

**THE BIHAR AND WEST BENGAL
(TRANSFER OF TERRITORIES) BILL,
1956**

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI GOVINO BALLABH PANT) : Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the House passed the States Reorganisation Bill unanimously on Saturday last. As compared with that Bill, this is an unambitious and a simple measure. Already a full-dress debate has been held over the provisions of this Bill. It was referred to a Joint Select Committee by this House, and also by the Lok Sabha, and at that time, all relevant matters connected with the clauses of the Bill were fully thrashed out. Since then, we had the opportunity of further examining the provisions contained in the Bill in the Select Committee. The Lok Sabha had, after that, the opportunity of discussing the amended Bill, as it was returned to the Sabha by the Joint Select Committee. It has now come to this august House as approved and adopted by the Lok Sabha.

Sir, it deals with only two States, namely, Bihar and West Bengal. It provides for the transfer of a portion of Kishanganj sub-division and Purulia sub-division and also a portion of Gopalpur thana to West Bengal. It also provides for the transfer of certain areas in the south from the Manbhum district to West Bengal. The clauses of the Bill are quite plain and do not admit of any ambiguity. The Bill is based on the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission. The changes that have been made in the Bill since it was introduced have improved it considerably. As hon. Members are aware, the proposals for the transfer of the areas in the north, namely, those from the Kishanganj sub-division and from Gopalpur thana were made with a view to connect the two portions of West Bengal. The northern part consisting of Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri and Cooch-Behar has been disconnected, as a result of the partition of 1947, from the main body of West Bengal, and these two disconnected parts have to be linked together. It is not with a view to provide a corridor, but to satisfy an imperative administrative necessity, that this proposal has

been made. The State should be compact and it should not consist of parts that are scattered about, and which do not have any geographical contiguity. So, it was considered necessary to propose the transfer of this territory from Bihar to West Bengal. There was no other way of connecting the two parts. There was some difficulty on account of the fears and apprehensions that had been roused in the minds of some of the people living in the Kishanganj sub-division, and there was also another administrative difficulty in the proposals that had been made in the States Reorganisation Commission's Report. The whole scheme has been designed with a view to connect the two parts, but still, taking the uppermost limit of the area that was to be transferred from Bihar to West Bengal according to the proposals of the States Reorganisation Commission, there will be a strip, about 15 or 16 miles in length, coming between that area and the northern part of West Bengal. So, some arrangement has to be made to get over this defect, and the remedy has been found in proposing the transfer of that strip too. So far as the north is concerned, now we will have a compact area, connecting Bengal proper with Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri and Cooch-Behar. There will be no missing link in between the two. It was necessary to have a compact area, not only for administrative purposes, but also in order to ensure the security of the country, because this tract adjoined East Bengal. The major part of the area that is contiguous to East Bengal already lies in West Bengal. But the small border lay outside it. Now, as a result of the arrangement proposed in the Bill, the entire frontier will be under the control of the West Bengal Government, and so it will be easier and more effectively possible to control the frontier, to prevent smuggling, and to see that no abuse is made of the generosity with which our State has been treating the men on the other side of the border. For these purposes, too, this transfer was essential and unavoidable.

Sir, the people of Kishanganj are mostly Muslims. They were opposed to this transfer, because they speak a different language, and also they felt that it would be better for them to continue as they were. In order to remove their misgivings and apprehensions, the Select Committee has suggested that Kishanganj should lie outside the area that is to be transferred to West Bengal, and that the eastern boundary of the

[SHRI Govind Ballabh Pant.] area to be transferred should pass by the municipal boundary of Kishanganj, and that the two should coincide, so that the town may not be disturbed. It has also been suggested that there should be one contiguous boundary. So, the highway has been accepted as the boundary throughout in the north. But there must be some elbow room beside, and adjacent to, the highway. So, it has been provided that generally 200 yards to the west of the highway should also go along with it. But it has again been considered necessary that, as far as possible, no towns or villages should be split up. So, a direction has been further embodied to the effect that the Central Government should demarcate the boundaries in such a way that while resorting generally to these 200 yards, no inhabited area, rural or urban, should be cut into two. That explains the position, so far as Purnea is concerned.

Besides that, it has also been, in a way, decided and accepted by the West Bengal Government that there will be no linguistic difficulty on account of the transfer to this area. Those who speak Urdu will be given every facility. An assurance to that effect has already been given by the Chief Minister of West Bengal. The Commission had also suggested that as it was a very congested area, no refugees should be settled in that area to be transferred from Purnea to West Bengal. That condition too has been accepted by the Government of West Bengal, and we have further ratified and confirmed it in the Report of the Select Committee, which has been virtually accepted by the Lok Sabha, and which, I hope, will receive the approval of this august House too. That disposes of the northern part.

The southern part relates to iz
Manbhum district, so
far as that goes, no particular change has been made. This transfer was suggested in order to ensure the implementation and proper efficient management of certain projects connected with the Kasai and Ajoy rivers which are going to be put into effect for the benefit of the people living in that part of the adjoining area. There were similar reasons for taking out a small area consisting of Chas thana, Chandil thana and Patamda police station from the area that had been originally suggested, and that has been retained in Bihar. There is no

controversy about it, and the proposal has been virtually accepted by the Bengal Legislature.

There was another objection raised in the Select Committee that by this arrangement which would result in the transfer of this area from Manbhum district to Bengal, the communications between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur would be in a way disturbed and that they will have to pass through Bengal territory, and it was argued that, while facilities were being provided for Bengal, the result so far as Bihar was concerned was somewhat embarrassing to them. So, to get over this, it has been proposed that a highway should be marked out and maintained by the Centre from Dhanbad to Jamshedpur and, if necessary, similar arrangements should be made also to connect Ranchi and Jamshedpur or Dhanbad through some common point. So, in this manner an attempt has been made to meet all difficulties and to satisfy all sections.

I do not think it is necessary for me to speak on the general aspects of the question. We have discussed matters of a general character more than once, and I thought that I should only place before the House the proposal that are contained in the Bill and explain the few changes that have been made by the Select Committee and accepted by the Lok Sabha, and the reasons why the Select Committee considered it necessary to make those changes. I commend my motion to the House for acceptance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Just one question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Later on. Please sit down.

DR. P. C. MITRA: May I know what are the means by which the wishes of the people can be ascertained on a subject of vital importance?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT:
That question does not arise out of my speech.

DR. P. C. MITRA: What are the reasons for ignoring the Assembly Members' verdict ?

श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे सामने जो यह बिहार-बंगाल विभाजन विधेयक आया है उसका समर्थन और स्वागत करने के लिये मैं खड़ी हुई हूँ। यह विधेयक हमारे सामने सिलेक्ट कमेटी के बाद और लोक सभा से पास होने के बाद इस सदन में आया है। यह खुशी की बात है कि आज तक बंगाल को जो असुविधा का सामना करना पड़ रहा था वह आज दूर हो रही है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत ने स्वाधीनता पाने के लिये बहुत ही कष्ट उठाये, सभी भारतीयों ने देश की स्वाधीनता के लिये कुर्बानी दी और स्वार्थ त्याग किया। आज हम लोग जो इस भारत की स्वाधीनता की रूपरेखा देख रहे हैं वह न होती, यदि आज की तरह हम लोगों में यह मनोवृत्ति होती कि यह हिस्सा हमारा है और वह हिस्सा तुम्हारा है। अगर उस समय इस तरह की मनोवृत्ति होती तो हम आज इतनी जल्दी भारत को स्वाधीन न देख पाते। उस समय गांधी जी के निस्वार्थ मंत्र के सामने किसी का अपनापन नहीं रहा, उस समय किसी राज्य के मन में दूसरे राज्य के प्रति कोई खराब भावना नहीं थी, सब जनता सारे देश को एक मानती थी, किसी तरह की कोई खराब मनोवृत्ति किसी के दिल में नहीं थी। यदि उस समय इस तरह की भावना होती तो आज हम लोग इस तरह से एकता के सूत्र में नहीं बंध सकते थे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट ने देश के अन्दर एक तरह से खलबली मचा दी है। हर राज्य में कुछ न कुछ हिस्सा अपने में मिलाने के लिए एक तरह का आन्दोलन चल रहा है। मैं समझती हूँ कि इस तरह का आन्दोलन करना, गड़बड़ी करनी हिन्दुस्तानियों के लिए और भारतवर्ष के लिये शोभा की चीज नहीं है। आज हमारा देश विदेशियों से मैत्री सम्बन्ध जोड़ रहा है, इधर उधर विदेशियों को अपनी विशालता दिखला रहा है और हम लोग देश के अन्दर टुकड़े टुकड़े के लिये लड़ रहे हैं, क्या यह हमारे लिये शोभा की बात है, क्या यह नमूना हमारे लिये उचित है? हम लोगों ने युग युगों से अपनी महानता दूसरे देशों में फैलाई और दिखलाई और आज इस तरह से अगड़ना हमारे लिये तथा देश के लिये अच्छा मालूम नहीं होता है। सैकड़ों वर्षों तक हम लोग पराधीनता के रंग में रंगे रहे। गांधी जी ने हमें एक नया

रंग और एक नया रंग एकता का सिखलाया लेकिन आज हम उसको अपना नहीं रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत की स्वाधीनता के लिए किसी एक दो प्रदेशों ने सैक्रीफाइस किया है, यह बात नहीं है। अन्य प्रदेशों ने भी, देश के और प्रदेशों की तरह भारत की स्वाधीनता के लिये सैक्रीफाइस किया है। अगर आप बंगाल के इतिहास को देखेंगे, तो आपको मालूम होगा कि उसने देश की स्वाधीनता के लिए सबसे ज्यादा स्वार्थ त्याग किया है। बंगाल प्रदेश को बार बार पार्टीशन का शिकार होना पड़ा। सन् १९०५ से लेकर आज तक बंगाल को एक दिन के लिए भी सुख नहीं मिला। ब्रिटिश अधिकारियों ने जब देखा कि बंगाल की जनता में एकता काफी है और उन्हें रूल करने में असुविधा हो जायगी तो उस एकता को तोड़ने के लिए लांड कर्जन ने १९०५ में बंगाल के टुकड़े टुकड़े कर दिये। तब से कुछ न कुछ हिस्सा बंगाल का इधर या उधर देना पड़ा। बंगाल का तीन बार बटवारा होने पर उसे कम से कम ५० हजार स्क्वायर मील से ज्यादा हिस्सा दूसरों को देना पड़ा। पहले बंगाल प्रदेश का एरिया १ लाख स्क्वायर मील था और पीछे वह एरिया केवल ३० हजार स्क्वायर मील रह गया। अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारतवर्ष के पार्ट ए स्टेटों में बंगाल ही एक ऐसा स्टेट है जो सबसे छोटा है। इतने बड़े देश के लिये यह शोभा की बात नहीं है और यह अच्छा भी मालूम नहीं होता है। बंगाल एक सीमावर्ती प्रदेश है। एक ओर तो उसकी सीमा पाकिस्तान के साथ मिलती है और दूसरी ओर उसकी सीमा तिब्बत के साथ मिलती है। इसलिये यह सारे देश का फ़र्ज हो जाता है कि बंगाल जो कि एक सीमावर्ती प्रदेश है उसे मजबूत रखा जाय क्योंकि सारे देश की रक्षा करने का भार इसी प्रदेश के ऊपर आ जाता है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक द्वारा बिहार का किशनगंज का हिस्सा दालखोला और चोपरा का हिस्सा बंगाल में मिलाया जा रहा है। इन दो हिस्सों के मिलने से दार्जिलिंग के साथ बंगाल का सीधा लिंक हो जाता है। इस तरह से आप लोगों ने एक फ्रंटियर स्टेट को मजबूत किया। इसके लिये मैं गृह मंत्री महोदय को धन्यवाद देती हूँ। इसके साथ ही साथ मैं बिहार के उन सदस्यों को भी धन्यवाद देती हूँ जिन्होंने बिहार का दक्षिणी और उत्तरी हिस्सा जो इस विधेयक द्वारा बंगाल को दिया जा रहा है उसको देने में किसी तरह की रुकावट नहीं डाली।

[श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री]

महोदय, बंगाल को १९५३ में जो दुर्भिक्ष की आग में पड़ना पड़ा वह भी बंगाल के लिये तथा हिन्दुस्तान के लिये कोई मामूली दृश्य नहीं था। उस दुर्भिक्ष में हजारों और लाखों की संख्या में भूख में तड़प कर लोगों ने अपनी जान दे दी। उसके बाद भी १९४६ में मुसलिम लीग के डाइरेक्ट ऐक्शन के फलस्वरूप नोआखाली में जो दृश्य दिखाई दिया और ढाका में लोगों की जो शोचनीय अवस्था हुई वह भी बंगाल का एक दुर्भाग्य था। जब से बंगाल में इस प्रकार चंद्रग्रहण पड़ा तब से बंगाल को हिन्दुस्तान के अन्य भागों की अपेक्षा सबसे ज्यादा सफर करना पड़ा।

बंगाल की जो मांग है, जिसके लिए बंगाल की प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी ने १२, १३ हजार स्ववायर माईल के एरिया की डिमांड रखी है वह अभी तक भी पूरी नहीं की गई। पार्टीशन के बाद से अब भी लाखों रिफ्यूजीज शरणार्थियों का जो ढेर लगा है और दिनों दिन जो रिफ्यूजीज बढ़ते ही जा रहे हैं, तो उसके लिये हम सोच रहे हैं कि बंगाल की इस बढ़ती हुई आबादी को कहाँ पर ले जाकर रखेंगे कहाँ पर उनको सेटिल करेंगे। इसलिए यह केवल बंगाल का फ़र्ज नहीं है, यह सेंटर का फ़र्ज है कि उन लोगों की मांगी हुई जो डिमांड है उसका मान कर बंगाल को वह क्लेम किया हुआ पूरा पोर्शन दिया जाय। अभी मा० गृहमंत्री ने बताया कि एस० आर० कमीशन ने जितना बंगाल को देने की सिफारिश की थी उसमें से भी १,६०० स्ववायर माईल्स को बंगाल से और भी काट रहे हैं, तो यह हमारे ख्याल में अच्छा नहीं मालूम होता है। इसमें यह जरूर है कि बिहार के रहने वालों को जरूर दुख होगा कि अपना हिस्सा काट कर बंगाल को हम क्यों दें। यह वातावरण वहाँ जो उठ रहा है, यह उठना भी उचित है, परन्तु देश की मजबूती को देखते हुए ऐसे भाव फैलाना ठीक नहीं दिखायी देता है। यदि उनको जमीन के बारे में कुछ कमी हो तो मैं एक सजेशन गृह मंत्री को देना चाहती हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश और मध्य प्रदेश में जो बड़ी बड़ी जमीनें पड़ी हैं और अभी तक एस० आर० सी० ने उस दिशा को टच नहीं किया है, तो उनको वहाँ से काट कर क्यों न बिहार को दे दिया जाय ?

श्री टी० पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अब इस बात को आप आगे न बढ़ाइये।

श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री : मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि बिहार का जो पोर्शन कम पड़ जाता है उसको वहाँ से काट कर मिल सकता है। मैं नहीं कहती कि वे लोग अपनी जमीन देने में अच्छा मानते हैं। लेकिन बिहार की जमीन के पोर्शन में जो कमी हो, उसके लिये बिहार के मा० सदस्यों को कोई ग़ज़ नहीं होना चाहिये क्योंकि यह तो बंगाल का ही हिस्सा था जो कि ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के समय में पार्टीशन कर के बांट दिया गया था। धनबाद, राजमहल, देवघर आदि जहाँ पर बंगाली स्पीकिंग पापुलेशन है, उन पर बंगाल की पहले से मांग थी। सन् १९११ में भारतीय कांग्रेस ने भी इस पर जोर दिया था कि बंगाल का पोर्शन बंगाल को ही जाना उचित है। इस हैसियत से हम देखते हैं कि जब से पार्टीशन हुआ तब से आज तक बंगाल का जो क्लेम है, उसकी पूर्ति नहीं हुई है। आज भी वही समस्या है कि हमारी बंगाली स्पीकिंग एरिया बंगाल में ट्रांसफर करनी चाहिये, बंगाल में आनी चाहिये। यदि वह बंगाली स्पीकिंग एरिया है, बंगाल का हिस्सा है तो उसे बंगाल को क्यों न दिया जाय। यह कमीशन जो बिठाया गया है वह लोगों की डिमांड मालूम करने के लिये और उनकी असुविधा देखने के लिये बिठाया गया है। तो यह असुविधा देखते हुए आज तक बंगाल का हिस्सा बंगाल को जो अभी तक नहीं मिला है यह अनुचित बात है। इसलिए, श्रीमान्, मैं यह सजेशन करना चाहती हूँ कि यह पोर्शन बंगाल को देना चाहिये और बंगाल की जो डिमांड है कि अपनी पापुलेशन अपने स्टेट में रहे, इसकी पूर्ति करनी चाहिये।

हमारा जो किशनगंज का छोटा सा पोर्शन दार्जिलिंग में मिला दिया गया है उसके लिये मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि किशनगंज में मुसलिम पापुलेशन है, वहाँ पर उर्दू स्पीकिंग पापुलेशन है लेकिन यह बात सही नहीं है कि वहाँ पर बंगाली स्पीकिंग पापुलेशन नहीं है। मैं भी दार्जिलिंग से आती हूँ, मैं भी बंगाली स्पीकिंग पापुलेशन से नहीं आती हूँ और मैं नेपाली भाषाभाषी हूँ, लेकिन बंगाल में रहते हुए हम लोगों को अभी तक कोई असुविधा नहीं है। उसी तरह मुसलिम पापुलेशन जो वहाँ पर दार्जिलिंग में है, उसको भी कोई असुविधा नहीं होगी। मैं आशा करती हूँ कि जिस तरह से बंगाल गवर्नमेंट ने बंगाल में मुसलिम पापुलेशन के राइट्स सुरक्षित रखे हैं उसी तरह से उनके हक हमारे दार्जिलिंग में भी सुरक्षित रखेंगी। इसमें कोई असुविधा नहीं होगी। एक बात इसमें और यह

है कि वहां पर कोई रिफ्यूजी न रखे जाय । जहां तक हम आशा करते हैं, शायद वेस्ट बंगाल की सरकार वहां पर रिफ्यूजी को लाद कर और भार न बढ़ायेगी और वहां पर जितनी पापुलेशन इस समय है उसको वैसा ही रहने देगी । हम चाहते हैं कि साउथ में जिस तरह एरिया देकर डिस्ट्रिक्ट बनाया गया है उसी तरह बंगाल की जो डिमांड है वह पूरी की जाय ।

मैं ज्यादा नहीं बोलना चाहती हूं और आपका समय भी नहीं लेना चाहती । मैं अनुरोध करती हूं कि अभी तक बंगाल की जो डिमांड है वह इसी बिल में खत्म कर दी जाय जिससे कि नया बिल लाने की जरूरत न पड़े । इस बिल का मैं स्वागत करती हूं ।

SHRI MAHESH SARAN (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words regarding this Bill. I do realise that West Bengal has suffered a lot for a very long time. Its boundaries have been shortened and the partition has brought a lot of difficulty to it. But at the same time, I do hope that the principle on which certain territories are asked to be transferred, it will be realised, is not quite proper. The linguistic principle is a very dangerous principle and I think that if on this principle portions are transferred, it will not bring unity. It will be the cause of great disunity and I am glad to find, Sir, that so far as the areas that are to be transferred are concerned, it has been clearly stated that they are not being transferred due to any linguistic consideration. Moreover, the consideration of the refugees having to be settled is not a proper approach, because the whole of India is prepared to have the refugees and to look after their comforts. The Central Government has already a Department which looks after the comforts and the rehabilitation of refugees, so that if territories are asked for their resettlement, I think it is not on a right principle.

Sir, we have seen what has happened when the question is tackled from the linguistic point of view. There is disunity, there is strife, people who have been friends become enemies. There is a feeling of tension all round. Therefore, this is not one of those things which should ever be encouraged, because the solidarity of India is to a little extent at stake at such suggestions.

Sir, there are a few points which I think it is necessary for me to enunciate here. If a transfer is made on the basis of language, then a time will come when a majority of people speaking one language may become the minority, because population is always mobile. Therefore it will be necessary later on to make an alternation regarding the territories if you stick to it on a linguistic basis. Then again, there is no one language in any State. There are people speaking different languages. Therefore if you give preference to the language which is spoken by the majority of the people, then a great frustration comes in, so far as the other people are concerned who speak the minority language and it is the bounden duty of the Government—and they have already stated it—to see that all the languages are carefully looked after.

So far as Bihar is concerned, it has always been ready to sacrifice whatever has been demanded of her in the national interest and Bihar has always been foremost in surrendering to the wishes of the majority of the people. Now, so far as the rehabilitation of the refugees is concerned, large numbers of people are staying there and Bihar is willing to have any number of refugees who wish to come and settle in the territory of Bihar. But Bihar also demands that the principles which are applied to Bengal or to any other State should be adhered to so far as Bihar is concerned. Therefore, what she demands is this. Due to the portion which is proposed to be given to Bengal, a great difficulty comes in and that is the want of connection between one portion of Bihar and another. For example take the case of Dhanbad and Jamshedpur. It is said that a highway would be provided to link both the places. I would very humbly beg of the Home Minister to consider this matter from a little more realistic point of view. That all these places where people have lived together should now be separated and only a highway given to them is not fair. What harm will there be if these portions are left as they are. Here I may make special mention of a few of these places. It will be found that so far as Jamshedpur and Dhanbad are concerned, in between there are Chas Thana, Jaipur, and Jhalda, Baghmundi, Arsa and Balarampur. All these places intervene between these two places. I say that most of these places should remain with Bihar. It is said that for the catchment area, these portions are necessary. My

[Shri Mahesh Saran.] humble submission is that the area given is larger than what is necessary and therefore, only that area which is essential should be given and there should be permanent connection not only by a highway, but these portions round about the highway should continue to be in Bihar.

There is another point of view which requires mention. It is said that 200 yards length to the west of the highway all through will be connecting Darjeeling with the other portion and it should be given to Bengal. I think a much smaller area would do the job. It is not necessary to cut out such a big portion all along the highway. My submission is that the main consideration is to make it compact. That is the argument that has been adduced so far as the giving of this portion from Bihar to Bengal is concerned. It should be considered from this point of view that only that minimum area should be given which would make the two portions a compact area. My submission is that this is too much. We are always prepared, as I said, to give whatever is asked for. We do hope that only that portion will be asked for which will be absolutely necessary. The question of resettling the refugees is gone. The question of linguistic principle is gone and now it is only a question of convenience for the State of West Bengal. Therefore, only that portion should be given which is absolutely necessary. My submission would be that we in Bihar have all along been willing to be of use, to be of help. We have not demanded any portion in Bengal. We have not demanded anything on the principle of language, although there was a demand some time back. We have been very very careful to be of use and help to the whole of India. Therefore, we who do not demand from others anything, we who are content with whatever we have, we have a right to ask for the sake of Bihar, "please consider this question from a little more realistic point of view, from a little more just point of view and take only that which is absolutely necessary."

I have a feeling that this question has created a lot of bad blood. I also see that West Bengal is not satisfied. They want more and there is discontent there and that feeling is not subsiding. More and more is demanded from Bihar, Bihar which keeps quiet and which is useful and helpful to the Government of India. Therefore, my submission is that

this attitude of mind should come to a stop. We should see to the solidarity of India to the great unity about which we talk all the time and we should not take a step which would create a sort of bitterness in the people who are always giving, who never demanded, who are always useful and who are never a block in the progress of the country.

Sir, I feel that the only solution which will put an end to all this is the merger of Bihar, Bengal and Orissa.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Never, never, never in your life nor in my life.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: If possible, Assam also should join. I know, Sir, that some people do not like this but this is the only solution. If you cut India into pieces on the linguistic basis, on principles of language, India will go to ruin. Therefore, the only and lasting solution, the only solution which will make the name of India great is the one which ensures the solidarity of India, the unity of India bringing the different States together. Therefore, I feel it should come—I am positive it will come soon—and there should be no talk of language, there should be no talk of all these things that are happening today. There should be talk of one India, one language and one outlook. The people who at present think that they will be satisfied by carving out some portions from other States will feel that this thing, instead of bringing India together, is creating dissensions, is creating ugly scenes and difficulties and hurdles in the way of good Government. Later on, they will also realise that the only permanent solution is the merger of big units into one and that India should be divided into four or five parts to be governed by the Centre.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Governed by the Centre?

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: In such a state of things, there would be a feeling of unity, a feeling of comradeship. Asking for this portion or the other portion. If one argument fails, putting in another argument, so that you get a little more, well never come to an end. This asking will go on increasing till you yourself feel dissatisfied with the asking and the people who want you to ask will also feel dissatisfied with the way in which you ask. Sir, my picture of

India, is a united India where petty-mindedness will not last, where troubles will not be created in the name of language. Where in the name of even language and in the name of community, harmony alone will be the guiding motive. In my picture of India, the central idea would be the unity of India, the solidarity of our motherland and the idea of bringing the whole of the country together, making it beautiful, making it grand, so that its name will shine in the world. Thank you.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Motion which has been so ably moved by the hon. Home Minister and I only wish I may be able to follow the method in which he has presented his case, trying to cut out all emotional references and treating the issue before the House in a purely objective manner. At this late stage of the discussions on this question when it has been debated over and over again, when various issues have been discussed in the Joint Select Committee and later on in the Lok Sabha, it is too late to make any new suggestions however interesting or brilliant they may be. Therefore, while I have great admiration for my hon. friend who has just now made an appeal to the unity of India in support of his suggestion for having four or five States without consideration of language or any other differences his suggestion would, at this stage of the discussion of the Bill, sound, if I may say so, a Utopian proposal. If we are going to do away with all differences, all kinds of differences within India and think of India as one unit, one indivisible unit in which we have, for administrative convenience, four or five Departments, why should we stop there and not go a step further? People all over the world today are talking of a world federation, one world State in which all distinctions will disappear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To be ruled from the Moon?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: If my hon. friend wants it to be ruled from his own domain, I would have no objection.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is what they said.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: If that is the domain to which he belongs, I certainly will not object but I would say

that any attempt at this stage to refuse to recognise certain facts, certain distinctions which are there, would be, to say the least, Utopian.

I have often felt, Sir, that if the world federation does come about—and like everyone else, I do hope that that federation will come—the basis of that federation will be not one undifferentiated, regimented States in which all differences have been abolished but a federation of much smaller units where each small unit has full opportunity of developing itself, its capacities and its potentialities to the highest possible extent. That, Sir, would also be in conformity with the traditions of Indian history. In Indian history, we have not achieved unity by denying differences; in Indian history, unity has been achieved by recognising the differences and finding out a solution in which all these differences and all these manifestations may live. I am reminded of a discussion in which Poet Rabindranath Tagore took part some sixty years ago. In discussing the multiplicity of languages in India, he said that there were some people who sometimes suggested that all this multiplicity would be wiped out and that there would be one Indian language spoken throughout the length and breadth of India. In reply to such a contention Tagore stated sixty years ago that if such an attempt were made, it was likely to prove dangerous to the ideal of Indian unity. India has survived because she has recognised the differences, the individualities of the different units and given opportunities to every single element in Indian life to express itself to its fullest capacity. There has not been any sense of constriction or restriction in India. That is why India has developed a sense of unity which has grown deeper in spite of all our diversities of language, of custom, of religion and of other differences. In spite of all such differences, we have had this sense of unity of Indian culture. Today also, we are moving towards the same end, and, from that point of view, I think, the States Reorganisation Bill, of which the Bill under discussion is a small part, is a move in the right direction. It seeks to preserve Indian unity not by suppressing the differences, not by imposing a dead uniformity but by recognising the differences and the individualities of the different regions and finding for everyone of them a place within the general picture of a composite Indian culture.

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.] [MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Sir, our Constitution has also emphasised this composite character of our culture. The language which is going to be the official language of the Indian Union, it has been laid down in the Constitution, will reflect the diversity of our composite culture. There is no attempt anywhere at establishing uniformity. From this point of view, the attempt to reorganise the State, recognising the differences which exist, is a move in the right direction. It is a wise and a statesmanlike move. The essence of statesmanship is not to do something according to a formula. Something may be ideal on paper but when we face certain facts, the essence of statesmanship is to face those facts and to recognise the differences or the diversities or the difficulties which exist and then to find a solution in which these difficulties, these diversities and these differences may be reconciled.

The present Bill takes a further step in that direction but my regret is that this Bill did not form part of the States Reorganisation Bill. If the proposals contained in this Bill had been presented as a part of the general proposals in the States Reorganisation Bill, perhaps this extra attention which has been paid to the particular problems discussed in this Bill would not have been given. So much time and attention would not have been consumed over this question if we were dealing with a larger number of problems. When we look into the totality of the situation in India, we look at the problems in a general way but when we isolate one particular problem from the general totality of the picture and look at only one isolated problem, there is always a risk, there is always a danger, that we might exaggerate the importance of some particular items. One of the reasons why there has been so much discussion over this rather small Bill, as the hon. Home Minister described it, is because it has been isolated from the general picture of the reorganisation of Indian States.

With regard to the particular proposals which have been made, Sir, I do not wish to speak at length at this late stage. These are, in essence, the result of discussions and, shall I say, if not complete agreement, at least the reduction to a minimum of the differences which existed between the different groups. The

various demands and counter-demands of the different States,—I said on an earlier occasion and I would repeat again—that use of the term "State" in this connection is somewhat unfortunate; If we had talked of Provinces, instead of States there would have been less of feeling on this issue—but, be that as it may, these demands of the different States have been before the country for a number of years. After a great deal of discussion over this particular Bill, we have come to what may be regarded as more or less agreed settlements. The Bengal Government had made certain demands; the Bihar Government had made certain demands. Perhaps in a case like this it would have been better if these demands had not been made publicly in that particular manner. It might have been better if the Governments had discussed it among themselves, but whatever that be, the States Reorganisation Commission took into consideration all the recommendations, all the demands, all the claims and counter claims of the different States and they made certain recommendations with regard to the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to Bengal in the northern region and certain territories to the west of Bengal.

So far as the territories in the north are concerned unfortunately, as the hon. Home Minister stated today also, there was a defect in the proposal of the States Reorganisation Commission, but my hon. friend, Pandit Kunzru, who is absent to-day, made it very clear in his speech before the House that that mistake had arisen because the Commission had been given certain defective maps. The idea of the Commission throughout was to suggest the redistribution of the territories in the northern region in such a way that Bengal may become one compact State. They had made the particular recommendation which they made partly because one of the rivers in that region, the Mahananda, is continually shifting its channel and partly because defective maps had been used. And Pandit Kunzru, in his speech before this House, left no doubt in the matter that if the correct maps had been before them, they would have framed their recommendations in a manner which would have ensured that Bengal was one compact State. As regards the needs of the compact State, I do not have to add anything after what was said by the hon. Home Minister to-day; for administrative purposes it is essential that a State

must be a compact unit, because otherwise, with regard to the problems of law and order, with regard to the problem of movement of goods, with regard particularly to the smuggling of materials and goods from India into Pakistan in this border region, a State divided into two different units with another State intervening in between would face all kinds of difficulties.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend who spoke last also agreed that there should be a compact State of West Bengal, but he asked why should the boundary of this compact State be 200 yards to the West of the national highway? Now, Sir, it is obvious that, if you are going to make it a compact State, that area which connects the two disjointed parts must be of such a size that it is a practicable proposition. You can theoretically give only 100 yards all along the Pakistan frontier, but obviously such a transfer of territory would not serve any purpose whatever. Now the suggestion has been made that the national highway with an area of about 200 yards to the west of it would be the boundary line in order to ensure that there are proper arrangements for the maintenance of the road and also for the proper looking into the question of smuggling, etc. and it is the least that could be given. During the discussions which were held in the Select Committee there were suggestions that if an agreement on these lines could be reached, perhaps that would be the best solution of the problem. There were of course demands for a much larger area on behalf of Bengal, that to the west the railway line may be the boundary or the river may be the boundary but, after a good deal of discussion and due to the very skilful negotiation on the whole matter, and the way it was handled by the Chairman of the Select Committee, there was an agreement that these 200 yards to the west may be the boundary

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal):
Between whom?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Between the groups of people who were taking part in these discussions, and when it was actually decided, there was general agreement, as far as I remember. There have been certain minutes of dissent no doubt, but during the discussions there seemed to be a consensus of opinion and this was accepted as the solution of what was otherwise a very difficult and ticklish problem.
3—20 Rajya Sabha/56.

In this connection it has been suggested that in the north, two difficulties arise on the question of the language of a group of people who were being transferred to West Bengal and also because of the religion of a number of people in that area. I would submit, Sir, in all humility, that both these references are in a sense irrelevant and I would go further and say, unfortunate. They are irrelevant because there are people of different religious and linguistic groups living within each of the Indian States, within each of the States of the Indian Union. Therefore, if a number of people whose language was somewhat different from the language of the people of Bengal in this particular area were transferred to Bengal, it should not cause very great difficulty. I would go further and say that this statement also requires modification. After all in a border area the language is bound to be mixed. The language which is spoken in this part of Kishanganj is Kishen-ganjia or Sirpuria. Well, these languages are very akin to the language which is spoken in the western part of the Dinajpur district and of Jalpaiguri district. It would be impossible, from the very nature of the case, where you have people living in contiguous territories, having continual exchanges of communications and continually meeting one another, it would be impossible to maintain two languages which would have no affinity whatsoever with each other. In a border area therefore the language is always bound to take on some of the features of the two major languages which impinge on that border area. It would not therefore be quite correct to say that in this northern area the language is quite different from Bengali. It is not different.

Kishanganjia has got similarities with the form of Bengali spoken in West Dinajpur and Jalpaiguri, and even if it were not so and even if the people were speaking Urdu, there are people speaking Urdu in Calcutta and elsewhere in West Bengal. There can be no suggestion that there is any difficulty whatsoever in this connection. I may here say with a certain amount of intimate knowledge, because I have been closely connected in various ways with the educational situation in the different parts of the country, I can say with a certain amount of, if you will forgive my using the phrase, with a certain amount of authority that so far as the question of providing educational facilities for the different language groups is concerned,

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.]

the record of West Bengal is not inferior to any, in fact I would go so far as to say that it is in some respects superior to that of some of the other States. The Calcutta University and the West Bengal Secondary Education Board have provided for instruction and examination in most of the languages of India and there is no reason whatever today to think that, if a large group of people speaking Urdu come into the Bengal territory, that old practice should in any way be changed.

Now, Sir, so far as the question of religion is concerned, I would say even more strongly than I have done in the case of language, that any such reference is unfortunate and irrelevant. We do not want that in India there should be any feeling in any part of the country that any religious group has any disadvantage compared to any other group. The Indian Constitution lays down that there shall be perfect equality not only in the profession and practice of religion but also in all civil matters so far as the different religious groups are concerned. That is the clear ideal that is embodied in the Constitution. Even if there be occasional aberrations from that ideal, even if our practice sometimes falls short of our profession, no one can for a moment suggest that such shortfall in our performance would be confined to any particular area. In the last ten or fifteen years of history in our country—I am thinking both of undivided India and the Indian Union—events have happened for which every reasonable person, every one who is proud of the traditions of Indian culture and Indian civilisation and of Indian history will be ashamed. Let it be our constant endeavour not to suggest anything which may in any way bring about the slightest hint or suggestion that that kind of condition can ever be re-created. In fact, Sir, the way the country has developed, the way the temper of the country and particularly of the younger generation has developed since 1947, it is clear that perhaps in ten years' time from now, all this religious bickering, all this communal bickering, all this bickering based on caste will be things of the past and Indians will take their stand on the fact that they are Indians, that they are human beings above all, that they are the members of a country and a State which has developed by reconciling differences.

which has achieved unity not by supressing diversity but by giving full expression to the development of all the capacities of its multiple languaged, multiple cultured and multiple regioned population. I would not stress this point about religion any further and would only say that I hope that there may be no reference to this particular aspect of the question during our discussions.

With regard to the Southern areas, I do not have much to say. The States Reorganisation Commission had made certain recommendations, but the Government of India after consulting the West Bengal Government made a large reduction in that area. Since that has been accepted by the Government of West Bengal. I would not say anything further about it, and I would only hope that all the Members of this House will now try to treat this as a closed chapter. Let us get behind us all these differences which have arisen with regard to the transfer of territories from one State to another. Just now the hon. Member who spoke said that Bengal does not seem I to be satisfied even if all these proposals in the Bill are granted. He seemed to ask what is the guarantee that there will not be a fresh demand for further adjustments of territorial boundaries between the different States? I would like to tell my hon. friend that if he considers that question seriously he can give an answer himself. The experience we have had in the last eight or ten years, ever since the question of the reorganisation of the States captured the public imagination and public mind, gives a clear answer to his question. Ever since the question arose the bitterness that has been created, the debates that have taken place and the amount of energy which we have wasted in this sometimes fruitless controversy have been very great. Instead of devoting all our energies and all our resources to the economic, social and political development of the country, we have been arguing about a few square miles on this side or that. After that experience it would be a very, very bold Government—or shall I change the phrase, it would be a very foolish Government indeed—which would come up with another Bill for the redistribution of the territories of any State or States in a short time. It is, of course, true that from time to time there may be minor adjustments; but there will not be for many years any major change. There can be no

question of any major territorial redistribution after we have got these different Bills behind us and the position has been settled.

My hon. friend who spoke last also raised the issue that there may be changes in the population distribution of the country with regard to language. So far as the different areas of India are concerned, I certainly concede that there is far greater mobility of people to day than there was in the past. This is a recent characteristic which holds true not only of our country but of the rest of the world. At the same time, I would like to remind the hon. Member that in spite of whatever happens, language boundaries seem to have a kind of stability which resists change and has resisted change throughout the centuries. In the last five or six hundred years, the map of Europe has been drawn and redrawn again and again. Poland, as you know, was partitioned three times and there was a stage when it was illegal to speak the Polish language. Every effort was made to suppress that language, but in spite of all such efforts, the Polish language has held and the Polish language is a vigorous, vital, flourishing, and progressive language of Europe today. And not only so, if you look at the linguistic boundaries of Europe, you will find that in the last five hundred years they have hardly ever changed. There have been minor adjustments, no doubt people have moved from one side of the frontier to the other, but the linguistic boundaries have, on the whole, held; and I have no doubt that this is also broadly the position in India. There will be certainly far greater mobility of population. Groups will come from one area to another but the broad areas which have developed in the course of centuries, if not millenia, will hold. The fears of my hon. friend that with the movement of population fresh demands for new linguistic adjustments of territories will arise seems to be baseless. In my opinion, as I said a moment ago, there seems hardly any reason.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: The census report is different in India.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I have deliberately avoided all reference to the census reports because I know and my hon. friend knows that the census reports for the last thirty years' have not found universal acceptance. If you look at the census reports in regard to some of these disputed territories, you will find striking changes from decade to

decade. I do not wish to go into this controversy, because that may imply some reflection on certain Governments or on certain officers. But if my hon. friend will look at the census reports for the last thirty years, he will see how there has been phenomenal, astonishing changes in the proportion of population which defy all laws of probability, which defy all laws of credulity, which defy all possibilities in human behaviour and conduct or the laws of growth of population as they are known anywhere else in the world. But anyway I do not wish to go further into this aspect of the question.

As I said at the very beginning, I would like to follow the example set by the hon. Home Minister and avoid anything which might in any way bring bitterness or controversy over an issue which we have almost closed and which we have closed, as far as I can judge, with a far greater degree of agreement among ourselves than seemed possible at one time.

Before I conclude I would only like to make one other observation on an important topic which arises out of all these happenings. I think everyone will agree that language is a very powerful factor in the organisation of States. It is one of the most important factors in the organisation of human societies. Everyone will agree that there may be genuine room for differences on a question like the one which we are discussing today. But what I want to discuss is a matter that sometimes baffles me. Why should we in India have these outbursts of bitterness which are taking place from time to time? Why is it that wherever we have any differences, violence should come out? We in India have always stood by the ideals of non-violence. We have always prided ourselves on the tolerance of our people. We have always said that all points of view we shall honour equally. Why is it then that in spite of these long traditions of the country, in spite of the pacific temper of our people—and there is no doubt that our people are on the whole friendly, pacific and docile, they are people who do not normally take to strife—why is it that on occasions they are swept off their feet? And the orgies which have taken place in the different parts of India, not only on the question of the linguistic reorganisation of States but also on other occasions, why it is that these orgies take place?

[Prof. Humayun Kabir.]

I would, if I may, like to mention some of the reasons why this type of undemocratic solution of some of our problems is attempted. There is in every democracy genuine room for difference of opinion and every democracy must evolve forms through which these differences can be expressed in a constitutional, democratic, peaceful manner. Any attempt to suppress differences can only lead to explosions, any attempt to obliterate genuine differences of opinion always creates greater opposition. But why is it that instead of expressing this opposition, these differences in a constitutional, peaceful, democratic manner, we sometimes take those violent steps? To my mind, there are three main reasons for this. The first reason is that though we have laid down the rule of law as the basic principle of our constitution, we have not yet accepted fully the rule of law as one of the fundamental ingredients of our life. It certainly is in the Constitution. The rule of law is an accepted ideal which we have set before ourselves and the rule of laws is

MR- DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not go into generalisations. It is a very limited Bill and the time also is limited.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: In that case I will conclude, though I feel these considerations are important now and for the future.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are nine speakers from Bengal and Bihar. There are four more speakers from other States.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I shall not attempt the analysis which I thought might be useful in this connection. But I will simply say that now that all the stages of discussion have been passed, and a solution has been suggested which has been, I believe, unanimously accepted by the Lok Sabha—I am not quite sure—we should also concur. The two main principles which are involved in this redistribution are (i) that there shall be a compact State of West Bengal and (ii) that some of the territories adjoining it and which for linguistic and other reasons ought to be attached to the State of West Bengal should be so attached. I think we should accept the Bill in its present form, particularly because as a result of the concessions, the modifications which have been made by the

Joint Select Committee, the Bill today is far more acceptable to our friends in Bihar than it was in its original form. I think there should be sacrifices on both sides. Bengal has given up a good deal from its own original demand and even from what the States Reorganisation Commission recommended. It has given up one area after another, things which it could legitimately claim and from that point of view Bengal has in a sense made the necessary concessions and I hope that friends from Bihar also....

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): What sacrifice has Bengal made?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Bengal wanted the whole area in the north and in the south recommended by the Commission but the Bill has excluded all areas to the west of the national high way and also the town of Kishanganj in the north as well as several police stations in the Purulia area in the south. In view of all this, I hope that my friends from Bihar will now agree and let us have the Bill passed unanimously as was suggested by the hon. Home Minister.

1 P.M.

STATEMENT REGARDING GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE MINISTER FOR PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA NARA-YAN SINHA) : Sir, with your permission, I rise to announce Government business for this House for the current week and the dates for certain important items of business thereafter. The following legislative measures will be brought forward after the conclusion of business entered in the order paper for 27th and 28th August 1956:—

(1) Consideration and return of the Appropriation Bills as passed by Lok Sabha relating to—

- (a) Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1956-57 in respect of Central Government;
- (b) Demands for Excess Grants for 1951-52 in respect of Central Government; and
- (c) Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1956-57 in respect of the State of Travancore-Cochin.

(2) Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill. (Motion for concurrence to the reference of the Bill to a Joint Committee.)