

MINUTES

MINUTE OF DISSENT

by

Mr. CHUNILAL D. BARFIVALA.

—: o:—

We have been asked to report on the "Development of Suburbs and Town Planning." Our panel assumed that the terms of reference, so vaguely defined, were comprehensive enough, to include the subjects of Communications and Housing, though there were two other panels set up simultaneously to deal respectively with these two subjects. The Communications and Housing panels have already submitted their reports which have been well received by the public and the press. Our report devotes, about half the space to these two subjects and is mainly on the lines of recommendations of those special Committees, with whom we had some joint deliberations. I do not wish to deal with these subjects, excepting in so far as they concern the administrative side of these problems

to which I shall refer hereafter. Speaking about Housing, I would like to refer to the report of a recent American Committee on Hygiene of Housing. These recommendations appear to me, to be fundamental to any housing programme. They have been summarised under the following four *main* headings:—

Housing.

- (1) Fundamental physiological needs.
- (2) Fundamental psychological needs.
- (3) Protection against Contagion.
- (4) Protection against Accidents.

There are thirty *sub-headings* under these four main headings. I believe they afford a very useful general guidance. I therefore reproduce them in **Appendix A**.

2. Besides the subjects of Housing and Communications, our report, crudely condensed, deals with these subjects:—

- (1) *The necessity of a Master Plan*; (2) *Zoning for use, density and height*; (3) *Amenities required in Bombay and the Suburbs*, and (4) *Administration of Greater Bombay*.

Topics discussed by
this Panel.

The first two subjects have received at our hands more or less adequate treatment. The third subject deals with amenities which can be expanded considerably as finances permit. The last subject has, I am extremely sorry to say, received a most cursory treatment.

3. As regards the master plan, I wish to emphasise the necessity of a scientific survey, to be carried out in the first instance, before any plan can be put up.

Master Plan.

It is necessary to lay down, at great length, the subjects for such a civic survey. This civic survey should be an all-embracing one and as thorough as possible and should be carried out by experts aided by competent non-officials. It should include subjects like General Topography, History and Archaeology, Traffic, Housing, Recreation, Education, Art, Environments, Structural methods, Hygiene, Economics, Law and Custom, and Administration, etc. Indications of all inclusive topics for a scientific survey are available in the report of the International Committee of Civic Arts (Hague). These international classifications were adopted, with the simplification and re-arrangement in Madras, when a civic survey was undertaken there in about 1918. I reproduce these topics in **Appendix 2**. These topics will have to be carefully revised to suit our conditions in the light of recent research. They, however, afford excellent guidance.

4. *The main reason which impelled me to write this note, was what I considered to be the failure on the part of my esteemed colleagues, to give due consideration to the vital problems of the governance of Greater Bombay.*

The 'why' of this Note—Where the panel fails.

Whereas, more than half of our report deals with the subjects of Housing and Communications, which could have been well left out in view of the special panels which were constituted to deal with them, recommendations regarding administration hardly occupy a page. No attempt has been made by my Colleagues to justify their proposal regarding wholesale annexation of vast area, abolition of suburban civic units and ruthless sacrifice of the corporate life of the annexed communities. No attempt whatever has been made to justify uniform application of the City's Municipal Laws and heavy taxes to the suburbs, irrespective of their stages of development—Rural, Semi-Urban or Urban—of the different standards of life of the residents and irrespective of their taxable capacities and without considering the probabilities or otherwise of their being supplied with amenities which the city enjoys at

present within a measurable distance of time. No data are given regarding the share of the suburban people or their representation in the administration of Greater Bombay. No thought has been bestowed to the City's administrative re-organisation which would be necessary, if their recommendations, to annex to the 25 square miles of Bombay about 200 square miles of Suburban Territory, with numerous Local Self-Government Units, were to be accepted. In fact, my esteemed colleagues have made small work of the very heavy responsibility cast upon them. *The whole subject of administration has been dealt with by them as if it were a mere question of normal extension of city's boundaries.* My colleagues have totally failed to realise that they were dealing with problems of Metropolitan Organisation requiring all the thoughts and serious considerations usually claimed from the administrators who are called upon, as experts to advise on a technical problem of great complexity. I am, therefore, afraid that the Government will have to seek assistance from a different set of persons altogether, who would appreciate the gravity of this most complicated subject, who would study the subject of metropolitan organisation in general and who have the necessary time, energy and inclination to apply the result of their studies, to the set of circumstances facing the problems of the governance of Greater Bombay. In the alternative, let Government appoint any competent Officer on special duty, to make a detailed report on the subject. If an Officer of high rank, with special aptitude for this work is not available, a non-official person of requisite competence may be entrusted with this work.

5. I shall now attempt to examine the recommendations of my colleagues, regarding administration, for what they are worth. These recommendations, as I have understood them, are:

Recommendations analysed.

(1) The Greater Bombay Region should comprise the City limits, the Bombay Suburban District, Thana City Municipal limits and Ambernath (in the Kalyan Taluka). "If additional land is required for further developments it can be obtained by expanding the limits in the North right up to the Bassein Creek." (Paragraph 22).

(2) The jurisdiction of the Bombay Municipal Corporation should be extended to the whole region covered by the Greater Bombay scheme. (Paragraph 69.)

(3) Process of amalgamation should be by stages. (Paragraph 69.)

(4) The first stage should be covered *within 5 years*: "During this period the *Municipal limits* of Bandra, Santacruz, Juhu, Andheri, Kurla, Ghatkopar-Kirol, Thana and Trombay *should be gradually absorbed* within the Bombay Municipal Limits." (Paragraph 61) In Paragraph 69, however, the report says "The Municipal limits of Bandra, Juhu, Andheri, Ghatkopar-Kirol, Thana and Trombay *may have to be taken over immediately.*"

(5) When the results of the development of areas included in the first stage, are found to be satisfactory and encouraging, then the question of absorbing the other *Municipal Bodies* and Notified Area *Committees* and of extending the operations further should be considered. (Paragraph 69.)

6. I would, in the first instance, give out my findings on these recommendations and then proceed to give my reasons for the same. Lastly, I shall put forward my own recommendations and submissions in support thereof.

(1) I agree with my colleagues that the Greater Bombay Region should include the whole of the Bombay Suburban District and the Thana City and Ambernath. **I would however include therein the western area including Malad, Kandivali, Borivali up to the Bassein Creek.**

(2) I would like to provide for some sort of *extra territorial or mural jurisdiction* for the Greater Bombay Council over areas extending up to and including Virar on the West and Municipal limits of Kalyan on the East, *for certain purposes only.*

(3) I am firmly convinced that the **proposal to extend area by stages is impracticable and fraught with dangerous consequences.**

(4) I believe that the recommendation of the panel for *outright annexation* of suburban areas by extension of the jurisdiction of Bombay City Corporation should not be given effect to, for grave reasons stated hereafter and *should therefore be rejected in toto.*

(5) I believe that the two tiered constitution on the model of the London County Council with suitable modifications is *the only satisfactory solution* of our metropolitan problem.

7. There is a considerable confusion prevailing in the public mind on the question of *the proper area*.
The question of area. Our first task would be to disabuse the minds of those persons who believe that an area smaller than the one proposed by this panel should be included in the Greater Bombay region. Either as a concession to the opinion or as sharers therein, my colleagues have provided for "Stages of expansion." The Housing panel also talks of chewing bit by bit.

8. The proper delimitation of the metropolitan region, depends upon several factors and upon the proper valuation of the needs, both present and future, of the metropolis. We must include in the region, those localities which are economically, socially and geographically one with the city though legally and politically separate. *In the language of Municipal experts, "we should not break up the Metropolitan District."* The whole of the Bombay Suburban District satisfies this criterion admirably. It must, therefore necessarily be included *wholly* within the region. Bisection of the suburban area recently effected for the purposes of Law, Order and Revenue, has given rise to considerable discontent and the suburbanites are anxiously awaiting reversal of these arrangements at the hands of the new Ministers. *This dissection of the Suburban area is a first class blunder from whatever point you look at it.*

9. A special Greater Bombay Conference of members of Local Bodies in the Bombay Suburban District, which was held in Bombay on the 1st December 1945, passed the following resolutions protesting strongly against the dissection of the Bombay Suburban District. These resolutions are worth reproducing because they throw considerable light on the question of "The Greater Bombay Region."

Greater Bombay Conference.
 "I. Protests against the Dissection of the Bombay Suburban District for Law, Order and Revenue purposes.

"(A) That the Conference protests against the dissection of the Bombay Suburban District caused by the Greater Bombay Laws and the Bombay High Court (Declaration of Limits) Act 1945 (Bombay Act No. XVII of 1945) by including the area comprised in Schedule I of the said Act in Greater Bombay and transferring the remaining area to the Thana District. *The area excluded from Greater Bombay is an integral part of*

the City of Bombay, with which it is united economically, socially, industrially, commercially, educationally, and otherwise. This excluded area has nothing in common with the Thana District to which it is now arbitrarily annexed against the wishes and in spite of the protests of the people of the Bombay Suburban District.

“(B) That the operation of the said Act has *shifted the incidence of criminality from the City and the Southern portion of the Suburban District (now included in Greater Bombay) to the northern part of the District. The burglarious elements have found a convenient home in the unguarded northern region and have become a grave menace and a source of perennial anxiety to that region. In order to obtain a natural boundary affording effective control, it is necessary to include within Greater Bombay all the Area South of the Bhyander-Thana Creek.*

“(C) That the said Act has caused considerable inconvenience to the litigating public, both of the suburban area included within Greater Bombay and also of the area transferred to the Thana District. The former are compelled to resort to the costly legal machinery of the High Court even in small matters because the jurisdiction of the Small Causes Court is restrictive, and the latter are obliged to go to the Bassein Court, which is indeed a very inconvenient place. Similar inconvenience is experienced in criminal matters. Government is requested to provide a cheaper and more convenient judicial machinery.

“(D) That Government is requested to cancel forthwith the executive orders issued by them, transferring for the purpose of Land Revenue a large number of villages from the Bombay Suburban District (which are excluded from Greater Bombay) to the Thana District *without observing even the normal formalities of inviting the opinions of the suburban people who are vitally and injuriously affected by the transfer and thereby treating these people as mere Goods and Chattels or Pawns on a Chess-Board or Persons in Bondage.*

These so called revenue transfers will, in their turn, bring about administrative transfers, involve dissolution and reconstitution of the District Local Boards of the Bombay Suburban and the Thana Districts, and transfer, to the Thana District:

Authorities, of control of several local self-governing units, medical institutions, administration of primary education, roads, water works, etc.

Government is requested to redress the grievance without any loss of time by cancelling these orders."

A further resolution adds—

"(E) That in view of what is stated in Resolutions A to D, it is the confirmed opinion of this Conference that no part of the Suburban District should be transferred to the Thana District for any purpose whatever."

10. The above resolutions show how bitterly the suburban people feel about the dissection of the Suburban District. It should be noted that

A warning.

these *protests are raised not merely on sentimental grounds*—though these also should carry certain weight—but on the grounds of the *real inconvenience and great hardships*. I would, therefore, warn the Authorities against the dissection of the Suburban District for *Municipal purposes* by vesting only parts of the same under the jurisdiction of the Greater Bombay Council and transferring the remainder to the Thana District. Hardships of the parts left out would be multiplied manifold and the Ministers would not have an easy time of it.

11. So far we have considered the objections from the suburban point of view. Let us now

City's needs.

consider what are the maladies besetting the Metropolis. Why is it that the City Corporation, which was for about half a century indifferent to the problem of Greater Bombay, is now face to face with it? If we properly appreciate the *why and wherefor of Greater Bombay*, the immediate necessity of a very large area will be apparent, nay imperative.

12. That the City is extremely congested is alarmingly apparent to every one. Providing for a reasonably safe

Maladies besetting the Metropolis.

in cold western countries

Congestion.

density of population and for a standard of open-space-area considered minimum even in (in Tropical countries larger areas are imperative) the city is capable of holding a population of 12 lakhs only. The present population is about 25 lakhs. There is thus a spill-over of about 13 lakhs to be

provided for in the Suburbs. If we take into account future developments, say only 30 years ahead—this is the smallest period we can take—we will have to provide for a much larger spill-over. The Suburban population in areas contiguous to the City has also increased tremendously and is increasing by over 50 per cent. at every Census. Therefore, it is impossible to provide for Bombay's excess population in the nearabout Suburban area without creating slums. The slums of Bombay including the seven dozen slums (86 to be exact) officially recognised (in addition to these "there may be some which may have escaped attention or grown up after the enumeration" vide p. 51 of the Report of the Housing Panel) and including the four insanitary villages of Parel, Worli-Koliwada, Colaba and Dharavi will have to be cleared up and room will have to be found for a large portion of the dishoused population, in the Suburban area.

13. The City is, moreover, so cramped that large areas are required outside the City, for locating both heavy and light industries. This panel is very keen, as will be seen from our Report (paragraphs 25 to 27) to remove these industries in the Suburbs and the areas found suitable by the panel lie outside the nearer contiguous municipal areas. The labour population connected with these industries will have to be provided with housing facilities near their works. *These non-Municipal areas, therefore will have to be roped in and cannot be left out of the Greater Bombay Region.*

14. A greater problem is that of the removal from the City of the obnoxious trades like tanneries, slaughter houses, chemical factories and milch cattle stables. For these also, no suitable places in the nearby Municipal areas are available and our panel is obliged to prescribe areas outside Suburban Municipal limits and within the areas under the jurisdiction of Village Panchayats and Notified Area Committees and the District Local Board. *If so, can we leave these latter areas out?*

15. To put the case more clearly I give the following facts:—
Our panel recommends that light industries should be removed to areas between Mulund and Kiroli. Now, the whole of this area is non-municipal (and not Municipal, which the panel exclusively wishes to annex to the City in the first stage). Moreover, our

Location for industries in non-Municipal Suburban area.

Location for obnoxious trades in non-Municipal Suburban areas.

Some glaring inconsistencies.

panel wishes to annex Thana City and Ghatkopar-Kirol Municipal limits during the first stage and presumably non-municipal areas reserved for the location of light industries in the second stage. Now, there are distinct localities like Mulund, Bhandup, Vikhroli, etc., which are non-municipal areas and are situated between the above-mentioned two municipal areas. I am certain that we cannot exclude from the Greater Bombay Region these intermeditate localities which the panel reserves for light industries. They will have to be taken in, from the start.

Similarly, the panel wants areas like Kandivali, Marol, etc., for the location of stables, etc., Kandivali, however, lies within the jurisdiction of a *Notified Area Committee* and not a Municipality. Moreover, if you take Kandivali, you must take the intervening areas between Andheri and Kandivali, i.e., Goregaon, Malad, etc., which are to the south of Kandivali. These intervening areas are situated within the jurisdiction of a Village Panchayat, or of a Notified Area Committee and of the Suburban District Local Board—and not within any Municipal limits. The Committee's recommendations, are, therefore, clearly inconsistent and are due to the overlooking of geographical positions and of the jurisdictions of several local units.

16. After reading the reports of the three panels—Housing, A Hopé. Communications and Suburban Development and Planning—is it difficult to comprehend that a small area is out of question? Can Bandra, Parla-Andheri, Kurla and Ghatkopar—Kirol—the immediately contiguous municipal limits—by any stretch of imagination satisfy metropolitan needs, to any reasonable extent, without creating slums and terrible insanitary conditions? I hope wiser counsels will prevail in respect of this most harmful suggestion.

17. Our panel has further suggested the immediate inclusion of Thana City limits within the Greater Bombay Region on the ground of "Public Health" and for securing "one common natural boundary", viz., the Thana Creek. On grounds, much stronger than these, areas upto Bassein Creek should be taken up in the Greater Bombay Region. There are indeed common grounds of public health and natural boundary of this salubrious extension on the north western side of the region. In addition, it should be mentioned that the places of upto Dahisar disclose metropolitan

conditions in an equal, or perhaps greater, degree than the eastern side. Moreover, the area south of Bassein Creek will give a beautiful open undeveloped locality where the Town Planners may give full play to their fancies and put into execution development schemes untrammelled by local obstructions of any sort. Indeed there is no sense in taking Thana Creek and leaving out the Bassein Creek. Both these Creeks will afford unlimited scope for development of water transport facilities. To a Planner with a vision, this area should be an ideal place for development on upto-date modern scientific lines.

18. Lastly, I urge that the Greater Bombay Council should be invested with extra territorial or mural jurisdiction over areas up to Virar in the North-west and Kalyan in the North-east, **for certain purposes.** These local areas are connected with the City by *local trains* and their considerable mobile population is subject to centrifugal and centripetal movements, diurnal and nocturnal. These places moreover send out to Bombay, every day, considerable quantities of fruits, vegetables, milk and other edibles. The City is dependent on these places for its daily needs of these essential commodities. In the interest of the public health of the City, there should be *some powers reserved* to the Greater Bombay Council to control epidemics and enforce health regulations and safeguard production and distribution of pure milk and vegetables so far as these places are concerned. Some extra mural jurisdiction will also be necessary for communications and some arrangements for prevention of ribbon development. I do not propose to discuss here the actual measures necessary to achieve these objects. There should be, however, no difficulty in making these arrangements once the suggestion is found acceptable.

19. Several recommendations of the Communications and Housing Panels cannot be implemented unless we take a larger area within the Greater Bombay Region.

Housing and Communication Panels require large areas.

20. I can reinforce my arguments further to show that the ideas of a smaller region are impracticable. In view, however, of the facts stated above and of the strong case made out by our panel, I refrain from enlarging upon this issue. I would, however, like to add that

Greater Bombay Conference again.

the recent Conference of members of local bodies in the Suburbs referred to above have laid great stress on some of the points urged by me. A copy of the Conference Resolutions is annexed herewith in Appendix C.

21. I hope I have given satisfactory reasons for rejecting **Conclusions regarding area.** the fallacious arguments for absorbing additional areas by stages. I have already shown that the suburban population is against the dissection of the suburbs which form an integral part of the Metropolitan District. I have also pointed out that the needs of Bombay regarding the accommodation of excess population, of location of small and big industries, and of the housing of the labour employed therein, and of establishing neighbourhood units, and of the removal of obnoxious trades, etc., are so great and so immediate that **undeveloped non-municipal areas are imperatively required.** If we fall a prey to the popular fallacy of eating the area, leaf by leaf, like an artichoke, we will be acting on lines condemned by the experience of other countries and we will be responsible for reproducing conditions in the Suburbs, the like of which we are out to remove from the City and we will be cursed by the coming generations for our short-sightedness. The recommendations of my colleagues to annex in the first stage Municipal areas only can be immediately dismissed, because on their own showing **non-Municipal areas only** are suitable for meeting the immediate needs of Bombay. The idea of giving priority to urban parts-first and rural or semi-rural next is inconsistent with their other recommendations and utterly fails to meet our requirements.

22. A final and grave warning is needed to prevent insanitary conditions and slums from springing up in the suburbs, as a result of the recommendations of different panels. **Scrutinize these recommendations one by one and you will come across a feature common to all of them, viz., REMOVE ALL UNDESIRABLE THINGS TO THE "OUTSKIRTS OF THE CITY OR BEYOND GREATER BOMBAY REGION OR FURTHER STILL".** For example, we are told that practically no area is available for future development in the City and therefore we must make room in the suburbs for a spill-over population of about 17 lakhs, for big and small industries and for noxious and objectionable trades *on the outskirts or outside Greater Bombay*". At the

A final warning.

A gift to the Northern Suburbs of things the City rejects.

same time we are told that we should have a limited area in the suburbs to accommodate all these. For example, the Housing Panel opines that "no new industries should be permitted in the City but they should be *located in the suburbs*. Old established industries that would like to move to the suburbs should be encouraged to do so" (para. 20). Again, the same Panel says :—

"There are still other trades and industries *which are so obnoxious that they should be segregated either on the extreme outskirts of the City or beyond the City boundaries in their own specific zones*. In Appendix D of the Housing Panel's report, the following obnoxious and objectionable trades and industries are to be segregated '*preferably*' on the **outskirts** of or **outside** the City limits (*the words underlined by me are put in black capital letters in their report*). Here are some of the '*preferable*' gifts to the suburbs—

"Refining gold and silver, Manufacturing candles, Casting heavy metals, iron, brass, etc., Chemical works including manufacturing of lime and charcoal, Manufacture of Cow dung cakes, Oil Mills, Paper manufacturing, Soap making, cleaning Tar melting, Packing offal, catgut, bones, etc., rags, Cleaning wool or cotton refuse, Milch Cattle Stables, Sorting or Tanning skins and hides, Manufacturing fat and tallow, Slaughter Houses, Blood boiling, Bone crushing, etc."

In fairness to the panels I am bound to add that they all realise the danger and are anxious to avoid it. How on earth can they avoid it, if they narrowly limit the Greater Bombay Region, is more than I can comprehend.

23. For the benefit of those who still persist in thinking that only the built up areas or developed parts, **Mr. Thomas Reed** quoted. "Municipal limits" (as our panel put it) of the Suburbs should be annexed, I take the liberty of quoting the following words of Mr. Reed who is the highest living American authority on the subject. He says that in a Metropolitan area it is clearly *impossible to dissect the urban from the rural*. He proceeds, **On every rational ground the whole should be treated as one. Objections seem to outweigh the advantages of such a course (taking up only developed areas)**. The first is that *outside the built up portion of a Metropolis there should be an extensive area in which the Metropolis may control its own development. Otherwise the present evils are going to be removed on a new*

frontier after each annexation. The second is that the area surrounding a very great city is in the nature of things charged with heavy expenses of highways and other improvements and services which a community of smaller size in isolated situation would not be called upon to meet. *This half-way measure* is in the opinion of the esteemed author **"a defiance of the clearly established unity of the Metropolis as a whole."**

24. Another eminent authority, Mr. Macdonald, states that **Mr. Macdonald** mere extension of City limits in *"this piecemeal fashion"* does not solve the Metropolitan problem. **quoted.** If corporate limits are made so broad as to have any degree of permanence they must necessarily include a great deal of **agricultural land."**

25. It is also to be observed that gradual consolidation by occasional annexation of clustering Municipalities to a central one, has not been a successful mode of achieving political integration (selected readings in Municipal problems by J. Wright). **J. Wright cited.** A number of other weighty arguments can be advanced to show that the policy of extension by stages does not suit our circumstances. I however, consider that I have said sufficiently on the subject to bring conviction to those who would keep an open mind.

OUTRIGHT ANNEXATION

26. I now come to the most important question of providing a **Out of date exploded theory of outright Annexation.** Metropolitan machinery for our Metropolitan conditions—the Governance of Greater Bombay. I have shown above, that **we have got to take in one stride the whole of the area marked out by our panel, viz., right upto the Bassein and Thana Creeks, in the Greater Bombay Region.** Those who plump for smaller area have in their mind of minds the fear of making the administrative machinery too cumbrous and expensive. In fact, my colleagues state in paragraph 69 of our Report that it is no use taking over for administration bigger areas unless finances permit of the same amenities, at present enjoyed by the City, being made available to the areas to be included. **This is certainly true if you go on the wrong tract** and annex outright large areas to Bombay by merely extending the jurisdiction of the City Corporation. **The fault**

lies not with the "area" but with the administrative machinery that you are proposing for the area. By following the out-of-date policy of outright annexation, you make yourselves simultaneously liable to provide the City's standard of amenities to the annexed area in return for the same percentage of taxes which the City recovers. Those who talk so lightly of annexations, do not know that **only a tiny fraction of the Suburban area would be able to pay** (apart from the question whether it would be equitable to call upon the area to pay) the same percent of taxes as that of the City. Those gentlemen should also realise that every one percent of rates raised in that tiny portion would yield a very small fraction of the amount that would be raised by a levy of one per cent in the City. The City's finance will therefore have to bear quite a disproportionate burden. *Policy of annexation, if it finds acceptance, will positively eat away Bombay's resources. Suburbs, as a whole, will never be able to pay anything like the City's taxes, as I shall show hereafter. We have got to take into account these facts, when we are constructing our administrative machinery.*

27. Let us give a few concrete instances. Will it stand to reason if the people of the Municipal areas of Thana, Ghatkopar-Kurla, Parle-Andheri, Bandra and Juhu are all asked *uniformly* to pay the Bombay taxes? Can we supply them with amenities identical with those provided for in the City **within a reasonable distance of time?** Even if we could supply them with these amenities, can these localities bear the financial strain? *What about the level of taxes during the intermediate period?* The case is even more complicated with regard to other localities. Versova Village, for example, has a population of about 8 thousand. There is no local tax at all. Will it be feasible to ask Versova Village people to pay Bombay scale of taxes? The Greater Bombay Conference of Suburban Civic Fathers mentioned above passed an apt resolution on the subject, I quote it hereunder.

Implications of the policy of annexation. Uniformity of taxes.

"(D) That when considering the levy of taxes on the suburban area the different stages of development of the respective places within the jurisdiction of the several suburban units their urban, semi-urban or rural characters, their different needs, their varying taxable capacities, the benefits enjoyed by them as gifts of nature or beneficence of donors or voluntary sacrifices of their citizens should always be borne in mind.

No area should be made to pay for amenities it does not receive."

28. In order to understand more clearly the complications of this administrative problem, I give below a table showing the *local authorities existing in the proposed Greater Bombay Region.*

Units of Local Self-Govt. in the Greater Bombay Region.

(1) Bombay Municipal Corporation; (2) Units of Local Self-Government in the Bombay Suburban District; (3) Units south of Bassein and Thana Creeks (Bhyander B. B. & C. I. Railway), Thana Municipality, C. I. P. Railway); (4) Units north of Thana Creek (Ambernath V. P.); (5) Extra territorial jurisdiction suggested upto Virar in the west and Kalyan in the east.

(2) Units of Local Self Government in B. S. D.

(A) Urban Area

(1) Borough Municipalities (B. M. Act 1925) :—(i) Bandra (B. B. & C. I. Railway); (ii) Parle-Andheri (B. B. & C. I. Railway); (iii) Kurla (G. I. P. Railway).

(2) District Municipalities (D. M. Act 1901) :—(i) Ghatkopar-Kirol (G. I. P. Railway); (ii) Juhu (B. B. & C. I. Railway).

(3) Notified Area Committees (D. M. Act 1901) :—(i) Malad (B. B. & C. I. Railway); (ii) Kandivli (B. B. & C. I. Railway); (iii) Borivli (B. B. & C. I. Railway).

(4) Sanitary Beach Committee (Village Sanitation Act 1889) :—(i) Versowa Beach Sanitary Committee (B. B. & C. I. Railway).

(B) Rural Area

(1) District Local Board (Local Board's Act 1923) :—(i) Bombay Suburban District Local Board (Office at Andheri).

(2) Village Panchayats (Village Panchayat Act, 1939) :—(i) Chembur (G. I. P. Railway); (ii) Bhandup (G. I. P. Railway); (iii) Mulund (G. I. P. Railway); (iv) Dahisar (B. B. & C. I. Railway); (v) Goregaon (B. B. & C. I. Railway); (vi) Malawni (B. B. & C. I. Railway); (vii) Manori (B. B. & C. I. Railway).

Authorities for Primary Education in Bombay City and Bombay Suburban District under the Primary Education Act, 1942.

(1) Bombay Municipal Corporation : Bombay Municipal School Board for The Town and Island of Bombay; (2) Bandra

Municipality : Bandra Municipal School Board for The Bandra Municipal Area; (3) Bombay Suburban District Local Board ; Bombay Suburban District School Board for The Whole of the Bombay Suburban District outside Bandra Municipal Area. A chart showing all the units in the proposed region is given in Appendix D.

29. It will be noticed that there are quite a large number of local bodies in the proposed region. Some of them, like the ancient towns of Bandra and Thana, are as old as the City itself, if not older. The Municipal Boroughs represent advanced urban units. Some of them, Kurla and Thana for example, have their own slum problem to solve. Then there are the District Municipalities whose constitution is based on the lines of normal Moffusil Municipalities. There are only three Notified Area Committees, viz., Malad, Kandivli and Borivli. These Committees will be abolished shortly and are likely to be converted into District Municipalities. Then there are seven Village Panchayats representing purely rural areas, except one or two of them which are partly rural and partly urban. Village Panchayats like Bhandup, Goregaon, Malavni and Manori are not yet raising any local taxes. There are a large number of other villages wherein the population is less than 2,000 each and where no local self-governing unit is yet constituted. They are under the jurisdiction of the Suburban District Local Board. The District Local Board looks after District and Village roads and administers medical relief in all the rural areas including areas under Gram Panchayats. It also manages primary education in the whole of the Suburban District except the Municipal limits of Bandra. Does it require any pleading to show that all these heterogenous areas would be absolutely unable to pay the City's taxes ?

30. The tax levels of these different units differ very widely. **City's heavy taxes and certainty of heavier taxes.** Here are the City's main taxes :—

- (1) General Tax at 14 per cent on the ratable value of lands and buildings.
- (2) Water rate at $3\frac{1}{4}\%$ per cent.
- (3) Halalkhore tax (conservancy and sweeping) at 30 per cent.
- (4) Fire Brigade tax at $\frac{1}{2}\%$ per cent.

(5) Tax on vehicles and animals at the maximum rate prescribed in Schedule G of the Bombay City Municipal Act (Section 180).

(6) Town Duties as under (Section 192, Schedule H) :—

	Rs. a. p.
Grain of all sorts per candy	... 0 6 0
Flour of all sorts	... 0 4 6
Wines and Spirits per Imperial gallon	... 0 4 0
Beer per Imperial gallon	... 0 0 6
Sugar, Molasses and Gur per cwt.	... 0 8 0
Ghi and ghi substitutes (of whatever composition) which are not pure ghi but which resemble pure ghi and are capable of being used as substitutes for pure ghi, per Bombay maund	... 0 10 0
Firewood per candy	... 0 2 0
Timber excluding Railway Sleepers, Aspen wood and Indian match wood	... 2½ per cent. on market value.

The improvements that are proposed to be effected in the City—those that are considered as immediately necessary—are estimated to cost colossal amounts. *The immediate additional income may have to be in the vicinity of Rs. 4 crores per annum, i.e., the total annual expenditure of the City which is at present about 4 crores has got to be doubled. (Vide Mr. Modak's note paragraph 83)* This additional amount cannot be found without further raising the City's taxes. In paragraph 93 of the report of our panel, it is stated in this connection that **“Regarding ‘assessment rates’ there is no likelihood of their being reduced. On the contrary, they are likely to be increased to the maximum limit permissible under the Municipal Act to provide additional facilities to the public for which they are clamouring.”**

The Communications Panel recommend the “outlay involved in planning on a vast scale” and make out that “such an outlay is a highly remunerative investment.”

The Housing Panel has proposed huge expenditure and hopes that a considerable portion therefore shall be borne by the Central and Provincial Governments. (Para. 56). This panel, also expects the Municipality to forego the General Tax for 10 to 12 years on the class of houses fulfilling prescribed standards and requirements. This means that the levy of taxes on other properties will have to be at a higher rate still.

It should also be mentioned that the Urban Immovable Property Tax on the City properties is I understand at a rate higher than that on the Suburban immovable properties and a considerable portion of the suburban area is not paying any urban immovable property tax at present.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that the Bombay City taxes represent a substantial percentage of debt charges. It may range from 20 per cent. to 30 per cent. and with huge improvements in view this charge will grow to large proportions. The Suburban Local Bodies have comparatively no debts to speak of.

31. In further support of my argument I give below a table showing the **incidence of taxes in different local bodies**. Recent rise of taxes in the City and in some suburbs and change in population will alter the figures slightly, but there should not be any substantial difference.

Municipalities.		Notified area Committees.		District Local Board, B.S.D.
	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Bombay ...	27 1 10	Malad ...	2 9 0	0 8 2
Bandra ...	13 4 0	Kandivli ...	2 3 0	Thana.
Parle-Andheri ...	5.90	Borivli ...	1 11 6	6 8 5
Kurla ...	10 6 2			
Ghatkopar ...	5 13 7			
Juhu ...	8.7			

I should like that those who talk of annexation should give a serious thought to the above facts and say whether it is possible to enforce levy of City's tax burdens on the Suburban area? **If**

Government authorities change their previous opinion as expressed in their Review of Greater Bombay quoted herein—after and fall in with the majority view of this panel and attempt to levy the City's taxes on the Suburban area, I am afraid, they will be inflicting a financial burden on the Suburbs for which there will be no justification whatever.

I would have cited the figures of tax-rates in the different localities of the Suburbs Municipal and Non-municipal, but the information in my possession is neither complete nor up-to-date and its correctness may be challenged. I, however, make bold to state that if Bombay rates are made applicable to the Suburban localities, there will have to be a rise of from 50 to 100 per cent in taxes in Municipal areas and over 200 per cent. in Non-Municipal areas and in areas where there are no local taxes, the whole burden will be absolutely fresh. I wish my estimates prove exaggerated. Let it not be forgotten that the suburban people are buying all their requirements at prices higher than those obtaining in the City. They are paying Railway rates which are ever increasing. They pay non-agricultural assessments, Khot's dues, heavier tap-water charges, etc. I ask those gentlemen who think lightly of these additional burdens to consider what commensurate benefits the annexation is going to give; and the more important query is "when will the taxes begin and when the amenities come? Are they going to be simultaneous or the taxes will begin from the date of the annexation and the amenities **in due course?**" The annexation would give

Legal right to demand amenities.

the annexed parts a legal right to demand City's facilities and they will certainly agitate for the same. It would take years to construct sewers, good roads, hospitals, and Schools throughout the annexed territories, not to speak of numerous other amenities. To supply even the tap water everywhere in the suburbs is a difficult problem. It is not merely a question of laying out water mains. The question is more complicated. The people in the suburbs who have water taps to-day are paying for water consumption to the Public Works Department at the rate of Re. 1 per 1,000 gallons.

The Problem of the Water rate.

In Kurla and Bandra the rate is a little lower. In the City proper, people are accustomed to unmetered water supply and they pay tax at a rate of only $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. on the annual rating value. **The suburban people therefore pay exceedingly heavy charges for water supply. What is going to be the future arrangement? Is**

the City in case of annexed Suburban part going to give unmetered water supply at the Bombay rate? Can the City afford to do so? Will it be economical and prudent for the City? I believe that in the near future, the City itself will have to seriously consider the question of supplying water by meter. If such a time comes and in my opinion it ought to come soon, those in the suburbs who are today counting on cheaper water supply by joining Bombay will be sadly disillusioned. At any rate, this is a point worth making clear in any scheme for Greater Bombay which is put forward before the public. Questions like these have confronted cities in the West, which attempted to annex neighbouring territories on the lines recommended by our panel. This fateful policy has resulted in financial embarrassment. Their experience **teaches one lesson viz., that those who are out for outright annexation are inviting their cities to commit financial suicide.**

32. Then there is that constitutional question of representation in the City Corporation which all these local areas will claim. Can you find any equitable basis of representation for them—representation that will give them adequate voice in the management of their affairs? Can we give them any satisfaction on this score? Will not this question be a constant source of trouble and a veritable cause for perennial cry for readjustments? Will this state of constant warfare conduce to smooth running of the administration? Will it not give rise to more bitter party struggles and worse still to pork barrel tactics? (See para. 34).

33. Then there is a further question. Will the Bombay Administrative machinery which at present deals with 24 square miles of area with concentrated population, be able to deal efficiently with about 200 square miles of area with a spread out population and with problems absolutely different from those of the City? Will the machine not crack? If it succeeds, will the local government be a human device for dealing with human beings or an iron-and-steel robot dealing with tools and plants? Will such an administration be anything better than paper administration carried on with the assistance of petty local officers who will boss over local affairs? **Will it not be a centralised bureaucratic administration with a vengeance?**

34. In reply to those who say that a **unified metropolitan Government** is economical and is administratively convenient, it has been

Arguments regarding administrative convenience refuted.

pointed by Mr. Griffith, a most reputed authority on Municipal Government, that these arguments hold no water. He says : " The case for unified metropolitan government is primarily administrative; yet the case, even on this ground, is none too strong. Unified control of **certain functions** "(e.g., water supply, Sewage disposal, arterial roads, etc.,) it is true, would seem to be not merely advisable but imperative ; other functions may be added and administratively it is certainly often desirable that this is done. Yet this is by no means the entire picture even from administrative standpoint. In the first place, the resultant administrative machine almost staggers the imagination. Even under the most favourable circumstances, the Government of a metropolis would tax the wit of the most efficient of executives through its sheer diversity and top-heavy character. However strong the case may be for transfer of a particular function to a regional Government, the case must become administratively less strong when a certain point is reached. Beyond this point, a kind of 'diminishing returns' sets in, and it is quite possible that the resultant tendency towards top-heaviness generally may outweigh the advantages in the case of the function itself. Geographical division of labour among the several boroughs and suburbs may well have administrative advantages, counter balancing those of a large scale operation in the hands of the regional government. This is quite apart from a second consideration which makes the case for such a strong regional government even more doubtful. Large units suffer from the danger of being out of touch with the various parts. Local improvements are also often best in local hands; for even the alternative of local representation on the metropolitan board, carries an inherent danger of 'port barrel' tactics (with each local representative struggling for favours for his district). It is also only fair to mention the very considerable transitional difficulties involved in the merging of several hitherto independent administrative systems. "

35. Mr. Wells, an eminent modern authority, refutes the **argument that annexation means economic administration. He says that on the contrary the costs would be increased.** These are his words :

Argument about economics of unified area illusory.

"The alleged economics are largely illusory. It would be impossible to administer all functions from the central office and hence local officers would still be necessary. Administrative machinery would then be more complicated than at present and costs would be increased rather than diminished. Lastly, the right of exclusive jurisdiction means increased Centralisation. The central city officer is a Government official and more powers will have to be vested in him, which means greater bureaucratic hold on the metropolitan area."

36. The same eminent authority, Mr. Wells, in his Standard
 Decentralisation Work on "German Cities" advocates de-
 necessary. centralisation and Municipal Federation
 in the following words:—

"It has come to be recognised that the outright annexation or consolidation of municipalities involves distinct disadvantages. When a flourishing suburb is annexed to a large city, its corporate life is extinguished, its governing organs are abolished, and its civic spirit tends to decline to the level of that of the metropolis. Whereas before annexation, many citizens had the opportunity to serve in the suburban council and upon the deputation, only a few of these may hope to occupy similar posts in the governmental machine of the Grosstadt.

"In addition to this disparity of representation, the problems of the large city are far more complicated and technical than those of the small. Of necessity, a greater reliance must be placed upon professional administrators, and bureaucratic tendencies appear. The average citizen comes to think of the city government as something remote and external to himself and his energies are drawn into other channels by the competing interests of urban life.

"The problem, then, is, to preserve local self-government and at the same time to permit the necessary expansion of the Grosstadt. Can the metropolis become, not a conglomerate mass, but a *communitas communitatum* ? Can the unity of the whole be secured without completely sacrificing the autonomy of the parts ? Can the government still be kept close

to the people ? **These are questions which administrative decentralisation and municipal federalism attempt to answer."**

37. Mr. Thomas Reed, a great American author, summarises **Case against annexation** the case against annexation as under :—
summarised.

"A metropolis is not an Assemblage of individuals so much as collection of Communities in which individuals are already assembled. Any sound solution of metropolitan problem must take into account these facts.

"So difficult is it to arouse the public to an interest in the affairs of large cities that **no opportunity should be lost of employing local patriotism in the service of local government.**

"There are objections to simple annexation, as a solution of metropolitan problem, other than the mere difficulty of its accomplishment. The most significant of them is that **an out and out annexation of the whole metropolitan area is financially destructive.** The moment any section comes into the City, every resident and property owner conceives himself or his property entitled to all imaginable municipal services. **The pressure upon the City Government becomes prodigious and often irresistible.** No American City has attempted to annex a whole metropolitan area except Los Angeles. The experience of Los Angeles is not likely to encourage imitation. Not only is annexation on a metropolitan scale financially suicidal but promises much less genuine satisfaction of those purely local needs which are best appreciated by members of the local community. The fact of the matter is, that while a metropolitan area possesses elements of unity which must be recognised and encouraged, it presents at the same time a picture of extra-ordinary diversity which can no more be safely ignored. To apply the same form of Government and attempt to supply the same services to the farms of Forward Township, a great centre like Pillsburgh, an industrial satellite like McKeesport and a fashionable residential suburb like Sewickle would be absurd."

38. Prof. Robson, though a whole-hogger, points out that the **Prof. Robson's dictum.** Federal Organisation is the only satisfactory solution for a number of functions. There

are many functions, he says, where "demands of administrative efficiency must yield, where necessary, to the higher expediency of ensuring the 'consciousness of consent' among the citizens. This means, in terms of organization, that the combination of authorities must be established in a federal form. Only in this way can the machinery of government be kept responsive to public opinion in the localities."

39. **Dangers of annexation have been very well appreciated by the Government of Bombay** and are vividly depicted in the pamphlet on Greater Bombay. I give the following extract from that valuable document :—

Considered opinion of the Government of Bombay.

"One proposal is that the city and the suburbs should be amalgamated into one large municipality. There are several objections to this proposal not as regards the object in view, but from a practical standpoint. In the first place, the resultant municipality would be so bulky and unwieldy as to be unmanageable. It would involve centralisation in extremes and the investing of almost autocratic power in the executive. Secondly, the local bodies in the suburbs, which have in a large degree the spirit of autonomy and have in many cases done most valuable public-spirited work, would have to be abolished. Not only would intense irritation be caused to the public, but the services of many public-spirited men would be lost. For it would be obviously impossible to include all the members of suburban local bodies in the new municipality thus formed."

"The matter is further complicated by the present situation of the Bombay City Municipality. The administration is growing far too unwieldy and complicated for a single body and a single municipal commissioner to administer.

"The comparative success of the present system in the past does not mean that it will not break down in the future. The difficulties of co-ordination and control, will increase. The specific defect of the Bombay system is the neglect of the poorer areas.

"An unduly large municipality cannot have any intimate contact with the needs of different localities and without such contact all areas are subject to a uniform policy, rendered rigid by the needs of administration, which works most smoothly from the administrator's point of view when mechanical. Small

areas having their own special needs therefore, will never be satisfied. If the special need of one area is met, other areas will claim similar facilities and often a need which would easily be satisfied for one area, if it possessed its own funds, has to be foregone in view of the jealousies of other areas and their equal claims on the common funds. A large body can suitably provide common necessities, but not individual luxuries. To take an instance, main and through roads are necessary and can only be provided by an over-riding authority. Side-roads are often luxuries and many small areas would prefer a bath-house or library or a play-ground to good side-roads. The delegation of minor local matters to small local bodies provides a wider sphere for the discovery of administrative geniuses and any mistake made by ignorance of administrative needs are of less importance.

40. Finally, I quote from the editorial note in a recent issue of **Days of annexation** the **Municipal Review of Canada (for September 1945)**.
are gone.

“It was recently stated by a municipal official that having so many political entities in a metropolitan area is responsible for a tendency of the citizens to ignore the fact that they are members of a single community and that its social problems apply to all the municipalities, the inference being that independent or separate units are not conducive to civic development. This is a wrong conception of sound metropolitan organization. According to Dr. Thomas H. Reed, the great American municipal authority, it is in the small local community that are nurtured and developed the habit and practice of democratic action, which in large units is all too subject to the perverting activities of machines and bosses.” And referring to metropolitan government, Dr. Reed goes on to say, ‘Metropolitan organization must not fly in the face of the traditions and habits of the people, but must leave in existence to the greatest extent possible the customary units of local government. **The day when the metropolitan problem could be solved by annexation or amalgamation is past.**’

Wrong conception that separate units are not conducive to civic development.

Machines and Bosses rule in octopus-like units.

“Practical evidence of the value of the small unit in metropolitan organisation is shown in the great Master Plan of London by Sir Patrick Abercrombie. From the first, Sir Patrick took into his confidence every organized community comprising the metropolitan area (about 100), with such good effect that every local authority is 100 per cent behind his plan. Had London been one huge single community Sir Patrick would never have got his plan accepted, it would have been subjected to the perverting activities of machines and bosses’, as pointed out by Dr. Reed.

“The machinery we would set up for the successful administration of a large metropolitan district is the Borough System, whereby the various districts would be independent units or boroughs in the administration of local affairs, while each borough council would send a delegate, or delegates according to the size of the borough to a central council, whose responsibility would be in matters of an inter-urban character, such as fire and police protection, inter-urban services, public health, education and finance. Here you have a complete checking service in metropolitan organization, not by some higher-up authority but by the administrative units themselves— one of the reasons for successful British local government. The fundamental principle of the Borough System of Government is local autonomy. As such it is essentially of a democratic character. Applied to a large metropolitan area it cannot help but be effective in welding the many factors that go to the making of a great metropolis, because under such a system every community interest would have a real voice in its government.

41. I hope I have proved, that the circumstances of our case and the experience of foreign countries are against accepting annexation as a proper solution of our metropolitan problem.

London County Council Plan with modifications.

42. We shall, therefore, have to resort to some suitable form of Federation of Local Bodies. This Federal principle is at the root of the recommendations of the Bell Committee which are revised and embodied in the Review of the Government of Bombay mentioned above. The same principle of federalism forms the basis of the government

Master Plan of London and small local units.

My suggestion: Adopt London County Council model with modifications.

of the Greater London, Greater Berlin and Greater New York. London County Council, which incorporates this principle, is recognised as "**the best organised democratic metropolitan body that is known to the world.**" At the same time, "**it is the most stupendous efficient and economic municipal administration in the world.**" The details governing this body are well known and can be seen in any text book and I need not repeat them here.

43. A special consideration why the London County Council plan would suit us better, is that the City, under that plan, does not render itself legally liable to supply all the City's amenities to the suburban units, irrespective of what contributions these units make to the common fund. Under the London plan, units pay directly for the local needs and the central fund pays for the common needs. The Plan permits development of each locality according to its needs and financial resources. **There is no necessity to have a uniform rate of taxes** in the City and in the federating units. Different rates prevail in different Metropolitan Boroughs of London today, because of the diversity of conditions obtaining there. This diversity, in our case, is much more marked than in London, and therefore the rates will vary considerably in our case. This feature of the London Plan saves the City from great financial responsibility which the annexation plan would impose on the City. At the same time, the said plan does not impose an unjustifiable and unbearable burden on the poorer units.

44. I should, however, like that the machinery governing London County Council should be adopted here with modifications demanded by our circumstances and suggested by competent critics. One of the modifications, so suggested, is the abolition of a number of numerous *ad hoc* bodies that are formed for the administration of Greater London. I would avoid these *ad hoc* Committees, as far as possible, and divide the functions between the Central body and the local units in such a way, as to obviate the necessity of resorting to these *ad hoc* bodies.

The present circumstances call for a warning against the appointment of Expert Committees, like the Traffic Committee, Housing Committee, Planning Committee and a host of other Committees which are

Expert *ad hoc*
Committees.

suggested from time to time. About half a dozen Committees, with independent controlling powers, with an assured tenure of life and presumably with assured funds, are proposed by different panels. These are definite danger signals. Dangers to which this method is exposed are ably stated by authorities like Dr. Robson, Mr. Reed and others. They have pointed out that these Committees multiply in course of time and lead to disintegrity and complexity. Popular understanding of Government is seriously obstructed. Real co-ordination of local Government budgets is rendered difficult. Various spending bodies submit independent demands. More vocal or influential Committees get overfed whereas others, though more essential, are starved. No authority knows what other authorities are doing. (*Vide* Finer on Local Government).

45. The Right Hon'ble Herbert Morrison, one of the leading members of the present British Cabinet, and a former leader of the London County Council, states : "Indeed some enthusiasts with specialist minds occasionally bob up demanding yet another Greater London authority in respect, for example, of Housing or Town Planning. There are people who believe that the establishment of special authority will solve most problems for co-ordination whereas it may have done little more than create a salary list." "Town Planning for example, is essentially related or a number of other Municipal functions and should be part of the work of a general Municipal authority." ("How Greater London is Governed").

46. I would create a Greater Bombay Council made up of **direct representatives** from each of the wards of the City and from the wards created afresh in the Suburban Area, as sub-divisions of the present local units, or where these units are small, the whole unit area may be taken as one ward. The reasons why I advocate direct representatives to the Greater Bombay Council, instead of indirect representatives from the members of the local units, are, that we would under the former suggestion secure a superior class of persons for constituting the central body; the wards would take direct interest in central subjects and the elected persons would be free from the influences of the party factions existing in local Councils.

47. The suburbanites have expressed fear (*vide* Conference resolutions, Appendix C) that they would be reduced to an impotent minority and that that they would have no effective voice in the Central Council.

Some concession, some weightage will have to be given in their favour to allay their fears. Such concessions are a common feature in western countries.

48. There are several well recognised principles for the division of functions between the Federated Greater Councils and Local Units and they should be adopted in the Constitution of the Greater Bombay Council. The fundamental guiding principle is that local functions should be left to the management of local Units and general functions to the Central body. Where the technical nature of the service requires that the whole area should be dealt with as one unified body (e.g. Regional Planning); where a high degree of specialization requiring a very large area is necessary for optimum efficiency and economy (e.g. lunatic asylum, technical education, testing of water meters, etc.), when the uniform system of policing is necessary to prevent evasion of control (e.g., in cases of Terminal tax, Octroi or town duties), where it is desirable that there should be a strict co-ordination of efforts, etc., in all such cases it would be the Central body which would be in charge of the affairs of the whole region.

49. Some functions would be performed directly by the Central body, some by local body under Central supervision and the remaining would be left entirely under Local Control. The Central Function will include Arterial roads, Public Health control (executive powers with primary Units) Water Supply, Main drainage, Public Utility Services, Education, Fire Brigade, Town Planning, etc., whereas subjects like regulation of offensive trades, adulteration of food, Registration of Voters, etc., would come under the category of functions managed by primary units but under central directions.

Finance.

50. As regards the finance, the following general principles may be laid down :—

Each locality will entirely bear the burden of the expenditure of the local functions left with it specifically or as residual.

51. As regards the burden of expenditure, thrown by the Central body on a locality for functions performed by the Central body, the general guiding principle would be that the burden will be approximated to benefit. This principle would have to be

Division of Functions.

Functions divided according to control.

Burden according to benefits and ability to pay.

modified by considerations of ability to pay, the stronger units bearing a heavier burden, because needs and tax capacities are often met with in inverse ratio.

Loans. 52. As regards loan charges, the burden of current loans which benefit only particular localities should be borne by the localities concerned.

The present loans of the City should be the burden of the City only.

The burden of loans which benefit more than one unit should be apportioned between them in proportion of the benefits received as approximately as possible. The same principles should be applied to future loans.

Borrowing facilities. 53. I should suppose that the Central Body would be able to raise loans for local units without the red tape methods of the Local Authorities Loans Act.

What help is expected from the Provincial Government. 54. The Provincial Government will have to come forward and support the scheme of federation by lending a helping hand in a number of ways (1) It will have to give up to the Central Council not only non-agricultural revenue but also

land revenue which forms part of the sources of the income of the Local Bodies in other countries. (2) Provincial Government should continue to maintain the provincial roads. (3) Provincial Government will have to grant monopolies for transport service and Electric Supply and such other utility concerns as may be suitably handled by the federal council. These will serve to reduce tax burdens either directly or indirectly by introduction of cheap transport. (4) Substantial subsidies will have to be paid by Government for housing, planning and zoning activities that the federal council will have to undertake. (5) Provincial Government will have to give a substantial grant to the Greater Bombay Central Council, consolidating grants at present given or permissible to Local Bodies in the Suburbs, for example, in respect of Drainage and Water Supply schemes as also for Roads, Medical Relief, towards the salaries of Medical Officers and Chief Officers and Educational Grants. (6) Government will also have to forego a substantial share of revenue from (a) Betting Taxes, (b) Entertainment Taxes, (c) Electricity tax, (d) Tax on Transfer of Properties, (e) Petrol Tax, (f) Registration and License Fee for motor vehicles. (7) The Housing Panel has suggested some further sources of revenue to which due consideration may be given.

55. The Urban Immovable Property tax is clearly an Urban Immovable encroachment by the Provincial Government Property Tax. on the taxing privileges of Local Bodies, though for a laudable object. I believe the Provincial Government should now find it convenient to forego this and thereby enlarge the sphere of Local Taxation.

56. Government should also consider whether the Greater Share of Central Taxes. Bombay Council should not receive certain allocation of funds out of allotments received by them from Central Government in respect of Income Tax and Death Duties (if introduced) in view of the large amounts which the Greater Bombay region would be contributing to these funds.

57. I also hope that the Greater Bombay Council will receive Sales Tax. a substantial amount from the proceeds of the Sales Tax that may be imposed.

58. I have given only a rough sketch of what should form the Conclusion. basis for a Scheme of Metropolitan Government. I know that it would be easy to point out difficulties regarding details. I have not, therefore, ventured to lay down any details. For the purpose of such a detailed draft of a scheme, I would request Government to appoint a competent Officer on special duty at an early date with instructions to prepare a concrete detailed scheme, which might be published for inviting public opinion, and on receipt of such opinions, let Government decide the form of administration and introduce necessary legislation.

59. We would be failing in our duty if we did not express our Mr. Modak. appreciation of the work of our able Secretary, Mr. N. V. Modak. He is a great Engineering expert, holding a first class reputation. His technical knowledge and experience were of considerable assistance in formulating our recommendations. A considerable share of the credit, if any, due to our report goes to Mr. Modak, whose note formed the basis for our discussions.

I am particularly grateful to Mr. Modak, who was good enough to visit my office on more occasions than one and to hold preliminary discussions with me for hours together, on subjects that were to be included in his note and thereafter on the draft of his note. In Part II (Greater Bombay), therefore, are incorporated many of my

ideas with which he agreed. If the report of our Panel is so very poor, as I think it is, on the subject of the governance of Greater Bombay, it is no fault of Mr. Modak, who expressed clearly that the problems of administration were outside his province. I pay my sincere tribute to his competence and untiring efforts, for I know personally what heavy work he has put in at great inconvenience to himself.

60. To DR. ALBAN D'SOUZA, our Chairman, I am thankful
Dr. Alban D'Souza. for special indulgence shown.

61. Lastly, I crave to be excused by my esteemed colleagues if I have misunderstood or unconsciously misrepresented any of their recommendations and have offered uncalled for comments. I am also sorry for taking 6 days more than the week allowed to me for submitting this Note.

BOMBAY, 11th April 1946.

CHUNILAL D. BARFIVALA.