no reason, why that should be done. Water has not been impounded, the villages are not destroyed, land has not yet been taken over for digging canals so that irrigation water may flow to Gujarat. But, before that, the villages are handed over. And today experts are still not united on the question whether Ukai dam is necessary at all and, if so, whether it should be done in the way it is done. So, why this hurry? If this water is there and, later on, you want to claim that land and the water will engulf that land, by all means take it away, but not just now. Not only that, they want a two-mile area round that lake which should form part of

[Shri S. A. Dange]

the Ukai dam. Could the two-mile area villages be occupied only by Gujarat? Why? Are we hostile States, independent sovereign States with two armies so that from even now on they should guard that lake for irrigation and they must have a four-mile security area like as Saar was handed over to Germany? This two-mile area is occupied by Marathi-speaking people. There is no question about that and there is no quarrel on that score. If the people on the two-mile area, who are Marathi, have to vacate when the construction work is taken up, by all means it can be done when necessary. Are we Indians going to quarrel about the sharing of waters? I do not think. We do not stand for such quarrels as to whether the river here or there should be dammed and the water should be given to this or the other State. Certainly, it is unscientific, undemocratic and anti-Indian.

An. hon. Member: If you are so generous, why not you give us the whole of Nawapur district?

Another hon. Member: What more things do you require?

Shri S. A. Dange: It is not a question of generosity that I am raising here.

An. hon. Member: It is mischievous.

Shri S. A. Dange: The question is why they are claiming Marathi villages. If it is a question of generosity then one might ask that Poona city be in Gujarat.

Shri Goray: Is "mischief" parliamentary?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not desirable to use it, though I do not rule it out as unparliamentary. Sometimes it is used in Parliament as well, though it should not be used so lightly.

Shri S. A. Dange: Therefore, on this question I hope the Joint Com-

mittee and the House will pay detailed attention as to whether this sort of separate area is to be created and the Marathi people near the canal lake should be put in another State, making it a troublesome affair. In the Umbergaon taluka also the majority of villages which they are getting is correct. I have no objection about that. But there are some villages which are purely Marathi-speaking and I do not know why they are taking them away. Perhaps I am wrong in saying why they are taking them away. I should say why they are being given under this Bill to the State of Gujarat. You can see the map and you will find that they are contiguous to Marathi territory. There is no reason why they should be allocated to the Gujarat State. The reason can be found, but I think the reasons are very well known to most people. In the House, later on after the Joint Committee discusses and takes the whole question into consideration, we shall deal with them in detail. Just now I do not want to do it.

All these five points, out of which the problem of name of Maharashtra is resolved—thanks for that—but all these problems, namely, finance, the border areas, Ukai, Dangs and the two-mile stretch and later on, when this Bill is passed, if my hon. friend on the other side will allow me to raise the question of Belgaum—all these points are what I say residuary problems. A residuary problem is being left. The residuary part of Bombay State is being transferred to Gujarat and a residuary part of the troubles is being transferred to Maharashtra. That is the whole problem.

What I would say is that let there be no residuary problem anywhere. Let there be a straight State of Gujarat and a straight State of Maharashtra. Let these problems be resolved not on the basis of prejudice—I do not make any claim on the basis of

any prejudice—not on the basis of any claims of this State or that, but on the basis of principle regarding Marathi-speaking villages, finance, two-mile stretch of villages Marathi-speaking, the necessity of irrigation etc. If it is necessary take it. I will have absolutely no objection. I am not prepared to quarrel with the State of Gujarat on the question of impounding of water for irrigation provided it is done by mutual agreement.

What is noticed here is so much distrust and fear that even this six years' deficit is being taken in advance. One does not know if the Congress Ministry was afraid that the next State of Maharashtra will not have a Congress Ministry, so they wanted to have the whole contribution paid in advance, lest the other Government which might belong either to the Samiti—perhaps it may not belong to the Samiti as my hon. friend of the PSP do not want the Samiti to continue.....(Interruption). They are right. They are saying that since the goal is achieved why continue the traditions of democracy and fight and all that? So, this is all right. Apart from that, if it is not Samiti it may be somebody else or it may not be somebody else. But are they afraid of that so that in advance they take all these funds and transfer the securities and so on in advance, take the area that is to be impounded by water in advance, take the two-mile areas? Is this not being rather suspicious whether in the next State of Maharashtra the gentlemen who framed the Bill and proposed it will at all be in power or not? If they are not, I shall be happy. There is no doubt about that. But then that happiness is not going to come to me perhaps so soon. But that shows the distrust. Therefore I would again plead with them that this approach of distrust should be given up.

Lastly I would say that let me make a reservation. This problem is not a problem between Gujarat and Maharashtra. I would tell the

House that this problem is not as if it was a battle or a hostile relation between the two people of Gujarat and Maharashtra. No, it is not. It was a fight for a fundamental principle of democratic constitution of States and that it is easier for the masses to talk in their language with the Government than to talk in four languages or in some other language. This principle is now accepted. Therefore we fought for the linguistic States. It was the principle with the Congress also. But, as I said, it was being violated for certain reasons. However now it is being corrected. But let me not sow an illusion. Let us take this as a victory of a principle. But I shall make it very clear that I do not think that the mere establishment of two linguistic States is going to resolve all the problems of the State. Just as the problems of Bengal are not resolved because it is a linguistic State or the problems of U.P. are not resolved because it is linguistic or of Kerala or Tamilnad because it is linguistic, the fundamental problems of Maharashtra, of the people's life, their economy, development, rights of democracy, services and so on cannot be resolved by the simple recarving of the two States on linguistic basis. That will only be a stepping stone. That problem will have to be resolved afterwards by a greater effort for economic re-organisation, for giving real democratic right to the working class and the peasantry and solving all those problems that we have posed in the Second Five Year Plan and are posing in the Third Five Year Plan. But the working of that will be facilitated if we have a proper re-organisation of the two States without leaving a legacy of these border problems, financial problems and such other problems.

Therefore when I was talking about 'joy and pride of achieving something' which unfortunately was denied to the State, I cannot exaggerate the content of this event. That is necessary in order to caution us, otherwise all future development of

[Shri S. A. Dange]

the two States will always take a departure from the quarrel. No. The fundamental satisfaction that both the States exist now is there and in so far as that is concerned the major problem is resolved even if minor bickerings persist. The fundamental achievement of the greatest solution of the biggest problem that existed in the last ten years is there. It is good. But at the same time this problem will not resolve all the other problems. To resolve those problems the way is not to start with provisions, safeguards on this and that.

For example, why the introduction of safeguards for Bombay's special rights—it is not in the Bill as such, but by statements and so on—Bombay's minorities by some special constitutional provision and if not by that then by some statement which will be binding? The guarantee of the minorities in the City of Bombay exists by the very fact that in its population, the most dominant, the most determining factor is the working class. The working class in the factory or in the city is neither Marathi nor Gujarati nor anything else. It is a whole class, made of several people coming from various parts of the country, speaking different languages but understanding one principle that of fighting for its rights against capitalism and heading towards socialism. Will such a working class they forget their minorities? The Malayalis, Keralites, Tamils—all of them when they go on a strike for the defence of their living, against high costs, high prices and so on, they forget all linguism, all their differences and act as one man which sometimes those who have not seen those classes in action and who perhaps do not like this class in action may not appreciate as also its importance. But this class is the guarantee of the protection of the minorities. Therefore it is wrong to introduce such guarantees and not rely on the traditions of the City of Bombay headed by the working class.

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

Shri S. A. Dange: Therefore it is guaranteed that the minorities will be safe, their trading interests, their service interests will be safe, but I am not sure whether it is healthy to make separate provisions.

The Akola Pact at least in the matter of High Courts is being guaranteed by statements. That will be guaranteed..... (*Interruption*).

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): No Akola Pact.... (*Interruption*).

Shri S. A. Dange: On that also, excuse me for taking a minute more. The problems of Marathwada, Vidarbha and the development of Maharashtra areas certainly is a problem which the Marathi State will have to look into because some areas are developed very fast, some have been kept backward by tradition. Marathwada under Nizam could never get a proper irrigation work. It will be the duty of the new State to see that it does help Vidarbha which, for example, certainly lacks in certain things. It should be developed. But uneven development is not cured merely by the fact that you make a separate State or an integrated State. Uneven development is taking place as a result of the capitalist structure in the Plan, some factories being grabbed because they are concentrated around one area or when they have one factory they want to make it into two, three, four or five. The gravitating power of monopoly capital in India is making for uneven development and therefore comes discontent from Tamilnad as to why not a steel plant for them or from somebody else as to why not a steel plant for them. This uneven development cannot be resolved merely by talking of linguistic areas or by talking of safeguards or by mentioning Vidarbha against Marathwada. This can become a fact only by curing the source, that is the power of monopoly grabbing many

resources of factories and all that in certain areas just because they have a tradition. I do accept that Vidarbha, Marathwada and Maharashtra should have an integrated even development, services, trade, factories, establishments and so on. But this even development will follow if proper democratic principles of economy and of outlook of social m. exist in the new State. That I do not know whether it will or it will not. So far as the Congress Ministry is concerned, I am quite sure that the Chief Minister of Bombay has been helpful in one respect that when the question came to him, "Have you succeeded in running the bilingual State?" Then he was honest enough to say, "I cannot say that it has succeeded." The man, who had worked the bilingual State despite the vehement condemnation of millions of people, had ultimately to come to a point saying, "No, it has not succeeded." That was a help and I do not know whether that sort of approach will develop further in realising the needs of Maharashtra and whether the new Ministry, which will be naturally under his leadership, will take the road of democratic relation between Gujarat and Maharashtra and correct all that may be uneven in our development and lead to a proper solution of all the problems.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Goray. He may also have that exception. But I would request the hon. Member to be brief.

Shri Goray: I shall try to be as brief as possible.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: After him, I will be calling the representatives of Gujarat.

Shri Goray: If they want to speak now, I have no objection. I will speak afterwards.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No; the hon. Member may speak.

Shri Goray: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, today when we are called upon to discuss this reorganisation Bill I think it would be very proper to pay

my humble homage to those in Gujarat and Maharashtra who sacrificed even their lives for the achievement of these two uni-lingual States. It may be that their names will be forgotten, but I must say that if they had not made the supreme sacrifice it would not have been possible for us who are only their mouthpieces to persuade Parliament to come to this decision.

I listened with great attention and respect to the speech of the hon. the Home Minister and I could not help having the feeling that how much better it would have been if the effort that is being made to satisfy the Gujarati-speaking and the Marathi-speaking people today would have been made three years back. This is one of the would-have-beens of history which always mock us from a distance and which always prove now short-sighted the powers that can be. Then the Home Minister told us in great detail the background of this reorganisation Bill. I would like to submit that we also can trace the history how this particular Bill has come before us. But that history will not be very palatable. I can only say this at this moment that when the Congress Party recognised that their effort to make a success of the bilingual State was not likely to succeed, they changed their attitude and now one is surprised to find that it is they who are claiming the credit for ushering in the two uni-lingual States of Bombay and Gujarat.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): Is there any doubt about it?

Shri Goray: You may not have doubts because you are from Punjab. But we who come from Maharashtra and Gujarat have our doubts because we happen to know the facts. Not only the present Finance Minister but even the Chief Minister of Bombay had told us that this bi-lingual State of Bombay has come to stay and the other hon. Minister who is unfortunately not here—Shri S. K. Patil who always indulges in hyperboles—went to the extent of saying that not only

[Shri Goray]

within five year, not only within 500 years, not till the sun and the moon are in the sky, the city of Bombay is going to be given to Maharashtra, Shri Patil is still there on the same seat and I am very glad that this thing has come to the House and very soon from the 1st of may we shall have two States. I would only say this. In future let our Government be more foresighted, more tolerant, more responsive to the wishes of the people. Otherwise, a day may come when like the other Ministers even my hon. friend the Minister of State Shri Datar will have to get up and say—like the Chief Minister of Bombay—"From the beginning I was of the opinion that Belgaum should go to Maharashtra."

As regards the Bill, I would confine myself to a few points because I will have ample opportunity to submit my point of view as I am a member of the Joint Committee.

Regarding the name of Maharastra, I would like to say to this House this particular name is not our invention at all. This is not a new-fangled name. It has been there for the last 800 years. I would also like to say that this particular name and the extent of the territory is mentioned by the great saint the founder of Mahanubha sect, Chakradhar who incidentally came from Gujarat. For the information of my veteran colleague Dr. Aney I would translate what Chakradhar has said. Defining the extent of Maharashtra, he says:

"The marathi-speaking division south of Phalatan.

To the north another division upto Balaghat.

The third between the banks of Godavari and Krishna.

From there upto Mehekar another division.

From there the whole of Berar is one more.

But all this is called Maharashtra."

This is what he said 800 years back. Therefore, when we say that Vidarbha

should not be separated from Maharashtra, when we say that the entire Marathi-speaking people of this country should come together and they should be known as Maharashtra State, it is not something that can be called chauvinistic. This word 'Maharashtra' has been there for the the last 800 years when Bombay was not even known and, therefore, I would say that this House should have no misgiving at all that in asking that this new State be called 'Maharashtra' State we are trying to revive some aggressive or imperialistic ideas. It is not so.

Shri S. A. Dange: He also said, "You should live in Maharashtra."

Shri Goray: Yes. I did not want to praise my State very much. But that is what Chakradhar said: "If you want to live at all in any territory, it is the territory of Maharashtra."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It was so at that time.

Shri Goray: Yes, at that time. The old people were wiser as they always are.

Shri Mahagaonkar (Kolhapur): Same can be said even today.

Shri Goray: Having said about the name, I would deal with the assurance which was given in the Bombay Legislative Assembly by the Chief Minister to the people of Vidarbha and Marathwada. There seems to be a feeling that this assurance is not enough. What has been said as a statement of policy of the Government of Bombay or of the Government that is going to come after the bifurcation, should be incorporated in the Act itself. I do not know how far it will be possible to do so, but if it is possible, I would say that certainly it should be incorporated, so that the people of Vidarbha and Marathwada will have a definite assurance, and they will have confidence, that what is promised today will not be broken tomorrow. Because we do not have to have anything underhand, we do not

want to hide anything from the people of Viderbha and Marathwada, we want to give them an assurance which will be taken as an assurance by them that whatever is possible will be done to preserve their prestige, to see that they are properly developed and to keep the great name of Nagpur intact. Therefore, I would say that this assurance should be, if possible, incorporated in the Act itself.

About the protection of minorities in the City of Bombay, I think a good deal of fuss is being made. One of the former Ministers of this Government had made a statement that there seemed to be in Delhi some sort of antagonistic or suspicious feeling about the intentions of the Maharashtrians. I would like to ask what sort of guarantees have been given to the minorities in a city like Calcutta, in a city like Bangalore. What sort of guarantees have been given to the majority in a city like Bangalore? Because in Bangalore it is not the Kannadigas who are in majority but people belonging to other languages. If they can do without guarantees, without assurances, if their interests are safe, whether they are in a minority or a majority. . . .

Shri Sugandhi (Bijapur North): What about the temperament of the Kannadigas and the Maharashtrians?

Shri Goray: . . . I do not know why any special assurances and guarantees are necessary in a city like Bombay. I would go further and point out to my hon. friends that, if it is really a question of temperament, there are any number of village and towns and cities in Maharashtra where, even if you wanted to protect the minorities, it will not be possible to do so if the majority community is not ready to protect them. In the farthest corners of Maharashtra, you will find in the villages a single non-Maharashtrian plying his trade, a Muslim, a Gujarati, a Marwari, and I am proud of it. I am not saying I am doing something extraordinary, but I am saying this because you accuse me and say that in the city of Bombay

certain assurances must be given to a community which is so dominant, which is so well organised, which is so enlightened and educated, otherwise they will not feel confident. Therefore, please do not introduce this idea of giving assurances to minorities in big cities like Bombay or Calcutta or Madras, because these cities will grow further and new, cities will be coming up with the development of the country, round about your new steel and fertiliser plants, and they will always be cosmopolitan, they will not be confined only to the residents of that particular area or only people speaking one language. There will be Tamils, Keralites, Andhras, Maharashtrians, there will be other people, and therefore, if you once introduce this particular idea of giving assurances, then I think there will be hundreds of cities in the whole of the country where such assurances will be demanded and will have to be given.

My hon. friend Shri Dange has dealt with the question of the territories, particularly the villages that have been given to Gujarat and the areas like the area in West Khandesh which are being incorporated in the new State of Gujarat. But the clarification I would like to ask is: what is the principle behind it? Even the Chief Minister of Bombay was at a loss to know how to defend it.

So far as Dangs is concerned, we are told the District and Local Board elections were fought on this issue and that Congress which was for incorporating Dangs in Maharashtra lost them—that is a section of the Congress. It was an election between two factions of the Congress, it was not the Samiti versus Congress. It was one Congress group against another.

Shri P. B. Patel: Shri Hiray was there.

Shri Goray: Yes, Shri Hiray was there, and most probably he will be a Minister in the next Cabinet.

So, it was one section of the Congress against another section of the Congress, and if you really investigate

[Shri Goray]

the matter, you will find no mention of giving Dangs to Gujarat or Maharashtra in the election manifesto of either section. But they say the District and Local Board elections have gone against you, and therefore it is given to Gujarat. All right.

But why are Umbergaon and all other villages being given to Gujarat? They say the Gram Panchayats have passed resolutions like that. Remember Umbergaon and all these villages are in Thana District, but the Thana District and Local Board election are not to be taken into account, but now it is village-wise Gram Panchayat resolutions.

From there you go to West Khandesh. There they say because the Ukai dam is going to be constructed and the catchment area will extend over so many villages, all these must be in Gujarat, otherwise the construction of the dam may not go on smoothly—another reflection on the Maharashtrians.

Shri Sugandhi: What about Ghataprabha? You prevented us from constructing a dam at Hadalga.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should have some patience.

Shri Goray: I would like to ask them to stick to one principle. From the very beginning the Samiti had demanded, and when there was no Samiti the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad under the leadership of Shri Shankar Rao Deo had demanded, that the village should be the unit, and that the next consideration should be contiguity, and they had said that if a line was drawn according to these principles, they would accept the award wherever the line be.

In Khandesh also, I am telling you, you are introducing a very dangerous principle, that if the catchment area of a particular dam is in another State, the whole of that area must be given to the State which is going to utilise the water. It will lead to a

very sorry state of affairs in this country, because we are going to have a number of dams and most probably the catchment area will be in one State and the utilisation of the irrigation potential will be in the other State. This is another principle which you need not have introduced; you have introduced it, but it is a very dangerous thing to do. Therefore, I would request you to consider this question dispassionately.

I am not saying this because I am a Maharashtrian. Tomorrow there may be a catchment area in Gujarat and the waters may be used by Rajasthan. It is quite possible. Does it mean that Rajasthan should claim all the territory, all the villages and also two miles around that catchment area? Are we going to have a sort of treaty as that between Nepal and China or India and China that for 20 K. M. there will be no military sentry, or anything of that sort? Therefore, I say that while you are trying to allay the suspicions, to do away with the discontent that has been simmering for such a long time which sort of bedevilled our lives in Gujarat and Maharashtra for the last three years, please do not introduce new spots of discontent. Let there be some common rule, whether it is the case of Dangs or Umbergaon Taluka or Khandesh or even the question between Mysore and Bombay. When you are creating a new state of Maharashtra and dealing with one frontier, you are neglecting the other. Therefore, I would plead once more: let not the Government be compelled once again after two or three years to come to this House and say that now they are going to adjust the boundaries between Mysore and Bombay. When you are having a comprehensive legislation like this, please be really comprehensive, be far-sighted, see where the danger spots are and prepare in such a manner that the danger spots are removed, if not removed at least minimised. That is what I said when I spoke last time here, that the tensions should be reduced to the minimum. That is a point that I would

like to stress again.

Regarding the financial arrangements, I do not want to enter into details, but I would only point out this, that so long as Bombay State continued as it is today, the Kutch area was the responsibility of the Centre. It is the Centre which is aiding that area. Before Saurashtra was merged with the Bombay State, also, you would find that Saurashtra was helped by the Centre. Then, Saurashtra was tacked on to the Bombay State, and now Kutch will be again tacked on to the Gujarat State, and you are throwing the whole responsibility of making good their deficits, i.e., the deficits of the Saurashtra districts, as well as the deficit of Kutch, on Maharashtra. I do not know why this should be done. I do not know why this should be done. You should be able to convince us as to why this is being done. I am not going to reveal any secret when I say that when I asked the Chief Minister of Bombay as to why this was done, he said, well, there are no principles involved but it was a package deal. It was a sort of compromise. He says here also that you must be ready for give-and-take. But who gives and who takes? It is all 'give' on one side, and all 'take' on the other.

An hon. Member: That is what the hon. Member thinks.

Shri Goray: Let my hon. friend convince me. I say that you must go by certain principles. I am pleading only for this that whether it is financial adjustments between Gujarat and Maharashtra, or it is territorial adjustment between Maharashtra and Gujarat, or whether it is a question of giving protection to the minorities, everywhere, you should show us where else this principle has been followed. Are these principles a special set of principles only made applicable to the division of Gujarat and Maharashtra? Why should that be so? It leaves a bad taste in our mouth. We feel that we are unnecessarily being differentiated.

23 (A) LSD-6.

Shri P. R. Patel: Why was it discussed between the Samyukt Maharashtra Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Parishad?

Shri Goray: Therefore, I would say that whatever arrangements you want to come to, please invite all these people. It is very curious that when this particular question was taken up, and when the whole thing was discussed, it was only discussed amongst the Congress people, as if we people who agitated for it and who sacrificed for it, did not matter at all.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): A domestic affair.

Shri Goray: That I am saying is that even the people from Gujarat or Maharashtra, who belonged to the opposi. side should also have been consulted and told, this is what we are going to do.

There is another very curious thing, that in this city, they are going to have a big celebration on the 1st of May, when the two new States will be coming into existence. When I got the invitation card, I found that the names of the organisers were there, but it contained names of people who had nothing to do with this Samyukta Maharashtra thing. I found that the name of Dr. Keskar was there. I am very glad, for, I know now how happy he is going to be that Maharashtra is coming. I found even Shrimati Alva's name.

An hon. Member: She is from Maharashtra.

Shri Goray: I know. But none of us is there. Even on such an occasion when people are trying to forget, and our Home Minister is telling us to forget all the animus and be as brothers, we are not treated as brothers. Because we asked for Samyukta Maharashtra and we are getting it now, the Congress people come forward and say, it is we who

[Shri Goray]

brought it about, therefore, you get aside; we cooked food, but when it comes to serving the food, they occupy all the seats, and say, now, you can stand outside like an untouchable, and after we have eaten, we shall throw some leaves, at you. If this is the attitude with which you are going to introduce Samyukta Maharashtra, I say that this is not going to succeed. That does not mean that I am giving you a threat; but that does not mean that you are not sincerely making an effort to weld the whole Marathi opinion into one, or the whole Gujarati opinion into one.

Shri P. R. Patel: I think a *morchha* will be there. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those hon. Members also will celebrate all that.

Shri Goray: All that I am pleading for is more sanity, a little far-sightedness and a little more responsive attitude to the wishes of the people.

In the end, I would only make a reference to what Shri S. A. Dange said. He said that the P.S.P. was eager to break the Samiti. Yes, that is true, because we think that the Samiti has served its purpose. We do not want to keep the Samiti going, even when it has served its purpose, because it suits Shri S. A. Dange to have a united front. Shri S. A. Dange has been a pastmaster in the game of united fronts. All the Communist Parties everywhere have been having united fronts. But we have not been blind.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: But you fell a prey to them.

Shri Goray: I would tell you that it was so because the question of Samyukta Maharashtra did not allow of any differences.

Shri D. E. Chavan (Karad): These were internal quarrels.

Shri Goray: You know that even the Congress was one of the parties which was demanding Samyukta Maharashtra, and that is why the Chief Minister has said here that he was for Samyukta Maharashtra but because of the party whip he could not do anything. So, if the Congress people also had not left, the Samiti would have consisted not only of Shri Dange but also of people like Shri Sankar Rao Deo and Shri Yeshwant Rao Chavan. That was exactly what my socialist friends did not appreciate. Therefore, you got yourself left out, and now you are smarting under the defeat.

Therefore, what I am saying is that we are not ready to oblige Shri S. A. Dange at all. The Samiti has served its purpose. That is what we feel. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That jubilation must not spill over.

Shri Goray: On such an important Bill as this, which is really going to turn a new leaf in the history of Gujarat and Maharashtra, when we really want to live as brothers, not as two hostile camps poised against each other, you should help us in bringing about that brotherly feeling. You should bring that feeling into existence by sticking to certain principles, not only as between Gujarat and Maharashtra but also as between Maharashtra and Karnataka.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): I have no hesitation in expressing my sense of joy and thankfulness at seeing the Bill introduced by the hon. Home Minister for dividing the Bombay State and for setting up the two States of Gujarat and Maharashtra. Let me also, like my hon. friend Shri Gorav, pay my tribute and homage to the boys and young men who sacrificed their lives in the cause of Maharashtra, and also those who sacrificed their lives in Bombay and elsewhere for setting up the unilingual State of Maharashtra.

May I say that the vision and the ideal of Maha Gujarat, of the separate unilingual State of Gujarat had not been propagated by us so far, till 1956. But it had been propagated by the Congress leaders and Ministers who went round praising the Bill that was on the anvil in the Lok Sabha for the division of the present Bombay State into three States. Thousands of receptions were held and garlands given in honour of Congressmen and leaders who went from town to village, to urban and rural areas, praising the great day of the installation of the new State of Maha Gujarat. Something turned up in August 1956 and the cup was spilled in sands. The young men who got this vision of Maha Gujarat from their elders and from their respected Congress leaders gathered together before the (Ahmedabad) Congress House, resulting in the holocaust that is well known. The sacrifice of these men started a chain reaction of disturbances, of lathi charges, of tear gas bombs and all that. I may also say that it is that sacrifice of these precious lives that has inspired not only me and my colleagues but hundreds and thousands of the people of Gujarat to suffer and sacrifice and to exert themselves for the setting up of a unilingual State.

I need not refer to all the events that have happened which pass today in a cavalcade before our eyes. But I must mention one thing. That was the homage, the martyrs' memorial that was sought to be placed—that was, in fact, placed—at the site of martyrdom in August 1958, which was cruelly removed by the hands of the Government police. That, again, started trouble and disturbances followed by a smarak satyagraha which continued for ten months and more.

We are happy to see that all that trouble and tribulations that have been our lot have not been in vain. Even when the Prime Minister, who is loved and respected all over the land, came to Gujarat, we had no hesita-

tion in holding parallel meetings not out of disrespect towards him, but to show him the depth of our feeling for the unilingual State. Anyhow, we are happy that during the last three years and more at least the Government of India and the Government of Bombay were ultimately convinced of the utility of continuing this bilingual State, and with the help of the Congress elders and Ministers, ultimately a Bill has been drafted now to divide the State of Bombay into two unilingual States.

While we are happy at this event, we cannot suppress an unheard note in our throats. I may assure you that while the people of Gujarat are waiting for the day of the inauguration of their new State after nearly 400 years of different kinds of rule, they cannot get over the pain that has been felt in their hearts over the shootings and the killings that have happened in Gujarat. We may waive the demand for a judicial inquiry into the firings in 1956. We may not want any confession of error or of sorrow by Congress leaders or Ministers. But is it not possible for us to light a lamp or to raise a modest memorial to our beloved martyrs at the place of their martyrdom? Why should Government come in the way, as the Chavan Government—the Bombay Government—have come in the way? Is it possible for the Gujarat State and the Gujarat Government to do away with the obstacle that has been raised in setting up a martyrs' memorial? My Committee, while it has decided to dissolve itself within one month after the setting up of the new State, has also commissioned me to appeal to the Government of India at this great hour of history to use their good offices with the new Governor of Gujarat and the new Government of Gujarat in removing the obstacle and the prohibition in setting up this martyrs' memorial not only in Ahmedabad, but also in Nadiad, Kalol and Dabhoi, the places where our young men have been shot down.

I quite understand the policy of the Government to pacify the people of

[Shri Yajnik]

Gujarat and Maharashtra, to inaugurate a new era of peace and concord in this troubled State. But I may say that the resentment and the anger and frustration are growing deep at the heart of the people of Gujarat. After all, the law is paper and parchment. Something should be done. Some gesture is required from the Governments—the Government of India and the Government of Gujarat—to remove the resentment and the anger from the hearts of the people so that they might very happily co-operate with the new Government in making a success of the new State.

I am very happy that this Bill is being referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses. It was rightly pointed out by my hon. friends that up till now we had no opportunity to deal with this matter at all. The Sanyukta Maharashtra Samiti and the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad had naturally taken a leading part in promoting agitation and discontent and in voicing the feelings of the people in both the States against the bilingual set-up. Unfortunately, the Congress by itself took a decision and appointed a 9-man Committee which took the decision to have a Bill brought forward. We were not associated with this. Then the Congress Working Committee took a decision. We were glad of the decision. But we were sorry that we were kept away all the time.

The Bill was before the Bombay Legislature. It was discussed there. It was understood before that the Bill was to be rushed through the House. I am very glad that the Bill is being referred to the Joint Committee in order to thrash out all differences of opinion on questions arising out of the division of the bilingual State.

My hon. friends have referred to the questions. I rather hesitate to say much on these vexed questions that have been raised by both the hon. Members who preceded me. I

hope that these questions will be considered in a spirit of sobriety and give and take by the Members of the Joint Committee who will meet to consider these matters. But I cannot allow this opportunity to go without making a passing reference to the questions that have been raised.

It has been argued that the decision embodied in the Bill have been arrived at without reference to any principle at all. I think it is not true to say that. We know that the hon. Home Minister has been associated with the Committee and with this decision, and I have it from the testimony of friends that he has taken very great pains in seeing the gulf between the two sides bridged as well as possible.

Take Dangs, for instance. The principle of democracy is there. 600 Marathi-speaking people were suddenly increased to 46,000 in the census of 1951. Obviously, it was under the influence of the *diktat* that was given by Shri Morarji Desai and Shri Kher.

Shri D. R. Chavan: He was a party to that agreement.

Shri Yajnik: Yes, he was a party to that agreement. But anyhow, the census report is obviously not reliable, because 600 people could not suddenly increase to 45,000 or 46,000.

16 hrs.

An hon. Member: Intense reproduction! (Interruptions).

Shri Yajnik: Apart from that, there have been three successive elections. It is not a fault of the Gujarati or the Maharashtrian people if the results of the elections have been taken at their face value. In Belgaum my friends of the Maharashtra Samiti are fighting for the inclusion of Belgaum specifically on the basis of their victory at the elections in Belgaum. I told them, if your victory at the elections in Belgaum gives you the right

to include Belgaum in Maharashtra, why should not Gujarat be able to include village people. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Yajnik: Why should not Gujarat be able to include the Dangs area where three successive elections have been fought over the question of its inclusion one way or the other, in Gujarat or Maharashtra? There was Shri Naranbhaj who fought the election in 1952. He again fought the election in the Dangs areas and got 10,000 out of 14,000 votes. So far as the local board election is concerned, there is nothing secret about it. It was made absolutely plain like higestaff by Shri Hiray, who represents the leadership of the Congress in the Nasik area. He said that these elections will decide the future of Dangs.

At that very moment I was, on behalf of the Mahagujarat Janata Parishad, discussing the future of Dangs with the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. At that time we could not come to any agreement. It was stated, nevertheless, that as the Gujarat side itself was not contented with the dicta of Shri Morarji Desai the question should be re-opened. It was left at that.

I pleaded before the Samiti friends that looking to everything, looking to geography, looking to the history, looking to its administration by Gujarat agency of Baroda all these years, looking to all that and looking to the trade routes and the geographic conditions, Dangs should be merged in Gujarat. They did not come to any decision. That is to say, we could not come to a joint decision in the matter. But, it was agreed that it should be left open. We then worked at this problem in our own ways, and then the election was fought. It was known to everybody that the election was being fought on this basis; and the election gave results, startling results; and the results were 26 to 4. Obviously, if you set any store by the results of the elections, here is a case, I humbly submit, for the inclusion of Dangs in Gujarat.

Then, there is the question of Umbergaon. Umbergaon again comes into the picture only on account of certain villages. The other villages are not disputed. Some 16 villages, I understand, are being disputed. Mind you, I was the first to take the initiative in bridging the gulf between Maharashtra and Gujarat beforehand; and, therefore, we had two meetings between the Parishad and the Samiti. So far as other areas, except Dangs, are concerned, we agreed to go by the Pataskar formula, as it was called. Now, Pataskar Formula means, going by the language of the people and taking the village as the unit.

I claim that so far as Umbergaon is concerned, the village has been taken as the unit and the language of the people has been looked into. The Parsis who came there about 900 or 1000 years ago have erected a monument at a place in Umbergaon taluka in which they say that they were given refuge and assistance by a Gujarati King who ruled there. The Parsis carry on the continuity in that area. The Maharashtra families there are few and far between. Among the other people, there is a large bulk of Gujarati people.

Of course, the Worlis constitute the majority. But then the Worlis are divided into two parts. There are the Davar Worlis, one of whom has been elected a Member of the Legislative Assembly. He fought the Samiti candidate. There are the other Worlis who have more in common with the Worlis of Dahanu. Therefore, I am not for closing the discussion because the matter has got to be discussed by the Joint Committee. I only want to point out that it is not being done without rhyme or reason. The question of language and the question of the desire of the people of the village has been looked into. What does a panchayat decision mean? When the panchayat passes a resolution and decides to live with the Gujarati people, it means that it is the decision of the people of the village to include the Dangs..... (*Interruptions*).

[Shri Yajnik]

Look to the number of boys in the schools. If you look at the number of boys in the schools you will find an overwhelming majority of the boys studying Gujarati as against a small number of boys studying Marathi. So, all that I want to say is that so far as Umbergaon is concerned, it has been discussed and thought out village by village. In fact, I would say that there are some villages which are left out and which should be included in the Gujarati areas.

An hon. Member: Why not the whole taluka?

Shri Yajnik: In fact it is right. The Maharashtra Congress had, at one stage, definitely decided to give up the whole of Umbergaon taluka to Gujarat. That is also on record.

An hon. Member: Congress?

Shri Yajnik: Yes, the Congress. Now, I am not saying this in order to shut out further discussion. By all means we are going to discuss every bit of it. But the main thing is that if a decision has been taken in this matter it has not been without any reference to the context of principles.

Much has been said of the Ukai dam and the Nandurbar areas. The people of 6 talukas of Nandurbar have submitted a memorandum to the Home Minister and have shown their readiness to take a referendum, to take a plebiscite. They claim that most of the people, apart from the Adivasis, have come from Gujarat. It may be right or it may be wrong; it may be judged by a plebiscite. But, it appears that the two wings in the Congress, the Gujarati side and the Marathi side do not agree so far as the six talukas en bloc are concerned. Therefore, as a compromise formula, this area that would be submerged by the Ukai dam and the two-mile periphery were decided upon for inclusion in Gujarat.

Now, is the Ukai dam to be constructed or is it not to be constructed?

I say the decision has been taken. The Government of India have taken a decision; the Bombay Government is implementing it and a technical committee had been appointed by the Planning Commission here to go into all the aspects of the question. They have made certain amendments in the project and, ultimately, the Finance Minister goes to Ukai in order to lay the foundations of the dam. Now, it is rather too late in the day for anybody to make a submission that the Ukai dam is not very feasible or valuable. I think they are too late. I think certain respect must be paid to a factual decision of Government to build the Ukai dam. It has also been made abundantly clear that this Ukai dam presents today the only source of hydro-electricity in Gujarat. (Interruptions).

I am not complaining about what has happened so long. But the fact remains that hydro-electric power is available in Bombay and Maharashtra and it is not available in Gujarat at all. This is the first opportunity that has been offered to Gujarat in the matter of hydro-electricity, more than for supplying irrigation water. That has been decided upon; foundations are being laid and work is actually going on on the spot. Now, when it is actually taken in hand and when the area is to be submerged within a foreseeable future, what is the Government to do? Obviously, when we are going on with legal and constitutional formalities at work, it is necessary to be quite clear about the possibilities of the immediate future. Therefore, it is quite right that while a referendum or plebiscite had been refused so far as the six taluks of Nandurbar are concerned, a compromise formula has been evolved of giving to Gujarat only that area which will be submerged by the Ukai Dam in the near future.

A complaint has been made about the two mile boundary. Obviously, if the Uaki dam in Gujarat is going

to render thousands or hundreds homeless and sumberge thir lands and villages, something has to be done for them and that can only be done in the neighbourhood and adjoining areas. Actually a five mile per-phery was suggested but ultimately this two mile one was agreed upon. That is how it stands in the Bill. Whatever you may say, it is not right to say that this has been done without rhyme or reason. There is rhyme; there is reason. It is not a question of being suspicious about each other. After all, this is a law which is being passed. Measures are being taken which will have far-reaching effects on the future of both the areas. Therefore, if any business like decision is taken, it is necessary that all due precautions should be taken in order to see that the area which is affected by the Ukai dam fundamentally beneficial to Gujarat should be included immediately in the State of Gujarat.

So far as the financial matters are concerned I do not want to say much. I only want to point out the mistake that has crept in Shri Dange's argument. He said that it had been agreed between the Samiti and the Parishad that friendly help should be given to the sister State of Gujarat. (An Hon. Member: Younger) . . . in the initial years to make up its normal deficit. These are the words. There is no restriction of 2 years or 5 years. It may be that Shri Dange or Shri S. M. Joshi had this in their own minds. But we had no categorical discussion on this question nor could we agree on the amount that should be given by one to the other. When we met again in Bombay, we were bogged in the discussions and controversies about the details and we could not come to an agreement. But an agreement has to be found. After all, if Gujarat has a deficit of Rs. 8 crores, the deficit would be paid, if this division had not taken place naturally from the surplus of Bombay. So, it is perfectly justifiable to contend that Gujarat is leaving really Rs. 200 crores of capital behind in leaving Bombay State and

carving out a separate State. If Rs. 4 crores is the deficit capitalised value of the amount of interest charges as the deficit will run to about Rs. 100 crores. After all let us remember that Gujarat and Maharashtra have been associated under the British flag for more than 150 years. . . . (An Hon. Member: Kan-nadigas also) May be, but I am speaking, for the moment, about the subject that we have in view. When a joint family, so to say, has kept together for 150 years and when it separates, can we not look at least for five or ten years in the future? Must we look only to two years? Let us remember that it is not a matter of a few crores; it has hundreds of crores on its liabilities. All the figures are very big figures as the House knows. Therefore, let us look at it in the proper perspective. If Gujarat State separates from Bombay, naturally it should be assured of sufficient amount to make up its full deficit only for the first five years and for the rest of the five years, it is tapering off. Is that, by any stretch of imagination, an incentive to spending too much or getting along with as much expenditure as possible and not thinking of income at all? I think it is not right for any friend to criticise this little amount that has been given to Gujarat for the first few years from the surplus of the Bombay State or the Maharashtra State. I would even go further. As Dr. Jivaraj Mehta pointed out in the Legislative Council,—there is no mistake about it—the deficit will be much greater, even in the first two years, than what has been assessed in the Bill before us. Therefore, I say that the deficit has to be met. Can you put the whole burden of meeting the deficit in the first few years on an infant State of Gujarat? Find out the means and remedies of meeting the deficit. If the Maharashtra State can give it, it is all right. Or, let the Central Government bear the burden. The solutions that have been suggested in the Bill are all based on reasoning and proper and detailed enquiry.

[Shri Yajnik]

I only hope that when this Bill goes to the Joint Committee, good sense will prevail and those who differ here would come to some concrete understanding and that they may be able to persuade and convince each other. I hope that harmony and concord will prevail and that the Joint Committee will be able to come to unanimous conclusions which will be placed before this House and adopted by this House.

Dr. M. S. Anay: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am not one of those who feel very much elated at the introduction of the Bill which is under discuss here. Because, when I look at the Bill, I find it means two things. One is the creation of a new State of Gujarat and the second is the amalgamation or the merger of Vidarbha in Maharashtra.

These are two things there (*Inter-ruption*). What are you delighted at? Are you delighted at the separation of Gujarat from Maharashtra? Do you think it is a matter to rejoice at, that those people who have been living together for more than 100 years and, more than that, as one people living under one common State are now separated or are, in fact, compelled to separate under this Act? Is it a matter of delight? I regard this Bill as the triumph of linguistic fanaticism and the defeat of catholic nationalism that was characteristic of the people of the Bombay Presidency for 150 years? From that point of view if you look at it, it is a matter to be deplored rather than rejoice at. That is the reason why unless you understand this principle you will not be able to understand the mental agony through which the Prime Minister was going when last time the three-State Bill was brought before the House and also the haste with which he ran to clasp the formula that was suggested to the effect that the two bilingual States should be put together and formed into one. In his speech during the debate—I have read that speech—he made it clear that this linguism was

running into a dangerous thing, this linguism was a menace which will carry them all in a dangerous direction.

This Bill as you know, was introduced in this House on the 28th of this month, the first of the Indian New Year. On the New Year Day, among the Christians the bells ring in the church meaning "ring out the old and ring in the new". I say by this Bill you ring out the old catholic nationalism and ring in the new linguistic fanaticism. That is the meaning I see in this new Bill which is being discussed here in all seriousness.

How has this Bill been brought? I do not want to discuss all those matters which are likely to incite the feelings of other people here, but the very speeches which have been made by some of my hon. friends of the Opposition have showed us the way through which they have been able to break the bilingual State and get these two separate States, and the hon. Home Minister thinks, as he thought even then, that this is at least a final solution

16-22 hrs.

[*Shri Goray in the Chair*]

Mr. Chairman: May I request the hon. Member to come to the front and speak sitting?

Shri P. R. Patel: Sir, I rise to a point of order

The front benches are only for Ministers.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order, the hon. Member may continue.

Dr. M. S. Anay: I realise the meaning of the point of order.

Sir, I can stand for some time and speak.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order. The hon. Member may take his seat and continue his speech.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I was speaking of the feelings of our Prime Minister when the last Bombay Reorganisation Bill of 1956 was brought for consideration in this House and the new amendment that was moved by Shri Frank Anthony was under discussion.

He then remarked: "At least now probably the corner has been turned". In this feeling, even the hon. Home Minister who also made a speech at that time, shared. They shared the feeling that now at least the corner has been turned. What is the meaning of that? The linguistic feeling was running so high—may be due to the mistake of anybody or to the encouragement given by anybody—that as events were taking place, in the country, in which distinguished persons who took part in the struggle for independence also were playing a prominent part, so much so that the events made Shri Jawaharlal Nehru who is our Prime Minister and men like our Home Minister to feel that nationalism of India seemed to be a story of the past. Therefore they say some faint hope of the revival of that nationalism in the new amendment that was suggested by Shri Frank Anthony, to which great support was given by the whole House. That was the feeling with which that thing was introduced and accepted by the whole House and was passed. What is the result of that?

After three years—our Home Minister has got a very suave way of putting things—he said that after all, the bilingual administration can be said to have worked very creditably for three years. If it has worked creditably for three years, if it has achieved success, if the State has progressed,—he said like that—I do not understand why he is coming forward with this Bill at all? He does not want to admit that it was a failure. He hoped that in spite of linguism having gone up to a particular stage, it will ultimately die and that nationalism

will come out in victorious new India and that the Bombay State will set an example to the other States also. If there are the things that he had in mind, then, it was a complete failure. On the other hand, linguism was going from one point to another. We have seen that it has not just ended. I do not want to blame anybody for the things that were going on in the border-land, but linguism has not ended; for one reason or another, the thing is there.

Therefore—apart from other reasons which I shall presently mention, in regard to the provisions of the Bill—I was one of those who even then felt that linguistic unions were not necessary. Even then I was never an advocate of a linguistic union. In the memorandum which was submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission I had clearly stated that linguistic affinities were no doubt important things that had to be taken into consideration in the formation of a State. But I had clearly stated also that linguistic affinity is only a part of all the factors to be considered. There are so many other considerations for the people to come together: relations are established, affinities are created and certain tendencies are produced which go to make up a group as one unit which deserves to be created for the purpose of administration. These principles are clearly explained in the memorandum that I had submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission. And these principles were not essentially my own; they were included in the terms of reference which were drafted by the Government of India.

Shri Mahaganekar: Are you for the liquidation of Madhya Pradesh then?

Dr. M. S. Aney: That will require a lecture to be explained. I have no time to do that now.

Mr. Chairman: Yes; there is no time for that.

Dr. M. S. Aney: As a matter of fact, what I want to say is this. The situation or the position which they expected, did not come about. Anyhow the bilingual State had to be broken.

Then there is another point which brings me more closely to the question which I have to handle. When the States Reorganisation Commission submitted its report, they recommended that the Vidarbha State should be formed as a separate unit. They also recommended that Bombay State must be formed with the present Maharashtra, Gujarat, brought together with Saurashtra and Marathwada. That was the new Bombay State to be created. For one reason or other, our Bombay friends did not like it. We did not want to give up our position, the position which we had gained after pleading our case before the States Reorganisation Commission. We stood by that. The Government of India found no difficulty in accepting the recommendations of the Commission about other States, but they found some difficulty with regard to the formation of the Bombay State, because Vidarbha did not like the idea of joining with Maharashtra, which was the demand of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti.

I must say a few words about the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. The name Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti creates some confusion. I do not want to mention any names but they, i.e. Maharashtra, are not only linguists, but very clever writers too. They combined the words Samyukta Maharashtra, meaning thereby that the other part which they want to be amalgamated today was also Maharashtra; it was separated at some unknown time in history and they were making an effort to get these two separate pieces of Maharashtra into one and create what they called the dream of one united Maharashtra. They wanted to have Samyukta Maharashtra. The meaning was that Marathwada and Vidarbha were part of Maharashtra at one time and for

some reason or other, which is not known—I shall presently show there is no reason at all about that—they separated and now they are being united together. It created a very good impression outside on those people who really knew nothing about what Vidarbha or Marathwada or Maharashtra was. They ignore the history of Maharashtra.

Mr. Chairman: May I remind the hon. Member that he himself wrote an article long back in which he advocated amalgamation?

Dr. M. S. Aney: That was in 1905, when I had come out from the college. The Bengal partition was going on and I was fighting for the sake of annihilation of partition. Then I delivered certain speeches in which I said that probably the case of Maharashtra might be like that and one day an amalgamated Marathi-speaking province would be achieved by bringing together the divided Marathi-speaking tracts. That was when I was 25 years old. My friends are fond of quoting those speeches as if from 25 to 80 years of age, there was no period for me to gain any knowledge. What I have written after that, what I have spoken after that, what I have explained after that and what I am saying every day, goes for nothing. They do not want to learn from a grown-up Aney but they want to quote what a raw boy said. That is the position.

I was explaining how Samyukta Maharashtra has been conjured up and invented by them. If you read the whole history of India as we learn from the old *Puranas*, *Smritis* and *Granthas*, you find there was Vidarbha mentioned in the *Upanishads*; it is mentioned from those days to the present day. The name of Maharashtra is not found anywhere in this old literature. I challenge them on that. Of course, Maharashtra has a history of which every Indian ought to be proud; I am also proud of it. But so to say that

Maharashtra has been split up, Vidarbha and Marathwada had deserted and Maharashtra was now making a laudable effort to bring them back and amalgamate them into a big State is nothing but a myth and a fiction. By creating this new State they are trying to befool the whole of India as if we have no knowledge of Indian history. They are great linguists and good writers also. They have nice speakers also. Anyhow, the whole story was that the idea of Samyukta Maharashtra for which they have been making such a big propaganda, and in which ultimately they have succeeded too, was I might say, as a matter of fact a completely new idea which occurred to them not till 1935 or 1945. Then, when the Nehru Committee was appointed to investigate into the constitution of the whole of India, the question of formulating the linguistic provinces was raised there. People from Karnataka came there to say that they wanted a separate province for Karnataka on the basis of language. Shri Diwakar appeared before us and representatives of other areas also came. But not a single representative from Maharashtra came there. May I, in this connection, say the secret of it? I received a letter from Poona—I do not want to mention the name; they are all dead and gone and I have the greatest respect for them—saying that we should not encourage this principle of linguism and should be that our friend from Karnataka will not succeed in pleading their case for the formation of Karnataka on the basis of linguism. They are no more; they have gone. There was a feeling in the minds of the people of Maharashtra against linguism at that time. Those were the days of the tradition of Justice Ranade, tradition of the hon. Gokhale, the traditions of Tilak, the traditions of Kalkar and others. They were fresh in the minds of the people. Those were the days when cosmopolitans like them were leading the public life of the Bombay Presidency and giving lead and impetus to other people. Now those days of Justice Ranade are gone.

Those were the days when the whole of Maharashtra and Gujerat used to feel proud of our leaders who commanded the respect of the whole of India like Dadhabhai Naoroji, Justice Ranade, Professor Gokhale, Sir Pheroz Shah Mehta, Lok Manya Tilak and others. They were respected because they were cosmopolitans. When those leaders have gone, the new leaders that have come here have more or less instilled into the people linguism, class war, communism and communalism. This is the position of Maharashtra.

I was most bitterly attacked by the Maharashtrian friends who have loved me like their younger brother or elder brother for all these years. They have published a blessed pamphlet attacking me most bitterly, saying this man did this and that spoiling the good name of Maharashtra. I do not want to repeat that I want that better feelings should prevail in Maharashtra.

If I cannot get Vidarbha, I will not spoil the name of my country. I will put my cause and plead before you how right is the cause which I have been fighting for and how good is my cause. I want to say only a few words about this. When the States Reorganisation Commission report was published the problem before the Central Government was to create States in accordance with their recommendations. Unfortunately, on account of the opposition of our friends from Maharashtra to accept the recommendations of the Reorganisation Committee with regard to Maharashtra, Vidarbha and other things the Central Government had before them the problem of reconciling the different viewpoints and arriving at an amicable settlement.

A three State Bill was prepared. It was just like the present Bill. That was sent for opinion to the Madhya Pradesh Government. Most of the elected members of the legislatures representing the Vidarbha districts of Madhya Pradesh were there, some of whom probably are now Ministers in the Bombay Cabinet. Those members

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

at that time, with the exception of two or three, voted saying "We stand for the formation of Vidarbha as a separate unit". That opinion was there. Of course, under the Constitution of India we have only to refer the matter, ascertain and give them an opportunity to express their views. But their views are not binding. Nonetheless, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Congress leaders felt that it was clear to reconcile the almost unanimous overwhelming majority of the people of Vidarbha somehow or other with the new position which they were probably thinking of. They were summoned and to them the position was explained. They were told: Are we going to allow these things to remain unsolved? A big problem was there before the Government of India. Therefore they summoned these Vidarbha leaders. They talked with them for some time and said "Would you help us in this hour of peril to get out of this difficulty?" The Vidarbha leaders, many of whom—I have no intention of discussing all that.....

Mr. Chairman: May I remind the hon. Member that his time will be up after five minutes and we will have to adjourn?

Dr. M. S. Aney: I may continue tomorrow. I will not take much time. But you can adjourn.

An hon. Member: He can continue.

Shri C. D. Pande (Nani Tal): He is very interesting. His is the only voice of reason.

Mr. Chairman: He may continue.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I will continue tomorrow.

Shri G. P. Pant: Continue for five minutes. Then you can resume tomorrow.

Dr. M. S. Aney: These leaders were invited and then they were appealed to whether in the wider interest of India they would try to make some sacrifice. If an appeal comes from the leaders like that at a time of that

nature when a national crisis was there, was it not natural that as loyal Congressmen they thought that they should accept the advice? So they were prepared to agree to the proposals that were prepared for consideration and incorporation in the Bill for the consideration of this House. That is how the thing was done at that time. Today when this matter was again taken up some of the persons with whom I had the opportunity to discuss this matter said that we had once agreed to it. I say, suppose it was a blunder on the part of the old leaders—I said this—do you want the people of Vidarbha to suffer from that blunder perpetually? Then I asked who has not committed a blunder in regard to this matter in this country? Without meaning disrespect to anybody, I may say: here is the hon. Prime Minister who has committed the blunder; here is the hon. Home Minister who has committed a blunder; almost the Congress has committed a blunder in preparing Bills of that kind and asking the people to accept that in the hope that things may turn out better. So, everybody has committed a blunder. You allow everybody to correct that blunder and take to the right path, but when Vidarbha people come and want to argue with you, you say, "Well, your leaders have sold you away for ever to Maharashtra and have put you under their domination for ever. Your question cannot be re-opened." There is no stoppage like that. I at least do not recognise the law of estoppel to come in my way of asserting my right. I am speaking on behalf of the people of Vidarbha that they want Vidarbha to be a separate State and there are good reasons for demanding that State.

Mr. Chairman: He may continue tomorrow.

16.45 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, April 1, 1960/Chaitra 12, 1882 (Saka).