

THE BIHAR AND WEST BENGAL (TRANSFER OF TERRITORIES)

BILL 1956—continued

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would inform the House that there are nine speakers from Bengal and Bihar and there are about five speakers from other places. I would first ask the Bengal and Bihar Members to speak. The hon. Minister will give his reply at 4-30. So the time is limited and I would request the hon. Members not take more than ten minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If this is the attitude of the Government, if you want to finish it within three hours, we cannot accept the position. I say the Government should consider the position. If necessary we can sit longer hours. On such a vital matter we should be allowed to speak. Now you are cutting out our time even before we start.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Business Advisory Committee has fixed the time.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I quite appreciate that. We should try to be as brief as possible, and when we discussed it in the Business Advisory Committee, the understanding was that we should try to finish it as early as possible. But if it was necessary to extend it by some time we should try to do it. Therefore, I appeal to you not to shut out discussion but to give us a reasonable period of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you want five or ten minutes more, I will give you. I would request every Member to be brief.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: We always try to follow you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are also a party to the Business Advisory Committee. I am always in favour of sticking to the time-limit fixed by them. But if we think that it is necessary to extend the limit, then why should we not do that? Before we have started to speak you have cut the time-limit.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to stick to the time schedule.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then we won't participate in the debate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know it. We have been doing it.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I oppose this Bill lock, stock and barrel. The Bihar Legislature, as you know very well, has almost unanimously rejected this proposal. It is Bihar which is vitally interested in this Bill because it is Bihar which has to lose in territory, and therefore it is not prudent and wise to ignore the almost unanimous wishes of the Bihar Legislature. Sir, it offends against Article 3 of the Constitution. In a democratic State the people's wishes should be the decisive factor, and I find that the people have given a clear verdict against this transfer. In a recent bye-election in May 1956 in Para-cum-Chas constituency of the Manbhum Sadar sub-division, the Congress candidate and an independent candidate who stood against the transfer together polled more than 15,000 votes and the candidate supported by the Lok Sevak Sangh which advocated the transfer polled only 5998 votes. In the Para area to be transferred to West Bengal, the former two secured 4260 votes while the latter got only 710 votes. Sir all Gram Panchayats in these two areas which have been elected statutorily on adult franchise have passed resolutions that this transfer should not take place, which amounts to a voluntary referendum. Sir, much has been made about the agitation that has been carried on by the Lok Sevak Sangh for the transfer of these territories to West Bengal. I would like you, Sir, to appreciate that the Lok Sevak Sangh never fought the last general elections on this particular issue. Moreover, they have secured only 34 per cent of the votes polled in the area proposed to be transferred, and out of their 7 M.L.As. in the Bihar Legislature, one has made a public declaration that he was against the transfer. Sir, a memorandum signed by three lakhs of people was submitted to the Chairman of the Joint Committee, people coming from the Purnea area, who wanted that such a transfer should not take place. Sir, the people concerned are against this transfer. If you had any doubt about the wishes of the people in the areas concerned, the only democratic method open to you was to have referred the matter to the people themselves and to hold a plebiscite in order to ascertain the wishes of the people. Sir, for God's sake, do not sacrifice principles and do not ignore the wishes of the

sovereign people, and do not pamper the expansionist desire of the West Bengal in order to keep up the prestige and the waning influence of the Congress in West Bengal.

Then, Sir, there is another aspect of the question. It fosters the doctrine of home land for the people speaking a particular language. In this connection, Sir, I wish to draw your attention to paragraph 155 of S.R.C. report which reads as follows:

"Finally, there are certain aspects of the claim for linguistic units, the implications of which should be carefully analysed and understood. The most important of these is the doctrine of an area claiming to be the 'home land' of all the people speaking a particular language. Its implication is that a Bengali, an Andhra or a Malayali, wherever he is settled, has his home land in Bengal, Andhra or Kerala; that he has a loyalty to that home land, over-riding the loyalty to the area of his domicile; and that in the same way, the homeland State has claims on him, wherever he may be. We cannot too strongly emphasise the dangerous character of this doctrine, especially from the point of view of our national unity. If any section of people living in one State is encouraged to look upon another State as its true home land and protector on the sole ground of language, then this would cut at the very root of the national idea."

Sir, this is what has precisely happened in this case. Under the influence of the Government of West Bengal certain parties have been set up in Bihar to agitate for the transfer of these areas to West Bengal. It is therefore now for this House to take into account this factor and decide whether to concede such a dangerous proposition or not.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): May I know, Sir, whether the hon. Member's attention has been drawn to the minute of dissent which has been written by Mr. N. C. Chatterjee? He has stated in that minute of dissent as follows:

"It was the demand of Bengal that the Bengali-speaking areas which had been its integral parts should be restored to her. When the partition of Bengal was annulled, Bengal was deprived of the Bengali-speaking areas

just to render it a Muslim-majority Province and these were tacked on to form the new Provinces of Bihar and Assam. It was the old Imperial game to create cleavage between communities and provinces and to disrupt the organic unity of a linguistically and culturally integrated people."

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir, I will refer to this point when I come to the question of linguistic considerations.

Sir, I was speaking about home land. I beg of this House to reject this Bill altogether.

Now, Sir, coming to the question of linguistic considerations, which my hon. friend has also raised, I am very happy to find that the Home Minister has given a lie to that much talked of linguistic question, and in so doing, he has merely endorsed the views of the States Reorganisation Commission. I would like to refer my hon. friend to the Report of the Commission by way of explanation. Well, Sir, Bihar will ever remain grateful to the Home Minister for his emphatic declaration that this transfer is not taking place—or can be justified—merely on the ground of linguism.

Sir, with regard to the Purulia subdivision, which is proposed to be transferred, the Commission knew that the composition of the Bengali-speaking people in the rural areas was 55 per cent. But now by recounting the census slips of 1951 by the Government it has now been established that the Bengali-speaking people in this area are 30·8 per cent. only. Now in the case of Purnea it is well-known that the Hindi and Urdu speaking people are 97 per cent. There is nothing in common with them and Bengal either culturally or linguistically or otherwise.

Now, Sir, as my hon. friend has drawn the attention of this House to paragraph 4 of the minute of dissent of Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, I would like to say a few words on this point. I have explained to my friend the linguistic composition of the areas that are sought to be transferred through this measure. The Bengali-speaking people are not in majority. When the two States were together, it

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]

was very difficult to say whether this area formed an integral part of Bihar or of Bengal. As a matter of fact, Sir, great injustice was done to Bihar when Darjeeling was taken away from Bihar at the time of partition in 1912. Darjeeling was an integral part—if you put it in that way—of Bihar. It was in the division of Bhagalpur, You will find that there is greater affinity between Bihar and the northern districts of West Bengal than between the northern districts of West Bengal and the rest of West Bengal. That is true from every point of view, linguistic, cultural or otherwise. So, it is really the other way round and on the contrary, the northern areas of West Bengal should be transferred to Bihar.

Sir, the areas in Purnea are sought to be transferred mainly on the grounds of geographical contiguity and administrative convenience. Now, Sir, for any State to claim a corridor within the Indian Union, is to strike at the very root of national solidarity and unity, and such a claim by a component within a union is unknown in the annals of history. Sir, after 1947, communications have been going on without any let or hindrance between the two Bengals. You must justify before you can make any accusation that there was some difficulty with regard to transport and communication. Then, Sir, the highways and the railways are controlled and managed by the Central Government. There is no question of Government of Bihar or anybody else coming in the way of transport and communications. Now, Sir, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What holds good for West Bengal holds good for Bihar too. By transferring all the areas in the south, you are disrupting the lines of communication between the two important industrial areas of Bihar. Dhanbad is the centre of the Jharia coal field. All our factories are there. There is the steel factory, the aluminium factory, the copper factory, and so on and so forth. And these two industrial areas are connected by an important artery, the Dhanbad-Tatanagar road or the Dhanbad-Moori road. Now, Sir, after this transfer has taken place, the important sources of raw materials, fuel etc. will be cut off from the consuming factories. As it is, there are about 2,000 trucks plying every day to and fro on these roads, and they will now have to pass through the territory of West Bengal. I do not say that

Bengal will hinder any of those movements of goods, but when you are applying one principle, one consideration, by giving that national highway to West Bengal in order to ensure administrative convenience, you should apply the same principle in the South, and that is the reason why we have a grudge, a rightful grudge, that you are discriminating between West Bengal and Bihar. Because Bengal is more powerful, because Bengal has more powerful personalities at the head of the Government, you are discriminating against Bihar. This is the feeling in existence in Bihar. If this important artery of communications is disrupted, I am afraid that the economic development of the area will be retarded, because now the distance that will have to be traversed from Dhanbad to Jamshedpur will be 350 miles, whereas, if we pass through this road, it is only 106 miles.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: But that is being declared as a national highway.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The road which connects two portions of West Bengal is a national highway. Why are you transferring this road to West Bengal in order to ensure administrative convenience? You should mete out the same treatment to Bihar in the south as well. That is what we want.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: But there will be a highway between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Administrative convenience is not ensured at all. We have to travel a distance of 350 miles before we can reach these places.

Now, the States Reorganisation Commission justified the transference of the Purulia Sub-Division to West Bengal mainly on grounds of facilitating the implementation of flood-cum-irrigation projects. West Bengal has a project on the Kasai River and they have said that the catchment area of this river should be passed on to the administrative control of West Bengal. Now, this is a most dangerous and monstrous proposition to accept, because all our rivers are inter-State rivers, and therefore we have passed Central legislation that in the case of projects on such inter-State rivers the Centre should take action in

the matter in the event of difficulties. But then you must remember that Bihar has important projects on the Subranrekha River, but its catchment area too is being transferred to West Bengal. We have the D.V.C. also, and the major beneficiary is West Bengal and not Bihar. If that is the only consideration, you could easily have handed over the Kasai River projects to D.V.C., instead of doing this and disturbing the feelings between Bihar and Bengal. Surely they could have managed this project better than any of the two Governments. Again I say that you have discriminated against Bihar in favour of West Bengal. The catchment area of the Kasai river on which this transfer is being justified and has been justified by the States Reorganisation Commission, is only 1463 sq. miles, whereas you are transferring 2400 sq. miles, including 700 sq. miles of the catchment area of the Subranrekha River on which Bihar has got very important projects and Bengal has none.

I have failed to see any logic or reason behind this measure. Will it help refugee rehabilitation? The Commission itself have said that there should be no refugee rehabilitation in Purnea. In the case of Manbhum, the density of population in this area is higher than in the adjoining districts of West Bengal, and therefore the rehabilitation problem will not be solved by this. On the other hand, I maintain that the rehabilitation of the refugees will be definitely hampered by adopting this measure. Rehabilitation is a national question, and has to be tackled on a national basis. All the financial commitments of rehabilitation are met by the Central exchequer, and the West Bengal Government does not give a single pie to it. In a recent conference it has been decided that the refugees from East Bengal should be settled throughout the eastern region. Bihar has already settled 75,000 refugees and they have offered to take another 50,000 refugees. And Bihar has settled the refugees on cultivated lands. Bihar is the only State. I maintain, which has offered cultivated land to the refugees. The other States have offered only cultivable waste.

I could have consoled myself, if this was the end of the matter, but what I think is that this will provide the starting point for fresh disputes. This is what the press comments and the various statements made by the West Bengal

leaders foretell. I would like to quote here from the statement of the Chief Minister of West Bengal. The hon. Home Minister, while speaking the other day in the other House, expressed surprise whether the Chief Minister could have said that more demands would be advanced. I would like to refer him to page 121 and page 124 of the proceedings of the West Bengal Assembly, Debates on the Resolution on the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill, where the Chief Minister of West Bengal has said:

".....it is not correct to say that we have withdrawn our original demand."

They had originally demanded 11,000 sq. miles—

"Some of my friends have used the words 'first instalment' about which some criticisms have been made. I believe at least I do not know their mind, that what they really meant was that under the present circumstances, the present surroundings and environments and the temper of the people now prevailing in this country the utmost that we can go for at the present moment is to consider this Bill. It does not mean that we have given up our ideas regarding our demands for the areas that we have asked for."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You read the other speeches.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken 25 minutes.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I will take another five minutes.

"The only question is the pace and the time when the future instalment of our demands may be made and achieved."

Sir, the Government of West Bengal has merely accepted this as a matter of tactics. Their object is, 'Let us have what is coming but we shall continue to clamour and demand for more. Will this Bill solve the problem? It merely whets the expansionist desires of West Bengal and gives fresh impetus and encouragement to its further demands. The only silver lining in this whole debate has been the emphatic declaration of the

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]

hon. Home Minister in the other House when he said that "the people still persisting in the sterile controversy would find their labours and energies lost in darkness and dust". Sir, may I ask the hon. Home Minister whether he has succeeded in convincing his friend, Dr. B.C. Roy, to give up the stand that he took in the West Bengal Assembly? Has he consulted him and has he been informed that that statement made by the Chief Minister of West Bengal had been repudiated by him?

I have quoted his own words. If the honourable Home Minister has succeeded, it is a great victory for him and I shall congratulate him for this.

But what I apprehend is that the agitation for the transference of a larger area of Bihar will continue in Bengal and the Bengal Congress leaders may feel unnerved, and rush to New Delhi once again for help. The Centre, in its anxiety to prop up the crumbling and vanishing influence of the West Bengal Government, will make fresh concessions in favour of Bengal. This is a vicious circle and it is because of the weakness of the Congress in Bengal that the labours and energies of those who carry on the controversies are not always lost in darkness and dust. Thank you.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the hon. Home Minister, in his introductory speech, characterised this Bill as unambitious and simple. If the unambitiousness and the simplicity of a Bill is to be judged by its size, then certainly it is unambitious and simple but the principles involved are the same; the principle involved in the States Reorganisation Bill, which the House passed only on Saturday and the principle involved in this small unambitious Bill are the same. The question of language is the primary consideration which should determine how a State or a Province should shape. Bengal and Bihar along with Orissa, had been administered under the Government of Bengal since a long time. But during the course of history, this was changed. The British, when they came, impelled by the spirit of self-preservation allowed it to continue. In the meantime, the spirit of nationalism began to grow in Bengal. The dry bones in the open valley became instinct with life. A new

spirit was visible in the land. The breeding place of this spirit was Bengal and the standard bearers of this spirit were the Hindus of Bengal, with a sprinkling of Muhammadans. Precisely at this time, to curb this spirit Lord Curzon, who was, in those days, described as an efficient ruler of men who failed and an unwilling regenerator of a nation who succeeded, promulgated the Partition of Bengal in 1905 which unleashed the patriotic forces of Bengal and gave rise to a movement which bade fair to shake the very foundations of British Imperialism. In 1911, as a result of that movement, the Partition of Bengal was annulled and there was a re-partition of Bengal which gave some parts of the then Bengali-speaking areas to Bihar to make Bengal a Muslim majority province. That is the situation which is existing even now. It was really surprising that my friend Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha, for whom I have the highest regard, took up an attitude which reminded me of the words of Mr. Winston Churchill during the last World War, namely, 'We must hold what we have'. Did you hold the Bengali-speaking areas of Bihar which were a part of Bengal in 1911? If according to the wishes of the then leaders of Bihar and in accordance with the Resolution of the Congress passed in 1911, moved by Shri Tej Bahadur Sapru, the Bengali speaking areas had been retransferred to Bengal, then this controversy could not have arisen. No question would have arisen that these parts were not Bengali-speaking. Of course it was clear in those days, as clear as noon-day light, that the areas demanded by Bengal now were Bengali-speaking then. Then came 1937, the year in which, for the first time, the Congress under the British rule formed a Ministry in Bihar. Let me read out a portion of an article written by Shri Hemendra Prasad Ghose, that doyen of Indian journalism. He says in an article which appeared in the *Hindustan Standard* of December 15, 1955 as follows:

"Bihar was a part of Bengal till the partition, enacted by the British bureaucrats in 1911. The Bihar leaders of the time honestly and honourably confessed that the partition had done a grievous wrong to Bengal and that the portions of Purnea and Malda to the east of the Mahananda—which is the ethnic and linguistic boundary between Bengal and Bihar should go to Bengal. Similarly such tracts in the Santhal Parganas where the prevailing

language is Bengali should go to Bengal. The whole district of Manbhoom and the Pargana Dhalbhoom of Singbhoom District are Bengali-speaking and they should go to Bengal."

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Why not undo the Partition of 1911 altogether?

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Ask the Government to do it. Even during the first Congress rule to which I referred just now. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who now occupies the exalted position of the President of the Indian Republic in a report to the Congress, made four classifications of the Bengalis in Bihar. I am very sorry that this valuable report of Dr. Rajendra Prasad has been entirely forgotten by the Members of this House and by the people outside.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Which report is he mentioning?

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: The report submitted to the Congress in 1937 or 1938 when the Congress was administering the Province of Bihar under the British aegis. Shri Ghose says: "Dr. Prasad, in a report to the Congress, made four classifications of the Bengalis in Bihar. In one of these he placed those who are residents of the Bengali-speaking areas of Bihar, namely, Manbhoom, Dhalbhoom, parts of Santhal Parganas, and parts of Purnea. Ten years later..."

SHRI T. BODRA: I submit that quoting from a newspaper is not admissible as authentic. My friend may quote from Bengal Gazetteer. Quoting from a paper does not hold good...

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: You can have your say later on. Let me have mine. When I quite.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: After all he is quoting the President. What is the authenticity?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If it is wrong, you can refute it.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: I refer to an article written by Shri Hemendra Prasad Ghose who is known in Bengal as the living encyclopaedia:—

"Ten years later Dr. Rajendra Prasad rebuked the Bihar Hindi Sahitya Sammelan for not propagating Hindi in Singbhoom and Dhalbhoom areas—resulting in West Bengal claiming them. 'It is because of the negligence and inactivity of Bihar Provincial Hindi Sahitya Sammelan that Singbhoom and Dhalbhoom are being claimed by West Bengal for their being non-Hindi-speaking areas.'"

As against this, I will take you to a period much earlier, about 90 years back, when to late Bhudev Mukerjee, a contemporary of poet Michael Madhusudan and Pandit Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and Inspector of Schools of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, a proposal came from the British asking him to introduce Bengali as the medium of instruction in Bihar?" Shri Bhudev in those days flatly refused to do it, saying that the only medium through which instruction should be imparted is the mother tongue of the region. Therefore, Bengali was not imposed upon Bihar in those days. I will not give any pain to my friends in Bihar by reminding them as to how Bengali has been treated under the Congress Government there. Bengal and Bihar have been living as brothers in the past, they are living so now and they will also live like that in the future.

Sir, we have taken our position on three principles, the first principle is that of language, then the principle of contiguity village being taken as the unit. and then the wishes of the people where necessary. If these three principles had been the guiding factors, no trouble whatsoever in any part of India would have arisen. But the wisdom of the Government prompted them to go back upon that scientific principle of language as the basis for the formation of States and Provinces which the Congress has been officially propagating since 1920 under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. From 1920 to 1945-46, that of same principle of language permeates the Resolutions of the Congress so far as the construction of the Provinces and States are concerned. But no sooner they had power transferred to them, than they changed absolutely over-night.

[Shri Satyapriya Banerjee.]

When they had the power the will evaporated. When they had the will, they had not the power. In this untenable position we see the Congress now....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: (Uttar Pradesh): Can my hon. friend quote one single quotation from any Resolution of the Congress where it has advocated the formation of States or Provinces on linguistic basis:

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For the information of the hon. Member, I would ask my hon. friend here to read out this.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir, just one minute. Let him read out this. (*Hands over a quotation to Shri Satyapriya Banerjee.*)

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Before reading this out, I may remind my hon. friend. Mr. Kapoor and refer him to the constitution adopted by the Congress at the Nagpur Session in 1920.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: The Constitution of India?

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: No, the Constitution of the Congress.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: We are not concerned with that.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Then what are you concerned with?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: The resolution for the formation of the States on a linguistic basis.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: I am referring to the Congress, the Congress when it was a fighting organisation.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But he wants you to quote a resolution of the Congress asking for the reorganisation of the States on a linguistic basis.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Between the years 1920 and 1947, the Congress reaffirmed its adherence to

the linguistic principle on three occasions. I am reading from page 14 of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission and my hon. friend, if he has a copy with him now may please look up.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: But where is the resolution of the Congress.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: It is in the Office of the Congress situated No. 7 Jantar Mantar Road, New Delhi.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: This is how the States Reorganisation Commission, in ignorance of the real fact interpreted the Congress position today. So I ask, is there any resolution of the Congress on the subject?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would refer my hon. friend to the Election Manifesto issued by the Congress Working Committee in 1945-46 and there he will find a paragraph referring to the fact that the Congress stands for the linguistic reorganisation of the States.

SHRI T. BODRA: The Congress.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Let him continue, you can reply later on.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: I think Mr. Kapoor will agree with me when I say that the Congress constitution was changed under the leadership of Gandhiji in 1920 and one of the articles of that constitution of the Congress was the constitution of the provinces of India on the basis of language and in accordance with that the Congress constituted certain provinces which had no relation to the administrative provinces of British India.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: It is no use shifting the ground.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants to know if there is any resolution of the Congress to say that the administrative provinces will be on the linguistic basis.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: The constitution of the Congress is more than a resolution of the Congress.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How long has the hon. Member been in the Congress? He has been too long in the Congress not to know such things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Probably much longer than the age of my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is surprising that a learned man like Mr. Kapoor and so long in the Congress should be so ignorant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are indeed in a strange land.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: I did not expect such a thing from Mr. Kapoor who is always very careful in his expressions of opinion. However, when other interests prompt him to do so, I cannot help it.

Then my hon. friend Mr. Mahesh Saran—I do not find him in his seat—for whom also I have very high regard, at the end of his speech referred to the merger of Bengal and Bihar.

SHRI T. BODRA: And Orissa also.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: No.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Yes, I did.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Did he mention Orissa also? Very good, very good. He wanted Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to continue as they had been in the times of the Moghuls and under the British for some time. It was an unnatural thing nurtured by the Moghuls and the British and I did not expect such a thing to come from my esteemed colleague Mr. Mahesh Saran. We want to develop these States or Provinces on a natural basis.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Not on the linguistic basis.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: But the natural basis is the basis of language. Language helps the administration of the States and Provinces and therefore, administrative convenience comes later.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: That should come first.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Then let us agree to differ.

Sir, let me now come to the Bill as such. The Bill seeks to transfer certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal. The Congress of the Bengal, the Congress Government of West Bengal, the New Bengal Association of West Bengal and a prominent member of the Congress Government have demanded territories from time to time, differing from each other.

SHRI T. BODRA: It is because the Congress administers, not you.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Don't be impatient, Mr. Bodra. You will have everything you want to have. Only have patience. "Tarry a little", if I may quote Shakespeare.

In 1948, the new Bengal Association demanded 10,000 square miles. Later, Mr. N. R. Sarkar also in 1948, claimed 16,000 square miles. He was the Finance Minister of the West Bengal Government at that time. The West Bengal Government demanded before the Commission 11,840 square miles. Lo and be hold, the West Bengal Congress had demanded 13,950 square miles. The States Reorganisation Commission granted 3,812 square miles. Government of India took away also something from that 3,812 square miles and gave Bengal about 3,200 odd miles. Sir, a report of the Select Committee again betrays a very important matter and it appears therefrom that the Congress of West Bengal which pitched its demand so high before the Commission is satisfied with the Bill whereas the Congress Members of the Select Committee from Bihar are not. I do not quite understand how, in a Committee, in which there was an agreement, between the Congress members of Bihar and Bengal although after much discussion and hesitancy, we do not find any note of dissent from the Members of Bengal but a plethora of Minutes of Dissent from the Members of Bihar,

[Shri Satyapriya Banerjee.]

This one point explains that the Congressmen of Bihar are not satisfied while the Congressmen of Bengal are satisfied.

As I was saying, the areas that were claimed by different individuals and organisations were different. It might be legitimately asked as to whether the movement that was started in West Bengal against the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission and later on against the merger of Bengal and Bihar and which compelled Dr. B. C. Roy to withdraw the merger proposal had any basis? They had a very scientific basis the only basis. They did not mention any area. They mentioned, "all the Bengali speaking areas in Bihar" contiguous to West Bengal with village as the unit, and the indication of those areas was the historical background of the claims of Bengal since 1912. This has been forgotten; the justice of Bengal's case has been entirely forgotten now by the people of India. Bengal has been partitioned thrice once in 1905, second time in 1911 and for the third time in 1947. In 1905, it was as a result of the machination of the British Imperialists to curb the growing spirit of nationalism in Bengal that a partition was made by Lord Curzon. It was again as a result of the second instalment of the machinations of the British Imperialists to transform Bengal into a muslim majority province that a re-partition was made in 1911 and I am sorry, Sir, if I have to say, that Bengal was partitioned for the third time to satisfy the unusual, indecent lust of the Congress leaders of those days in 1947 for power. Had the Congress in those days not jumped at the prospect of power by the offer of the British Imperialists of a truncated India and a truncated Bengal and a truncated Punjab against the wishes of Gandhiji this situation would not have arisen. Not only that.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: May I ask my hon. friend . . .

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: I am coming to that, Dr. Barlingay. Please sit down.

If they would have waited for some time more, the whole of India would have been at the command of the Congress but the indecent haste in springing to power was responsible for this and

the whole country is suffering for that; and we are asked to be beholden to the Congress for the small mercies that have been shown to the people of Bengal in this Bill. The people of Bengal will certainly accept what they have been given but they will not rest content. They will go on agitating. I do not know what the Chief Minister of West Bengal has said but let it be said here and now that the Chief Minister of West Bengal does not represent the people of Bengal. He had to eat the humble pie when the result of the Parliamentary by-election in north-West Calcutta came out. He had to say, "I bow down to the will of the people of West Bengal". Therefore, he does not represent the people of West Bengal. I know he will never carry on an agitation for the achievement of the end that the people of West Bengal have in view. Here, Sir, I will not take much time of the House any longer. I will only say this. Bihar has got, as a result of this Bill, something which she ought not to have got. Bengal has lost, as a result of this Bill, a large portion of what was her due. We will say more when we come to speak of the amendments but here I will make a mention only. What are the Bengali speaking areas contiguous to Bengal? It may be said that the Bengal or the Bihar of 1912 is not the same as the Bengal or Bihar of 1956. Granted. Therefore, the only scientific method which can be evolved to ascertain what is what is, as we have suggested, a Boundary Commission which will go into the whole affair. That Boundary Commission has to submit its Report within a very short time also. If it is possible, after the enactment of these two Bills, to go into the delimitation work and finish it within a prescribed time limit, I think this Commission also could finish its work within the same time. Where there is a will, there is a way. Let justice be done.

Thank you, Sir.

DR. P. C. MITRA: Sir, I stand not to oppose the Bill but to submit some views of the Bihar Government.

In pursuance of the proviso to article 3 of the Constitution, the draft Bihar and West Bengal (*Transfer of Territories*) Bill, 1956, was referred to the States concerned, to ascertain the views of the Legislatures of the States. The debates in both the Houses in Bihar

were initiated on the Motion of the Chief Minister on the following terms:

"That this Assembly/Council proceed to express its view on the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill, 1956, as referred by the President under article 3 of the Constitution of India".

This was considered by the two Houses of the Legislature meeting at a special session at Ranchi on the 5th, 6th and 7th of July, 1956. In the course of the debate in both the Houses strong feelings of resentment were expressed against the Bill providing for the transfer of territories in complete disregard to the wishes of the people inhabiting those territories. There was an overwhelming demand that the Government of India should be

2 P.M. asked to abandon the Bill, . . . and that if the Government of India finally decided to proceed with the Bill, the Members of the Legislature and the Ministry should resign. At the conclusion of the debate an amendment to the motion of the Chief Minister.

was moved and adopted by 269 votes, and only 6 votes were against the amendment. The Members who voted for the Amendment were, besides the Independent Members, the members of the Congress Party, the United Jharkhand Party, the Socialist Party, the Janta Party, the Ramrajya Parishad Party and the Independent Jharkhand Party.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Mitra, you can continue at 2-30. I am adjourning the House for half an hour. The House will meet again at 2-30.

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

The House re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

DR. P. C. MITRA: The operative part of the motion adopted by both the Houses of the Legislature reads as follows:—

"The Government of India be urged to abandon the proposal to introduce the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill, 1956 and the President be requested to withhold the

recommendation of the Bill in Parliament."

The views of the Bihar Government on the provisions of the Bill are definitely that the Bill should be dropped, *vide* letter dated 12th July, 1956 from Mr. B. S. Pande, I.A.S. to the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. The people of the areas proposed to be transferred have expressed themselves clearly and unequivocally against the proposed transfer. Lakhs of people both in Purnea and Manbhum appeared before the Commission and demonstrated against the transfer. Almost every Gram Panchayat in the area concerned has passed resolutions opposing the transfer, and these Panchayats are statutorily elected bodies fully representative of the adult population.

Sir, in considering the question of redistribution of boundaries between two or more existing States, the wishes of the people should, in the view of the Government, be treated as the decisive factor. Having been a part of one State or the other for a considerable period, the people develop economic, social and cultural ties with the rest of the population of the State and whether these ties should be broken or not should obviously be a matter of their choice. In fact, the Commission itself took a similar view when they said that the wishes of the people to the extent they are objectively ascertainable and do not come in conflict with larger national interests, should be an important consideration in readjusting the territories of States (para. 221 of the report). The Commission also laid down the principle that in a democratic country the wishes of the people of even smaller areas are entitled to the fullest consideration (para. 228 of the report) and, in actual fact, the Commission followed this principle in almost every case in deciding whether a particular area should be detached from one State and attached to another State. The Commission in many instances was guided by this principle, but unfortunately in the case of redistribution of boundaries between Bihar and West Bengal, the Commission completely ignored the wishes of the people in making its recommendation for the transfer of territories from Bihar and that the Government of India should likewise have taken a decision in complete disregard of the wishes,

[Dr. P. C. Mitra.]

feelings and sentiments of the people affected. The State Government of Bihar are strongly of opinion that any transfer effected, except on the basis of the consent of the people concerned, would leave behind a feeling of bitterness and a sense of injustice which would ultimately poison the relationship of the two States and that such a transfer would not, therefore, be either in the interest of Bihar or of West Bengal, or in the interest of the country as a whole.

I believe that under article 3 of the Constitution it is not binding upon the President to accept the views of the Legislature of the State but the views of the Legislature of the State from which territories are proposed to be separated should be entitled to the greatest weight as they represent the views of the people of those territories, and should not be disregarded, unless there are compelling reasons for doing so. The Bihar Legislature has considered the draft and has adopted a motion urging the Government of India to abandon the proposal to introduce the Bill and requesting the President to withhold his recommendation to the introduction of the Bill in Parliament.

The views of the West Bengal Legislature on the proposals for transfer are not entitled to the same weight as the views of the Bihar Legislature because it is Bihar and not West Bengal which is the territory and it is the people of Bihar whose social, cultural, economic and administrative ties with the people of the area proposed to be transferred are to be broken.

As regards the areas to be transferred from the Purnea district, it would be an act of great injustice to be done to the people of that area who speak Hindi and Urdu, if they are transferred to a State with which they have nothing in common in language and little in common in culture, social customs, etc. There is not the least justification either on administrative grounds or on the ground of language for the transfer of any territory from Purnea. It should have been realised that if West Bengal must have territories from Bihar for providing a direct road link between two parts of it, there can be no justification to break the existing direct road links between parts of Bihar, as for example, between Dhanbad and Jam-

shedpur, Dhanbad and Muri, and Dhanbad and Ranchi by transferring certain territories from Manbhum Sadar to West Bengal. After all there should not be one standard for judging the administrative convenience of West Bengal and another for that of Bihar. The West Bengal Assembly and Council both considered and approved the provisions of the Bill subject to various suggestions and modifications.

So none of the State Legislatures were satisfied with the provisions of the Bill.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT (West Bengal): Sir, we have listened to a few forceful speeches and we have already had discussions on this Bill. I propose to place before the House some facts which will give you an idea why Bengal is asking for some more areas. At present our area is barely 30,000 square miles. Out of this area the actual plain area is about 18,000 square miles and undulating plains about 9,500 square miles. These undulating plains are generally subject to soil erosion, and on account of this soil erosion the land loses its fertility, and sometimes erosion has been mainly caused by deforestation. Generally the forests in a country should be at least 25 per cent. of the total area. In Bengal this area has been reduced to 14 per cent. On account of the shortage of forests these undulating plains are losing their fertility, and therefore we barely have 18 to 20 thousand square miles for living and for cultivation. Out of this we have cultivable area of about 21 million acres, and thus you can see that with a heavy population which is nearly 25 millions we have not got even one acre to a person. Therefore, this particular point should be taken into consideration for increasing the area of West Bengal. I am not discussing here the grievances of Bengal, though you know that we have been reduced to this small area first by the 1911-12 partition by which the area was reduced from 1 lakh square miles to 86,000 square miles. At that time the density of population was 717. In 1947 the density had gone up to 806. You know, Sir, though it is not admitted by our friends, how Bengal had suffered since 1905. The Britishers tried to increase the percentage of Muslims in Bengal and reduce the majority of the Hindus, and actually in the undivided Bengal the Muslims were 54 per cent. In order to reduce the Hindu

majority a large area of our province was tagged on to Bihar. At that time the Biharis were in the good books of the Britishers. I shall read a few lines from the despatch of Lord Hardinge to the Secretary of State: "The Biharis are sturdy and loyal people, and it is a matter of common knowledge that although they have long desired separation from Bengal, they refrained at the time of partition from asking for it because they did not wish to join the Bengalees in opposition to Government."

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: What is the reference he is talking about?

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: From a despatch of Lord Hardinge to the Secretary of State dated the 25th August 1911. This was written by Lord Hardinge to the Secretary of State. That shows that in 1911-12 the Muslims on the one hand and the Biharis on the other were good friends of the Britishers, and that caused the reduction of the area of Bengal.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: My friend must have known that Bihar had stood first in all the national movements or struggles, in all our national fights for liberation.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: All the provinces were not then awake, when the movement started in Bengal. There was then no question of a national movement.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Is this past history relevant?

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: It is not irrelevant. I only point out that Bengal has lost a large part of its territory, which was originally inhabited by Bengalis, due to this British policy. That is only what I want to point out.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): I have read the despatch. It simply says that the Biharis are a sturdy and loyal people, so their demand for separation should be conceded. The despatch does not say that, since they are loyal and Bengalis are disloyal, Bihar should be aggrandized at the cost of Bengal. What you say is not the correct interpretation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wish Members do not use language which would offend another province or another Member.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: I am only mentioning why Bengal suffered, why the Bengali-inhabited areas were transferred to Bihar and Pakistan. This partition is the cause of the present trouble. The partition of 1912 produced its fruits in 1947, and Bengal was reduced to a very small State, though it is counted as one of the Part A States. It is a matter of regret that neither the Joint Committee nor the States Reorganisation Commission have found their way to include Goalpara of Assam in West Bengal.

To this smallness of area of West Bengal I want to add the problem of refugees. For the refugees the figure is this: according to the 1951 census it was 21 lakhs excluding those who already came to West Bengal. Now we are having daily 750 to 1000 refugees entering into West Bengal. In December 1955 there were as many as 2,34,000 refugees in camps. Today the population of refugees is 36 lakhs. Now the settlement of refugees is a very great problem.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: They can be transferred to other States.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: Now, Sir, out of these refugees, 40 per cent. are agriculturists and 60 per cent. are non-agriculturists. We transferred about 36,000 to Bihar, but many of them have come back because they probably could not get good treatment there and there were other reasons also.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The hon. Member hasn't got the correct figures with him. In the first instance, 75,000 were sent and now we have another 50,000.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Sir, all these allegations are baseless.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Let him proceed.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: Sir, our problem is slightly different from the Punjab problem. In Punjab the density of population is 338, whereas it is 800 here. The number of refugees in Punjab was 47 lakhs as against 61 lakhs of

[Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt.]

evacuees. The number of refugees in our State is 36 lakhs and only 15 lakhs are evacuees, and even out of those 15 lakhs evacuees, 10 lakhs have come back, and have been rehabilitated and resettled on their own lands. Therefore you will see that in our case it is really a one-way traffic. Now added to this problem is the problem of immigrants that we are maintaining. We have in our industries at present 15 lakhs workers. And out of these 15 lakhs workers, 10 lakhs are immigrants coming from neighbouring areas and sending their earnings to their native places, although it is the State of West Bengal which is giving them all sorts of amenities etc. Therefore, Sir, we have almost reached the breaking point due to this heavy population consisting of refugees and immigrants. It is to save this State from reaching the breaking point that we are asking for a little more land.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): How will this little land or more land solve your problem? It is not going to solve your problem. Why not transfer these persons to those areas which are not thickly populated, for instance, in Madhya Pradesh?

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: But they do not want to live there. That is the whole trouble. Sir, our population figures.....

SHRI MAHESH SARAN: Every time you say our population'. What is this 'our population'?

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: Sir, the refugees suffer from so many difficulties. They cannot escape the spirit of parochialism, casteism and communalism, which is growing in the other States. Actually, Sir, 60,000 persons were sent to Bihar and 36,000 persons were sent to Orissa. But there is a steady flow back. Sir, experience has taught us that unfriendly atmosphere in other States, lack of genial surroundings, absence of cultural and linguistic homogeneity, all these things prevail in the other States, and therefore these refugees must be settled in an area within the administrative ambit of West Bengal. This is the opinion of our Government. Therefore I submit that if Madhya Pradesh or Bihar had been able to find accommodation during the last four or

five years for these refugees, perhaps West Bengal would not have pressed so much for land. We do not want land for Bengalis of West Bengal, but we want land merely for the refugees that have come to us. And it is not proper to say that Bihar has been offering any good treatment to these refugees.

Now, Sir, I come to the few specific points with regard to Purnea or Gopalpur thana. Now, Sir, it has been admitted both by the Commission as also by the previous politicians that it is essential and urgent that the two parts of Bengal should be made contiguous. In this connection, I would like to read from the Parliamentary Debates of 1951 in which Shri Hussain Imam (Bihar) appears to have stated as follows:

"I am rather in a difficult position. While I see the equity and justice of the demand of Bengal, I have the misfortune—or the good fortune—of coming from the Province which would have to bear the brunt of this adjustment.

The question before the Centre is not so restricted. While we, coming from different States look at it from the point of view how it affects our own particular State, the Central Government and the party in power can have a wider outlook and see it in its proper perspective. Let us examine the position of Bengal. It was a mighty province with a big population and a long tradition of leadership and from that it has been reduced to such a position that it does not come in the first five provinces of India, as far as population is concerned."

If the Centre is prepared to compensate Bihar adequately and completely, I believe, Bihar would not raise any objection to give something to the Province of Bengal who stand in so much need of readjustment of their frontiers and re-equipment of their shattered economy. I believe that it is in the best interests of all concerned that the Centre should behave in a manner, not of a partisan, but of an arbitrator."

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Sir, immediately after delivering this great speech, this supposed leader from Bihar found a very rick asylum in Karachi. He is there now.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: Then, Sir, in the course of his reply, Shri Rajagopalachari, Home Minister, Government of India, stated as follows:

"Here is a Province which is divided into two unconnected parts. Here is a southern part of West Bengal Province, and here is Darjeeling in the north, and in between there is no connection and let us have some connection. That was the proposition. It is not a corridor problem as was eloquently and graphically put, bringing before us all the pictures of the corridor problems of Germany and of Poland. It is a totally different thing. They want an administrative improvement in the matter of communications. It is really a question of communications and of bringing about a state of things whereby our general defence position and our administrative position may be improved."

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I know from where he is quoting?

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: You can refer to Vol. XIV, and the date is 23rd August 1951.

(*Interruptions.*)

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO (Andhra): Sir, I may point out that on the Treasury Benches there is neither a Minister nor a Deputy Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't bother. Everything is being noted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, it is a very relevant point. Without any disrespect to my hon. friend—he is a very responsible person and I would like to see him a Deputy Minister some day—we would like to have some hon. Minister on those benches.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He belongs to this House. Every word of what you are saying is being taken down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But don't you think, Sir, that when such an important matter is being discussed, not even one Cabinet Minister or even a Deputy Minister is present to listen to the debate?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, let us go on.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir, in order to maintain the dignity of the House, you can arrange for some hon. Minister to be here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have sent for him.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: Sir, we want the area between Mechi and Mahananda near Taibpur railway station and Barsoi thana. From 3 P.M. Pakur to Kathihar should be added, for that is also a Bengali-speaking area on the eastern side of the railway line. But this is too much to ask. I crave the indulgence of the Bihar Members. I am only placing it before the House that this would have been much better.

No, this Purnea area has been attached to the Darjeeling District. Perhaps it would have been better to attach it to West Dinajpur, for there are a large number of Muslims in West Dinajpur and Malda who are allied to the Muslims of Purnea. In Malda out of a population of 9,37,000, nearly 3,46,000 or 36.9 per cent., are Muslims and they have got the same culture as that of the Muslims of Purnea. Therefore, it would be preferable to attach the added area of Purnea to West Dinajpur to maintain uniformity in culture and language, for they also speak the same dialect.

A bogey has been raised about Muslim grievances, that Muslims are afraid of coming over to Bengal, because of their language and of the resettlement of the refugees there. Government has already promised that there will be no resettlement of refugees there. What I want to say is that the culture of the Muslims of Kishanganj is not very different from that of the Muslims elsewhere in India. The culture of the Muslims of Purnea is not different from the culture of the Muslims in Malda. Hence, to say that the Muslims of Purnea will be isolated and put to difficulties is a wrong reading of the situation. The Muslims of the Kishanganj sub-division and in Kasba Amur and Balarampur thanas are said to be of Koch origin. The Bengali Muslims are of Bengali origin. They were originally Hindus, but now

[Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt.]

converted Muslims. Therefore you will find that these Muslims have more affinities with the Bengal Muslims than the Muslims of other parts of India, and the same is true of their language. They speak Kishanganjia and Sirpuriya which are mixtures of Bihari and Bengali, and the same dialect is also spoken in Bengal.

(*The Deputy Minister for Railways and Transport, Shri O. V. Alagesan, entered the Chamber.*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is that all that we could get?

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: Hence, to attribute communalism to West Bengal is rather not proper. West Bengal has made ample provision for Muslim education. I shall give you an idea of the provisions that they have made so far. Besides the ordinary schools and colleges provided for education the West Bengal Government has provided special facilities for the religious and secular education of Muslims. The hon. Member, Prof. Kabir, touched on this point, but he did not give any figures. Higher Madarasahs in 1947-48 were 8; in 1953-54 they were 7; Junior Madarasahs in 1947-48 were 176; now it is 109. For these Madarasahs over Rs. 3 lakhs are being spent every year. Over and above this, special arrangements have been made for the education of the boys of the Nizamet family of Murshidabad. On this also about Rs. 3 lakhs are being spent every year. For the Urdu-speaking boys and girls, there are special schools like Takhawat Memorial School, Calcutta Madarasah, Koraya M. E. School, Woodburn M. E. School, etc. Then, there is an Urdu Department in the Calcutta Madarasah and you will be glad to hear that in our University ample provision has been made for teaching Persian and Arabic and Islamic history and culture, and the number of Hindu students taking up Islamic history and culture is increasing so fast that it is becoming almost difficult to provide them all with seats. Therefore, to say that West Bengal is communal and will not provide educational facilities for Muslims is very wrong.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: But nobody has said this.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: Actually West Bengal is non-communal in outlook. There are several Muslim pockets in Calcutta and they are all engaged in trade and commerce. Out of the 15 lakh Muslims who went to Pakistan, ten lakhs have returned, and out of these ten lakhs, a large number is employed in our industries, because it is thought that these Muslims will give better production. We appreciate their work very much and therefore they have been taken in.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar): Where is the question of Muslims and Hindus in respect of this Bill? My friend is referring to Muslims and he is answering points that were never raised. Nobody has asked anything, and I am sure nobody from Bihar or for that matter, anybody in Bihar Legislature.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: The point has been made that this area should remain in Bihar, because these people are Muslims and they do not want to come to Bengal.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Atleast no Muslim said that.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: There was an agitation from Purnea Muslims.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Why can't he simply say the Purnea people?

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: I shall come to Manbhum. Generally the Biharis claim that the Hindi of Bihar is the Hindi of U.P. It is not so. I would remind hon. Members that according to our ancient history Bihar Hindi was derived from Prakrit, whereas the U.P. Hindi was derived from Sanskrit. Sanskrit was spoken only west of the Sadanira (Gandak) river. East of the Sadanira river was inhabited by people who spoke Prakrit. Bihar Hindi is really derived from Prakrit and not from Sanskrit, and I think the derivations of Magadhi, namely, Bhojpuri, Maithili and Megahi will be hardly understood by a Hindi-speaker from U.P. These dialects will be understood by Bengalis and Biharis. Since the linguistic question has been brought up in the discussion, I would like to submit that Bengali and Bihari Hindi are more akin.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: That is why we wanted merger.

DR. NALINAKSHA DUTT: About Manbhum, the only point that I want to make is that Chas thana, Chandil thana and Patamda police station have been excluded. There will be administrative difficulties if these were kept out, but as the Joint Select Committee has recommended this and as I was a Member of that Committee, I do not wish to add anything. I only wish that Government would agree to these thanas being added on to West Bengal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Has the hon. Member submitted any note of dissent on the subject? If not, why not?

سید مظہر امام (بہار): مسٹر ڈیپٹی چیئرمین - سر اس سے پہلے جبکہ اس کمیشن کی رپورٹ ہاؤس میں پیش ہوئی تھی تو میں نے ہاؤس کے سامنے یہ بتانے کی کوشش کی تھی کہ یہ رپورٹ کیسی ہے - آج وہ چیز اس بل کی شکل میں ہمارے اور آپ کے سامنے موجود ہے - میں چاہتا تھا کہ میں اس بل پر نہ بولوں - مگر ہمارے کچھ دوستوں نے ایسی تقریریں کی ہیں اور یہ بتانے کی کوشش کی ہے کہ جو فیصلہ ہوا ہے وہ صحیح اور جو بنٹال کی ڈیمانڈس تھیں وہ پوری نہیں ہوئی ہیں - حکومت نے یعنی ہوم منسٹر صاحب نے اپنی تقریر میں جو کہا ہے اس کے خلاف ہمارے دوستوں نے یہ بتایا ہے کہ یہ جو ایریا ہمیں ملا ہے وہ بہت کم ہے اور ہمیں جو ضرورت ہے وہ ری ہیبیلیٹیشن کے لئے ہے -

سب سے پہلے میں یہ آپ کو بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ابھی ہمارے پروفیسر ہمایوں کبیر صاحب نے یہ کہا کہ ڈاکٹر کنزرو صاحب نے اس ہاؤس میں اپنی اسپیک میں کہا تھا کہ ہم نے مہاندا ریور کو جو باؤنڈری بنائی اس کی وجہ یہ تھی کہ بہار گورنمنٹ نے ہمیں ڈیفنکٹیو میپس سپلائی کیا

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I never said 'Bihar Government' in connection with the defective maps. I referred to no Government whatever.

سید مظہر امام: میسرے ہاتھ میں یہ میپ کتاب کی شکل میں موجود ہے جس کو کمیشن کے سامنے بہار گورنمنٹ نے اپنے میمورنڈم کے ساتھ پیش کیا تھا - اگر حضور دیکھنا چاہیں تو آپ کے سامنے پیش کر سکتا ہوں -

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Does it contain any signature of the Commission? So that we may know

SYED MAZHAR IMAM: The Commission has a right to refuse it. This is a memorandum.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We would like to know the view of Dr. Kunzru who was a Member of the Commission.

سید مظہر امام: میں عرض کرنا ہوں کہ کمیشن نے سامنے جو میپ اور میمورنڈم رکھا گیا تھا اس کے ساتھ اس کو ملا لیا جائے - بالکل وہی کتاب ہے وہی میمورنڈم ہے اس لئے ہمارے دوست کا یہ کہنا کہ بہار گورنمنٹ نے ڈیفنکٹیو میپ دیا تھا بے معنی ہے اور میں اس کو ہرگز بہتر نہیں سمجھتا -

دوسری چیز جو مجھے عرض کرنی ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ ہمارے دوست بنرچی صاحب نے اپنی اسپیک میں ہاؤس کو یہ بتانے کی کوشش کی کہ میں یہ چاہتا ہوں کہ لنکوسٹک بیسس پر اس علاقہ کا مطالبہ کروں - میں آپ سے یہ کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ ہاؤس اس بات پر غور کرے اور بہار کے جتنے ممبر ہیں وہ اس بات پر تیار ہیں کہ اگر اس علاقہ کے لوگوں کی زبان بنگالی ہے - تو وہ علاقہ ان کو دیدیا جائے - ایک ممبر بھی اگر بہار کا مخالفت کرے تو آپ کہہ سکتے ہیں کہ تم نے غلط کہا ہے - میسرے بنٹال کے دوست ذرا فارورڈ

[سید مظہر امام]

ہو کر آئے انہیں اور اس چیز کو دیکھنے وہاں جائیں کہ یہ بات کہاں تک سچ ہے۔ ویشیز آف دی پیوپل کا جو حوالہ دیا گیا اس کے بارے میں آپ سے میں کہتا ہوں کہ اگر آپ پورنیا میں جائیں اور تحقیقات کریں اور ۱۰ پرسینٹ بھی بنگالی اسپیکنگ پیوپل اس کے حق میں آپ لے آئیں تو میں وہ ایریا ان کو دیئے کیلئے تیار ہوں۔

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Are you in a position to give the whole area? Does it belong to you?

سید مظہر امام: بہار کی طرف سے میں کہتا ہوں۔ میں اگر آپ سے یہ کہنے کی پوزیشن میں نہیں ہوں تو یہی میں آپ سے کہتا ہوں کہ اس ایریا کی طرف آپ جائیں اور دیکھیں۔ آپ کو پتہ چلے گا کہ میں سچ کہہ رہا ہوں یا نہیں۔ اگر آپ تیار ہوں تو آپ بنگال گورنمنٹ سے لوگوں کو لائیں اور ہم بہار گورنمنٹ سے لائیں اور اس بات کی جانچ کروالیں کہ آیا وہ اس بنا پر بنگال کے ساتھ ملنے کو تیار ہیں۔

دوسری طرف ۳۱ پرسینٹ آپ کی (بنگالی) پاپولیشن سینسس میں موجود ہے۔ کمیشن نے جو ۵۵ فیصدی رپورٹ کی ہے وہ موجود نہیں ہے جس کی بیسس پر انہوں نے مانہوم علاقہ کو رکھا ہے۔ لیکن یہ سوال کیا ہے کہ کسی جگہ آپ کہیں کہ ہم کو کیپٹمنٹ ایریا کی ضرورت ہے کسی جگہ یہ کہیں کہ صاحب ہم کو سوک کی ضرورت ہے اور کسی جگہ کہیں ہم کو ری ہیبیلیٹیشن کی ضرورت ہے۔ میں ہاؤس کے سامنے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ شروع سے جب یہ مسئلہ ہاؤس میں پیش ہوا ہے اس وقت سے یہ کہا جا رہا ہے کہ سنہ ۱۹۰۵ سے جب سے بنگال کا پہلا بتوارہ ہوا بنگال

کے اوپر بڑے ظلم ہوئے ہیں۔ میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ اُچکل کے زمانہ میں میرا علاقہ آپ کا علاقہ کہنے کے کیا معنی ہیں۔ یہ تو پرانے وقت کی بات ہو گئی ہے۔ جب یہ بات کہی جاسکتی تھی کہ میرا علاقہ ۲۵ زمینداری کا تھا۔ آج ۵ زمینداری کا رہ گیا اور میری آمدنی بھی کم ہو گئی۔ آج اڑیسہ کم ہو گیا جو پہلے آپ کی تیریٹری تھی اور بہار الگ ہو گیا جو آپ کی تیریٹری تھی۔ آج تو وہ علاقے اپنے اپنے پراونس بنا کر گورنمنٹ چلا رہے ہیں۔ آپ کے اس ایریا کا سوال اب کہاں رہا۔ اب تک آپ ان پر ڈومینیشن کر رہے تھے اور جب وہ علاقہ آپ کے ہاتھ سے نکلا تب آپ کو تکلیف ہے کہ ہم ڈومینیشن نہیں کر سکتے اس لئے آپ کہتے ہیں کہ ہمارے پاس کوئی علاقہ نہیں رہ گیا ہے۔ میں پوچھتا ہوں کہ اگر ایک خاندان کے اندر بتوارہ ہو جائے اس کے تمام لوگوں میں بتوارہ ہو جائے تو ہر ایک کو اپنا اپنا حصہ ملے گا یا نہیں۔ یہاں پر مثال کے طور پر میں آپ سے کہوں کہ اگر کسی کی زمینداری رہی ہو اور اس میں وہ ایک لاکھ کی آمدنی کا مالک رہا ہو اور اب اس کی آمدنی ۲۵ ہزار کی رہ گئی ہو کیا وہ کورٹ میں جا کر یہ کہے گا کہ صاحب میں تو غریب ہو گیا میری آمدنی کم ہو گئی اب ہماری ایک لاکھ کی آمدنی ہم کو دلائی جائے۔ تو کیا اس کی وہ بات مان لی جائے گی۔ وہی آرگومنٹ ہمارے بیئرچی صاحب ہاؤس کے سامنے پیش کر رہے تھے کہ پہلے اڑیسہ ہمارا تھا بہار ہمارا تھا وہ سب نکلنے سے ہم غریب ہو گئے ہیں۔ اس لئے ان میں وہ علاقے پھر کات کات کر ہم کو دیدئے جائیں۔ اس کے کیا معنی ہیں اور یہ کونسا ڈیموکریٹک پرنسپل ہے۔

اب رہا سوال پورنیا کے علاقہ کا۔ ہمایوں کبیر صاحب سے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ لینگویج کے معاملہ میں اس کی ہسٹری جاننے کا اب سوال پیدا نہیں ہوتا کہ کیوں صاحب آپ زبان کو اہمیت کیوں دیتے ہیں۔ آپ ذرا خود جا کر وہاں لوگوں سے پوچھئے کہ آپ کی زبان کیا ہے۔ آج وہ اردو زبان بولتے ہیں مجھ سے پوچھئے میرے والد اور پر دادا عربی فارسی جانتے تھے۔ ہسٹری میں لکھا ہے کہ جب مغل بادشاہوں کی حکومت تھی اس وقت فارسی زبان تھی۔ لیکن اب تو وہ نہیں بولی جاتی ہے۔ تو اب اس وقت کی جنریشن کیا بولتی ہے۔ کس زبان میں بولتی ہے۔ میں تو حکومت سے بھی کہتا ہوں کہ جائیے اس علاقہ میں اور وہاں کے لوگوں سے پوچھئے۔ اگر وہ لوگ کہیں کہ ہماری بنگالی لینگویج ہے تو آپ خوشی خوشی انہیں بنگال میں لیجائیے۔ ہمارے بھائیوں کو تو آپ کے سامنے اور اس ہاؤس کے سامنے صرف یہ اعتراض ہے اور عذر ہے کہ اس علاقہ کے لوگ بنگال میں جانا چاہتے ہیں تو ہم ایک بھاری بھی اس کے خلاف بولنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں۔ اگر اس علاقے کے لوگ وہاں جانا نہیں چاہتے جہاں کے علاقے کی لینگویج ان کی نہیں ہے اس کا وہ حصہ نہیں کلچر نہیں تو پھر کیوں آپ اس کے ساتھ زیر دستگی کرتے ہیں کہ ہم اس علاقے کو لیں گے۔ یہ کس بنا پر آپ کہتے ہیں۔ پھر آپ رفیوجیز بسانے کی بات کرتے ہیں اور کہتے ہیں کہ ہم ان کو بسانیں گے۔ یہ بڑا مشکل سوال پیدا ہو گیا ہے کہ آپ سینٹی منٹ سے اپیل کر بیٹھتے ہیں کہ صاحب رفیوجیز کا بڑا پروہلم ہے ان کو بسانے کے لئے ہمیں بھار کے علاقے کی ضرورت ہے۔ لیکن بھار کے لوگ اور بھار کی حکومت تو ان رفیوجیز کو بسانے کے لئے ہمیشہ سے تیار

ہے۔ لیکن آپ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہم نہیں بسانیں بلکہ آپ بسانیں گے۔ اور وہ تب ہی جب ہم آپ کو بھار کا ایریا دیدیں گے اور اس پر آپ کا کنٹرول ہو جائے گا۔ یہ بڑا اہم سوال ہے ۳۶ لاکھ رفیوجیز کو بسانا ہے۔ اس میں ۱۲-۱۵ لاکھ آپ نکال دیجئے وہ دوسرے پرائنسیپلز میں بھی بسانے جاسکتے ہیں لیکن زیادہ تر تو ہم بسانے کے لئے تیار ہیں۔ اب جیسا کہ کمیشن نے لکھا ہے وہاں کی میجسٹری کی زبان اردو ہے اس کی حفاظت کی جائے۔ اس کے بعد بھی آپ کہتے ہیں کہ سورج پوریا وہاں کی زبان ہے وہ بنگالی سے ملتی ہے اور بنگال کا کلچر اور وہاں کا کلچر ایک ہے۔ یہ سب آپ کیسے کہہ سکتے ہیں۔ یہ دوسری بات ہے کہ یوں کہنے کو آپ چاہے جو کچھ کہیں۔ سیلیکٹ کمیٹی میں بھی اس چیز پر روشنی ڈالی گئی تھی اور اس ہاؤس کو میں انفارم کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہاں کے لوگوں نے ہوم منسٹر صاحب سے درخواست کی تھی کہ ہمارے دستخط لئے جائیں کیونکہ ہم نہیں چاہتے کہ ہم لوگ بنگال کے ساتھ ملا دئے جائیں۔ مگر گورنمنٹ نے نہیں مانا۔ نہیں مانا۔

اب رہا یہ سوال کہ سڑک وہاں دیدی گئی تو کہتے ہیں کہ سڑک کے بعد ۲۰۰ گز کا فاصلہ دیا جائے روتہ مینٹین کرنے کے لئے۔ روتہ ایکسپریٹ سے بھی اگر پوچھا جائے تو ۲۰۰ یارڈ روتہ کو مینٹین کرنے کے لئے جگہ ہوتی ہے ایسا وہ نہیں کہے گا۔ کہاں ایسا اصول ہے۔ اب رہا راستہ کا سوال۔ مانہوم سے دھنباہ اور جمشید پور جانے کے لئے آپ کو بنگال سے ہو کر جانا پڑے گا۔ جب آپ ہی کو یہ چیز پسند نہیں ہے تو دوسرے کو یہ کہتے ہیں کہ ۳۵۰ میل گھوم کر جائیں جمشید پور۔ دونوں ایریا انڈسٹریل ایریا ہیں

[سید مظهر امام]

دوئوں کو جانے کے لئے نیپریست روت ہونی چاہئے۔ بیچ میں آپ نے بنگالی ایریا بنا دیا۔ وہی اصول نارتھ میں آتا ہے۔ نارتھ بنگال کو اور ویست بنگال کو ملانے کے لئے آپ پورنیا کے علاقہ سے ۲۰۰ گز کی روت مانگتے ہیں اور ہماری روت پر بہار کی روت پر نیشنل ہائی وے ہونا آپ کو پسند نہیں تھا۔ مگر آج آپ ہم کو کہتے ہیں کہ پورنیا میں بھی بنگال کے علاقہ کی روت سے جائیے۔ اب کشن کمنج نے علاقہ کے لوگ جو پورنیا دسترکت میں آئیں گے وہ بنگال ہو کر آئیں گے اس لئے کہ وہ روت آپ نے بنگال کو دیدی۔ اسی صورت میں آپ ساؤتھ میں بھی جانے کو بنگال سے کہتے ہیں۔ آخر یہ کیوں۔ کوئی اصول ہو تو ہم کو سمجھا دیجئے۔ ہم آپ کی بات مان لیں گے۔

اس کے بعد بھی ہمارے بنگالی بھائی کہتے ہیں کہ ہمیں یہ علاقہ ۳۶ لاکھ لوگوں کو بسانے کے لئے چاہئے۔ اس طرح سے انہوں نے ریفوجیوں کو بسانے کے لئے یہ پیرایہم کھڑا کر دیا ہے اور اس بہانہ سے یہ علاقہ لے رہے ہیں۔ اگر ان کو بسانے کے لئے زمین کی ضرورت ہے تو کوئی بھی نیشنلسٹ اُسی کوئی بھی صوبہ اپنی زمین دینے سے انکار نہیں کر سکتا۔ ریفوجی کا جو سوال ہے وہ ایک نیشنل سوال ہے۔ مگر اس سوال کی آڑ میں اس طرح سے زمین کو اپنے قبضہ میں لے لینا ایک غلط طریقہ ہے۔

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिगे : मैं आपसे एक सवाल करना चाहता हूँ। सन् १९३१ की सेंसस में यह बतलाया गया है कि वहाँ की जो पापुलेशन थी वह करीब करीब ७० परसेंट बंगालियों की थी। ऐसा मैंने सुना है। अगर यह बात ठीक है तो आज उस पापुलेशन के बारे में यह क्यों कहा जा रहा है कि बिहारियों की पापुलेशन तो वहाँ पर ७६ परसेंट है और बंगालियों की २१ या ३१ परसेंट है, क्या यह सच बात है। सही बात क्या है? क्या आप बतलायेंगे?

سید مظهر امام : جناب والا آپ سنہ ۵۱

کی سینسز رپورٹ لے لیجئے اس میں ۵۵ پرسیینٹ دکھلائی گئی ہے۔ اس بات کے خلاف ہوم منسٹر کو لکھا گیا کہ وہاں پر پھر سے دی کونٹنگ ہونی چاہئے۔ ہوم منسٹر نے اس شکایت کو منظور کر لیا۔ اصل میں بات یہ ہوئی کہ جب پچھلی سینسز وہاں پر کی گئی تھی تو وہاں کی کورٹ لینگویج بنگالی تھی اس لئے لوگوں سے یہ کہا گیا کہ تمہاری زبان بھی بنگالی ہے۔ اس طرح سے وہاں پر زیادہ بنگالیوں کی راپولیشن دکھائی گئی۔ مگر دوبارہ سینسز ہوا تو بنگالیوں کی راپولیشن صرف ۳۱ پر سینٹ ہی رہی۔ یہ تب ہوا جبکہ وہاں پر دوبارہ سینسز ہوم منسٹری کے سپرویزن میں ہوا۔

डा. डब्ल्यू. एस. बार्लिगे : सन् १९३१ में जो सेंसस रिपोर्ट निकली वह गलत है ?

سید مظہر امام : اس وقت بھی جو

بہاری نہ ان کو بھی لکھدیا گیا تھا کہ وہ بنگالی ہیں۔ میں یہاں پر یہ بات صاف طور پر بتلا دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ ان علاقوں میں جو بہاری لوگ رہتے تھے ان کا بنگالیوں سے کسی قسم کا کوئی تعلق نہیں تھا۔ اور نہ ان لوگوں کا دھن سہن ہی بنگالیوں کی طرح ہے اور نہ ہی ان کے ساتھ بیابا شادی ہوتی ہے۔ ان نے جو بھی تعلقات بیابا شادی کے ہوتے ہیں وہ سب بہاریوں کے ساتھ ہی ہوتے ہیں۔

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Is it not a fact that the census of 1921 was on the basis of Brierson's view that the language spoken in these districts was more allied to Bengali than to Hindi and in 1901 Sir Edward Gait I think came out with the theory that the language used was more allied to Maithili than to Bengali.

سید مظہر امام : جی ہاں - جناب والا

میں یہی عرض کر رہا تھا کہ ہمارے بھائیوں نے جو سوال اٹھایا ہے وہ اصل سوال نہیں ہے - اصل سوال یہ ہے کہ وہاں کے لوگ کیا چاہتے ہیں - ہم زبان کے بارے میں بھی کوئی جھگڑا اٹھانا نہیں چاہتے ہیں - ہمیں اس بارے میں کوئی جھگڑا نہیں ہے کہ وہاں کے لوگ کونسی زبان بولتے ہیں - اگر وہ بنگالی زبان بولتے ہیں تو ہمیں اس میں کوئی عذر نہیں ہے - مگر اصل سوال یہ ہے کہ وہاں کے لوگ چاہتے کیا ہیں - آیا وہ بنگال میں ملنا چاہتے ہیں یا نہیں - میں ایس - آر - سی رپورٹ کی طرف بھی نہیں جانا چاہتا ہوں - میں تو ایک قیمو کریٹک طریقہ کے بارے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں - دنیا کے کسی بھی کانسٹی ٹیوشن میں یہ نہیں لکھا ہے کہ جس علاقہ کے لوگ دوسرے علاقہ میں نہیں جانا چاہتے ہیں ان کو زبردستی وہاں بھیج دیا جائے - یہ ایک پرنسپل کی بات ہے - ہم یہاں پر مجاریٹی اور مینڈریٹی کا سوال اٹھانا نہیں چاہتے ہیں - ہم تو پرنسپل کی بات کرتے ہیں کہ جس علاقہ کے لوگ دوسرے صوبہ میں جانا نہیں چاہتے ہیں ان کو آپ زبردستی کیوں بھیجتا چاہتے ہیں - یہ ہمارا آپ سے کہنا ہے -

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it the assertion of the hon. Member that if there are 99 per cent. Bengalis in Bihar, then Bihar would be another Bengali-speaking linguistic State ?

CAPTAIN AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH (Vindhya Pradesh): That will be the next step.

سید مظہر امام : دوسری چیز جو

مجھے کہنی ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ بنگالی بھائیوں کی طرف سے یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ ہمارے پاس ایریا کم ہے - ہمارے صوبہ کو کئی

بار بانٹا گیا - اس وجہ سے ہمارا ایریا کم ہو گیا - یہ مانگ ان کی جائز ہے - مگر میں ان سے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب بنگال اور بہار کے مرجر کا سوال پیدا ہوا تو ان لوگوں نے وہاں پر کیوں اس کے خلاف مومنٹ شروع کر دیا - کیوں وہ مرجر کو پسند نہیں کرتے تھے - اس سے تو ان کے پاس کافی زمین ہو جاتی اور دونوں صوبے ایک ہو جاتے - وہ اینٹی لنگوسٹک مانگ پر کیوں قائم رہے - اس کا تو مطلب یہی ہے کہ وہ مرجر پلان کو نہیں چاہتے تھے - دوسرا سوال یہ اٹھایا گیا کہ کلکتہ میں جو بائی الیکشن ہوا اس میں کانگریسی امیدوار کی بری طرح سے ہار ہوئی - پبلک نے مرجر مومنٹ کے خلاف ووٹ دیا - اس طرح سے وہاں کے چیف منسٹر صاحب کو پبلک وائس کے سامنے جھک جانا پڑا - میں آپ سے یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس الیکشن میں پچھلے جنرل الیکشن سے کانگریسی امیدوار کو + + ووٹ زیادہ ملے - جب بنگال کی طرف سے اور وہاں کے چیف منسٹر کی طرف سے یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ ہم نے مرجر کا سوال پبلک کی رائے کے سامنے چھوڑ دیا تو آپ بہار کے حصہ میں وہ پرنسپل کیوں نہیں لاگو کرتے ہیں - جب آپ نے کلکتہ کی پبلک کی وائس پر مرجر کا سوال چھوڑ دیا تو آپ کو بہار کے اس حصہ کی پبلک کی آواز کو بھی سننا چاہئے اور اس مسئلہ کو بھی اس پرنسپل کے مطابق ہی حل کرنا چاہئے -

بار بار یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ پبلک کی وائس نے سامنے جھکنا چاہئے تو بات ایک ہے - پبلک جو چاہتی ہے اس کو تسلیم کیا جانا چاہئے - مگر میں آپ سے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جس اصول کو آپ بنگال کے لئے تھیک سمجھتے ہیں اس کو آپ بہار کے لئے کیوں نہیں تھیک

[सिद् मظهر امام]

समज्हेते हैं - बिहार की पब्लिक जो चाहती है उस के सामने आप कियों नहीं जेहते हैं - में इस हाउस के सामने ये एरु करों ग के जस वुत बङ्गाल और बिहार के मरजर का सुवाल बङ्गाल के चीफ मन्स्टर साब ने अतहाया तहा इस वुत बिहार के चीफ मन्स्टर साब ने ही इस पर अकिले दस्तखत किये - अन्हों ने बिहार की जन्ता से इस बारे में कौनी राँने नहीं ली तही - इस के बावजूद भी सारी बिहार की जन्ता अन के साने तही - जो कच्चे तहोरी मखालफत हौनी वे पिछे दब गयी - दुसरे सबे में ये वुत नहीं रही - वहाँ पर जुरों के साने इस मरजर असकम की मखालफत की कयी - ये बिहार के चीफ मन्स्टर साब को ही फुकर तहा के वहाँ की पब्लिक अन के साने पुरी एरु से तही - वहाँ की पब्लिक ने दुनिया के सामने ये दकला दिया के वे अपे लीडर के पिछे हैं वहाँ की लीडर शप मबुवत है - बिहार की कुरिब चार कुरो पब्लिक ने अपे चीफ मन्स्टर का इस मरजर के मुसल्ले पर साने दिया और अज भी वे अन के साने हैं -

तिसरी चीज जो मुझे एरु करनी है वे ये है के कुछ लुकों ने यहाँ पर ये कहा के बिहारी अङ्गरेजों की गद बक में तहे इस लिये अन्हों ने इस हसे को बङ्गाल से लिकर बिहार को दीदिया - में यहाँ पर मुसलमानों का डकर नहीं करना चाहता हों - में सुरुव अतना ही कहा चाहता हों के महाना गान्धी ने बिहार को ही पहले पहल अपे मुवुमन्त के लिये चना - जस मुवुमन्त ने सारे मुलक को आरुदी दाली वे बिहार सबे से ही शुरुव किया दिया तहा इस बात का वहाँ के लुकों को फुकर हावल है -

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE:
Bengal started it long ago.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: In Bengal....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No personal talks. Order, order.

सिद् मظهر امام : मरुफ कीजिये -

अङ्गरेजों के साने बङ्गालियों के भी जिये तल्लत रहे में अन पर बख्त करना नहीं चाहता हों मिर जेफर ने अङ्गरेजों का ही साने दिया तहा - आप को बिहार का एक भी अदमी इसा नह मालिगा - हस्तरी में आप को कौनी बात इसी नहीं मले की जस में ये लका हो के बिहार के लुकों ने अङ्गरेजी हकुमत का साने दिया और इस को मबुवत किया - ये कहा के बिहार के लुक अङ्गरेजों के गद बक में तहे इस वजे से ये एल्ले अन को दीदिया दिया तो ये त्हीक नहीं है - और अङ्गरेजों में ये बात मान जूही लों और हम अन को ये एल्ले दीने को तहार भी हों तो किया वे वहाँ पर सुरुव लङ्गुसुतक बिसस पर जाना चाहते हैं और इस का कौनी मल्लब नहीं है -

अखर में में हों मन्स्टर साब से ये एरु करों ग के अब जूही मुवुमे है के वे इस बात पर एरु करों के हम ने अमन्डन्त के दुबिये जो चीज मानगी है इस को कम से कम इस अल्ल पर मल्लुव किया जाये जस अल्ल पर आप ने कशन कुन्ज के एल्ले की रुवुस बङ्गाल को दीदी हैं इसी अल्ल और परनुवल को मदनार रकते हौने मानहों की रुवुस को बिहार के एल्ले में मल्ल दीजिये ताके जो हमारा मानहों और सङ्गहों के दुमियान कत अफ हो किया है वे दुर हो जाये -

ये मीरी आप से अखरी इपिल है -

†[सैयद मजर इमाम (बिहार) : मि० डिप्टी चैयरमैन । सर इससे पहले जब कि इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट हाउस में पेश हुई थी तो मैंने हाउस के सामने यह बतलाने की कोशिश की थी कि यह रिपोर्ट कैसी है । आज वह बीज

इस बिल की शकल में हमारे और आपके सामने मौजूद है। मैं चाहता था कि मैं इस बिल पर न बोलूं। मगर हमारे कुछ दोस्तों ने ऐसी तकरीर की हैं और यह बताने की कोशिश की है कि जो फैसला हुआ है वह सही है और जो बंगाल की डिमांड्स थीं वह पूरी नहीं हुई हैं। हुकूमत ने यानी होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी तकरीर में जो कहा है, इसके खिलाफ हमारे दोस्तों ने यह बताया है कि यह जो एरिया हमें मिला है वह बहुत कम है और हमें जो जरूरत है वह रिहेबिलिटेशन के लिये है।

सबसे पहले मैं यह आपको बता देना चाहता हूं कि अभी हमारे प्रोफेसर हुमायूँ कबीर साहब ने यह कहा कि डाक्टर कुंजूरू साहब ने इस हाउस में अपनी स्पीच में कहा था कि हमने महानंदा रिवर को जो बाउंड्री बनाई, इसकी वजह यह थी कि बिहार गवर्नमेंट ने हमें डिफेक्टिव मेप्स सप्लाई किया]

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: I never said 'Bihar Government' in connection with the defective maps. I referred to no Government whatever.

†[सैयद मजहर इमाम : मेरे हाथ में यह मेप किताब की शकल में मौजूद है जिसको कमीशन के सामने बिहार गवर्नमेंट ने अपने मेमोरेंडम के साथ पेश किया था। अगर हज़ूर देखना चाहे तो आपके सामने पेश कर सकता हूं।]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Does it contain any signature of the Commission? So that we may know.....

SYED MAZHAR IMAM: The Commission has a right to refuse it. This is a memorandum.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We would like to know the view of Dr. Kunzru who was a Member of the Commission.

†[सैयद मजहर इमाम : मैं अर्ज करता हूं कि कमीशन के सामने जो मेप और मेमोरेंडम रखा गया था, इसके साथ इसको मिला लिया जाय। बिलकुल वही किताब है, वही मेमोरेंडम है। इसलिये हमारे दोस्त का यह कहना कि बिहार गवर्नमेंट ने डिफेक्टिव मेप दिया था, बेमाइने है और मैं इसको हरगिज बेहतर नहीं समझता। दूसरी चीज़ जो मुझे अर्ज करनी है वह यह है कि हमारे दोस्त बनर्जी साहब ने अपनी स्पीच में

हाउस को यह बताने की कोशिश की कि मैं यह चाहता हूं कि लिग्विस्टिक बेसेज पर इस इलाका का मुतालबा करूं। मैं आपसे यह कह सकता हूं कि हाउस इस बात पर गौर करे और बिहार के जितने मेम्बर हैं वह इस बात पर तैयार हैं कि अगर इस इलाका के लोगों की जबान बंगाली है तो वह इलाका इनको दे दिया जाय। एक मेम्बर भी अगर बिहार का मुखालफत करे तो आप कह सकते हैं कि तुमने गलत कहा है। मेरे बंगाल के दोस्त जरा फारवर्ड होकर आगे आयें और इस चीज़ को देखने वहां जायें कि यह बात कहां तक सच है। विशिज् आफ दी पीपिल का जो हवाला दिया गया इसके बारे में आपसे मैं कहता हूं कि अगर आप पूर्णियों में जायें और तहकीकात करें और टेन परसेंट भी बंगाल के हक में वोट आप ले आयें, तो मैं वह एरिया इनको देने के लिये तैयार हूं।]

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: Are you in a position to give the whole area? Does it belong to you?

†[सैयद मजहर इमाम : बिहार की तरफ से मैं कहता हूं। मैं अगर आपसे यह कहने की पोजीशन में नहीं हूं तो भी आपसे कहता हूं कि इस एरिया की तरफ आप जायें और देखें। आपको पता चलेगा कि मैं सच कह रहा हूं या नहीं। अगर आप तैयार हों तो आप बंगाल गवर्नमेंट से लिखा कर लायें और हम बिहार गवर्नमेंट से लायें और इस बात की जांच करवायें कि आया वह इस विनियम पर बंगाल के साथ मिलने को तैयार हैं।]

दूसरी तरफ यानी पुरुलिया में ३१ परसेंट आपकी (बंगाली) पापुलेशन सेंसस में मौजूद है। कमीशन ने जो ५५ फीसदी रिपोर्ट की है वह मौजूदा नहीं है जिसकी बेसेज पर इन्होंने मानभूम इलाका को दिया है। लेकिन यह सवाल क्या है कि किसी जगह आप कहें कि हम को कैंचमेंट एरिया की जरूरत है किसी जगह यह कहें कि हमको सड़क की जरूरत है और किसी जगह कहें कि हमको रिहेबिलिटेशन की जरूरत है। मैं हाउस के सामने यह कहना चाहता हूं कि शुरू से जब यह मसला हाउस में पेश हुआ है उस वक्त से यह कहा जा रहा है कि सन् १९०५ से जब से बंगाल का पहला बंटवारा हुआ, बंगाल के ऊपर बड़े जुल्म हुए हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि आजकल के जमाना में मेरा इलाका आपका इलाका कहने के क्या माइने हैं यह तो पुराने वक्त की

†[सैयद मजहर ईमाम]

बात हो गई है। जब यह बात कही जा सकती थी, जब कि राज था, मेरा इलाका २५ मौजे जमींदारी का था। आज ५ मौजे जमींदारी का रह गया है और मेरी आमदनी भी कम हो गई। आज उड़ीसा कम हो गया जो पहले आपकी टेरीटरी थी और बिहार अलग हो गया जो आपकी टेरीटरी थी। आज तो वह इलाके अपने अपने प्रोविन्स बनाकर गवर्नमेंट चला रहे हैं। आप के एरिया का सवाल अब कहाँ रहा। हाँ, इस वक्त आप इन पर डोमिनेशन कर रहे थे और जब वह इलाका आपके हाथ से निकला तब आपको तकलीफ है कि हम डोमिनेशन नहीं कर सकते इसलिये आप कहते हैं कि हमारे पास कोई इलाका नहीं रह गया है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि अगर एक खानदान के अन्दर बंटवारा हो जाय तो हरेक को अपना अपना हिस्सा मिलेगा या नहीं यहाँ पर मिसाल के तौर पर मैं आपसे कहूँगा कि अगर किसी कर्ता खानदान की जमीन्दारी रही हो और कर्ता खानदान एक लाख की आमदनी कामालिक रहा हो और अब उसकी आमदनी २५ हजार की रह गई हो बंटवारा के बाद क्या वह कोर्ट में जाकर यह कहेगा कि साहब मैं तो गरीब हो गया, मेरी आमदानी कम हो गई अब हमारी एक लाख की आमदनी में ५० हजार की आमदनी हमको दिलाई जाय तो क्या उसकी वह बात मान ली जायगी? वही आरगुमेंट आज हमारे बनर्जी साहब हाउस के सामने पेश कर रहे थे कि पहले उड़ीसा हमारा था, बिहार हमारा था, वह सब निकलने से हम गरीब हो गये हैं। इसलिये इनमें कुछ इलाके फिर काट काट कर हमको दे दिये जायें सके क्या माइने हैं और यह कौन सा डेमोक्रेटिक प्रिंसिपल है?

अब रहा सवाल पूर्णिया के इलाके का हुआय कबीर साहब से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि लैंग्वेज के मामले में उसकी हिस्ट्री जानने का अब सवाल पैदा नहीं होता कि आप जबान को तारीखी अहमियत क्यों देते हैं। आप जरा खुद जाकर लोगों से पूछिये कि आपकी जबान क्या है। आज वह उर्दू जबान बोलते हैं। मुझे पूछिये मेरे वालिद और परदादा अरबी फारसी जानते थे। हिस्ट्री में लिखा है कि जब मुगल बादशाहों की हुकूमत थी उस वक्त फारसी जबान थी लेकिन अब तो वह नहीं बोली जाती है। तो अब इस वक्त की जेनरेशन क्या बोलती है। किस जुबान में बोलती है। मैं तो हुकूमत से भी कहता हूँ कि जाइये उस इलाका में और वहाँ के लोगों से

पूछिये। अगर वह लोग कह दें कि हमारी बंगाली लैंग्वेज है तो आप खुशी खुशी उन्हें बंगाल में ले जाइये। हमारे बिहारियों को तो आपके सामने और इस हाउस के सामने सिर्फ यह एतराज है और उज्र है कि उस इलाका के लोग बंगाल में जाना चाहते हैं तो हम एक बिहारी भी इसके खिलाफ बोलने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। अगर उस इलाके के लोग वहाँ जाना नहीं चाहते जहाँ के इलाका की लैंग्वेज इनकी नहीं है। उसका वह हिस्सा नहीं, कल्चर नहीं तो फिर क्यों आप इसके साथ जबरदस्ती करते हैं कि हम इस इलाका को लेंगे। यह किस बिनय पर आप कहते हैं। फिर आप रिफ्यूजीज बसाने की बात करते हैं और कहते हैं कि हम इनको बसायेंगे। यह बड़ा मुश्किल सवाल पैदा हो गया है कि आप सेंटीमेंट से अपील कर बैठते हैं कि साहब रिफ्यूजीज का बड़ा प्रोब्लेम है इनको बसाने के लिए हमें बिहार के इलाका की जरूरत है। लेकिन बिहार के लोग और बिहार की हुकूमत तो इन रिफ्यूजीज को बसाने के लिए हमेशा से तैयार है। लेकिन आप चाहते हैं कि हम बसायें इस वक्त जब हम आपको बिहार का एरिया दे देंगे और इस पर आपका कंट्रोल हो जायगा। यह बड़ा अहम सवाल है ३६ लाख रिफ्यूजीज को बसाना है। इसमें १४ १५ लाख का बैलेंस आपको मिल गया है। आप निकाल दीजिये और रिफ्यूजी को बसाइये। अब जैसा कि कमीशन ने लिखा है वहाँ की मेजोरिटी की जबान उर्दू है इसकी हिफाजत की जाय। इसके बाद भी आप कहते हैं कि सूरजपुरिया वहाँ की जबान है वह बंगाली से मिलती है और बंगाल का कल्चर और वहाँ का कल्चर एक है। यह सब आप कैसे कह सकते हैं। यह दूसरी बात है कि यूँ कहने को आप चाहें जो कुछ कह दें। मिलेक्ट कमेटी में भी इस चीज पर रोशनी डाली गई थी और इस हाउस को मैं इन्फार्म करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ के लोगों ने होम मिनिस्टर साहब के यहाँ तीन लाख दस्तखत पेश किया है और साफ-साफ कहा है कि हम लोग बंगाल के साथ नहीं मिलाये जायें। मगर गवर्नमेंट ने नहीं माना। नहीं माना।

अब रहा यह सवाल कि सड़क वहाँ दे दी गई तो कहते हैं कि सड़क के बाद दो सौ गज का फासला दिया जाय रोड मेंटेन करने के लिये। रोड एक्सपर्ट से भी अगर पूछा जाय तो २०० याई रोड को मेंटेन करने के लिए जगह होती है ऐसा वह नहीं कहेगा। कहां ऐसा असुल है। अब रहा रास्ता का सवाल। मानभूम से

धनवाद और जमशेदपुर जाने के लिये हमको बंगाल से होकर जाना पड़ेगा। जब आप ही को यह चीज पसंद नहीं है तो दूसरे को यह कहते हैं कि ३५० मील घूम कर जाय जमशेदपुर। दोनों एरिया इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया हैं दोनों को जाने के लिए नियरेस्ट रोड होनी चाहिये। बीच में आपने बंगाली एरिया बना दिया वही असल नार्थ में आता है। नार्थ बंगाल को और वेस्ट बंगाल को मिलाने के लिए आपने पूर्णिया का इलाका दे दिया है और हमारी रोड पर नेशनल हाई वे है इस पर होकर जाना आपको पसंद नहीं था। मगर आज आप हमको कहते हैं कि पूर्णिया में भी बंगाल के इलाका की रोड से जाय। अब किशनगंज के इलाका के लोग जो पूर्णिया डिस्ट्रिक्ट में आयेंगे वह बंगाल होकर आयेंगे। इसलिए कि वह रोड आपने बंगाल को दे दी। इस सूरत में आप साउथ में भी जाने को बंगाल से कहते हैं। आखिर यह क्यों? कोई उसूल हो तो हमको समझा दीजिये। हम आपकी बात मान लेंगे। इसके बाद भी हमारे बंगाली भाई कहते हैं कि हमें यह इलाका ३६ लाख लोगों को बसाने के लिये चाहिये। इस तरह से इन्होंने रिफ्यूजियों को बसाने के लिये यह प्रोबलम्ब खड़ा कर दिया है और इस बहाना से यह इलाका ले रहे हैं। अगर इनको बसाने के लिए जमीन की जरूरत है तो कोई भी नेशनलिस्ट आदमी, कोई भी सूबा, अपनी जमीन में बसाने से इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। रिफ्यूजी का जो सवाल है वह एक नेशनल सवाल है। मगर इस सवाल की आड़ में हम तरह से इलाका को अपने कब्जा में ले लेना एक गलत तरीका है।]

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिगे : मैं आपसे एक सवाल करना चाहता हूं। सन् १९३१ की सेसेन में यह बतलाया गया है कि वहां की जो पापुलेशन थी वह करीब करीब ७० परसेंट बंगालियों की थी। ऐसा मैंने सुना है। अगर यह बात ठीक है तो आज उस पापुलेशन के बारे में यह क्यों कहा जा रहा है कि बिहारियों की पापुलेशन तो वहां पर ७६ परसेंट है और बंगालियों की २१ या ३१ परसेंट है, क्या यह सच बात है। सही बात क्या है? क्या आप बतलायेंगे?

† [सैयद मजहर इमाम : जनाबवाला आप सन् ५१ की सेंसस रिपोर्ट ले लीजिये। इसमें ५५ परसेंट दिखाई गई है। इस बात के खिलाफ होम मिनिस्टर को लिखा गया कि

वहां पर फिर से रिकार्डिंग होनी चाहिये। होम मिनिस्टर ने इस शिकायत को मंजूर कर लिया। असल में वहां यह हुई कि जब पिछली सेंसस वहां पर की गई तो वहां के कई लोगों की जवान बंगला लिखी है इसलिये कि कोर्ट लैंग्वेज बंगाली थी। इस तरह से वहां पर ज्यादा बंगालियों की पापुलेशन दिखाई गई मगर दुबारा रिकार्डिंग हुआ तो बंगालियों की पापुलेशन सिर्फ ३१ परसेंट रही। यह तब हुआ जब कि वहां पर दुबारा रिकार्डिंग होम मिनिस्ट्री के सुपरवीजन में हुआ।]

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिगे : सन् १९३१ में जो सेंसस रिपोर्ट निकली वह गलत है?

† [सैयद मजहर इमाम : इस वक्त भी जो बिहारी थे उनको भी लिख दिया गया था वह बंगाली है। मैं यहां पर यह बात साफ तौर पर बतला देना चाहता हूं कि इन इलाकों में जो बिहारी लोग रहते थे इनका बंगालियों से किसी किस्म का कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था। न इन लोगों का रहन सहन ही बंगालियों की तरह है और न ही इनके साथ ब्याह शादी होती है। इनके जो भी ताल्लुक तब ब्याह शादी के होते हैं—वह सब बिहारियों के साथ ही होते हैं।]

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): It is not a fact that the census of 1921 was on the basis of Grierson's view that the language spoken in these districts was more allied to Bengali than to Hindi and in 1901 Shri Edward Gait, I think, came out with the theory that the language used was more allied to Maithili than to Bengali.

† [सैयद मजहर इमाम : जी हां! जनाब वाला मैं यही अर्ज कर रहा था कि हमारे भाइयों ने जो सवाल उठाया है वह असल सवाल नहीं है। असल सवाल यह है कि वहां के लोग क्या चाहते हैं। हम जुवान के बारे में भी कोई अगड़ा नहीं उठाना चाहते हैं। हमें इस बारे में कोई अगड़ा नहीं है कि वहां के लोग कौन सी जवान बोलते हैं। अगर वह बंगाली जवान बोलते हैं तो हमें इसमें कोई उजर नहीं है। मगर असल सवाल यह है कि वहां के लोग चाहते क्या हैं। आया वह बंगाल में मिलना चाहते हैं या नहीं। मैं एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट की तरफ भी नहीं जाना चाहता हूं। मैं तो एक डेमोक्रेटिक तरीका के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। दुनिया के किसी भी कांस्टीट्यूशन में यह नहीं लिखा है कि जिस

†(संयद मजहर ईमाम)

इलाका के लोग दूसरे इलाका में नहीं जाना चाहते हैं उनको जबरदस्ती वहां भेज दिया जाय। यह एक प्रिंसिपल की बात है। हम यहां पर मेजोरिटी और मायनोरिटी का सवाल नहीं उठाना चाहते हैं। हम तो प्रिंसिपल की बात करते हैं कि जिस इलाका के लोग दूसरे सूबा में नहीं जाना चाहते हैं उनको आप क्यों जबर दस्ती भेजना चाहते हैं। यह हमारा आपसे कहना है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it the assertion of the hon. Member that if there are 99 per cent. Bengalis in Bihar, then Bihar would be another Bengali speaking linguistic State?

CAPTAIN AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH (Vindhya Pradesh): That will be the next step.

†(संयद मजहर ईमाम): दूसरी चीज जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि बंगाली भाइयों की तरफ से यह कहा जाता है कि हमारे पास एरिया कम है। हमारे सूबे को कई बार बांटा गया। इस वजह से हमारा एरिया कम हो गया; यह मांग इनकी अगर मान ही ली जाय, मगर इनसे मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब बंगाल और बिहार के मरजर का सवाल पैदा हुआ तो इन लोगों ने वहां पर क्यों इसके खिलाफ मुवमेंट शुरू कर दिया। क्यों वह मरजर को पसंद नहीं करते थे। इससे तो इनके पास काफी जमीन हो जाती और दोनों सूबे एक हो जाते। वह अपने लिग्विस्टिक मांग पर क्यों कायम रहे। इसका तो मतलब यह है कि वह इस बहाना से कुछ इलाका चाहते हैं। दूसरा सवाल यह उठाया गया कि कलकत्ता में जो बाई एलेक्शन हुआ इसमें कांग्रेसी उम्मीदवार की बुरी तरह से हार हुई। पब्लिक ने मरजर मुवमेंट के खिलाफ वोट दिया। इस तरह से वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब को पब्लिक वाइस के सामने झुक जाना पड़ा। मैं आपसे यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इस एलेक्शन में पिछले जनरल एलेक्शन से कांग्रेस उम्मीदवार को सात सौ वोट ज्यादा मिले। जब बंगाल की तरफ से और वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर की तरफ से यह कहा जाता है कि हमने मरजर का सवाल पब्लिक की राय के सामने छोड़ दिया तो आप बिहार के हिस्सा में वह प्रिंसिपल क्यों नहीं लागू करते हैं। जब

आपने कलकत्ता कि पब्लिक की वाइस पर मरजर का सवाल छोड़ दिया तो आपको बिहार के इस इलाके की पब्लिक की आवाज को ही सुनना चाहिये और इसमसले को भी प्रिंसिपल के मुताबिक ही हल करना चाहिये।

बारबार यह कहा जाता है कि पब्लिक की वाइस के सामने झुकना चाहिये तो बात ठीक है। पब्लिक जो चाहती है इसको तसलीम किया जाना चाहिये। मगर मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि जिस उसूल को आप बंगाल के लिये ठीक समझते हैं उसको आप बिहार के लिये क्यों नहीं ठीक समझते हैं। बिहार की पब्लिक जो चाहती है इसका सामने आप क्यों नहीं झुकते हैं। मैं इस हाउस के सामने यह अर्ज करूंगा कि जिस वक्त बंगाल और बिहार के मरजर का सवाल उठा था उस वक्त बिहार के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब ने अकेले दस्तखत किये। उन्होंने बिहार की जनता से इसके बारे में कोई राय नहीं ली थी। इसके बावजूद भी मारी बिहार की जनता इनके साथ थी। जो कुछ थोड़ी मुश्कालफत हुई वह पीछे दब गई। दूसरे सूबे में यह सूरत नहीं रही। वहां पर जोरों के साथ इस मरजर स्कीम की मुश्कालफत की गई। यह बिहार के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब को ही फर्क था कि वहां की पब्लिक उनके साथ पूरी तरह से थी। वहां की पब्लिक ने दुनिया के सामने यह दिखला दिया कि वह अपने लीडर के पीछे हैं। वहां की लीडरशिप मजबूत है। बिहार की करीब ४ करोड़ पब्लिक ने अपने चीफ मिनिस्टर का इस मरजर के मसले पर साथ दिया और आज भी वह इनके साथ है।

तीसरी चीज जो मुझे अर्ज करनी है वह यह है कि आज लोगों ने यहां पर यह कहा कि बिहारी अंग्रेजों की गुड़ बुक में थे इसलिये उन्होंने इस हिस्से को बंगाल से लेकर बिहार को दे दिया। मैं यहां पर मुसलमानों का जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता हूं। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि महात्मा गांधी ने बिहार को ही पहले पहल अपने मुवमेंट के लिये चुना। जिस मुवमेंट ने सारे मुल्क को आजादी दिलायी वह बिहार सूबा से ही शुरू किया गया था। इस बात का वहां के लोगों को फकर हासिल

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: Bengal started it long ago.

PROF HUMAYUN KABIR: In Bengal....

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No personal talks. Order, order.

†(सयद मजहर इमाम) : माफ कीजिये । अंगरेजों के साथ बंगालियों के भी जैसे ताल्लुकात रहे हैं मैं इस पर बहस नहीं करना चाहता हूँ । मीर जाफर ने अंगरेजों का ही साथ दिया था । आपको बिहार का एक भी आदमी ऐसा न मिलेगा । हिस्ट्री में आपको कोई ऐसी बात नहीं मिलेगी जिसमें यह लिखा हो कि बिहार के लोगों ने अंग्रेजी हुकूमत का साथ दिया और उसको मजबूत किया । यह कहना कि बिहार के लोग अंग्रेजों की गुड बुक में थे इस वजह से यह इलाका इनको दे दिया गया तो यह ठीक नहीं है । और यह हकीकत से दूर है । बहसियत बिहारी में इस पर प्रोटेस्ट करता हूँ ।

आखिर में मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से यह अर्ज करूंगा कि अब भी मौका है कि वह इस बात पर गौर करें कि हमने अमेंडमेंट के जरिये जो चीज मांगी है उसको कम से कम इस असूल पर मंजूर किया जाय जिस असूल पर आपने किशनगंज का इलाका की रोड बंगाल को दे दी है और इसी असूल और प्रिंसिपल को मद् नजर रखते हुए मानभूम की रोड्स को बिहार के इलाका में मिला दीजिये ताकि जो हमारा मानभूम और सिंहभूम के दरम्यान कटआफ हो गया है वह दूर हो जाय ।

यह मेरी आपसे आखिरी अपील है ।

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the very outset, let me say, without dilating on the point, that there is at least professedly a basic difference in our approach and that of the States Reorganisation Commission, the Government and the Congress today, to the question of the reorganisation of the States. That difference lies in this that we lay more emphasis on the criterion of language. We do not say that other considerations are unimportant; but we say that primarily it should be by linguistic considerations that States should be reorganised. Now, I said professedly there is a difference, because although the Government and the Congress say that they do not believe in linguism—whatever that may mean—yet in actual practice, both the States Reorganisation Commission and the Government have redistributed the States on the linguistic basis. There were the bilingual States like Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad,

and there were other bilingual States also. Why have they not been maintained? Why have they been given up and reformed into unilingual States? Outside of the Bombay State whose formation was recently accepted by Parliament, there is no bilingual State today in the whole of India. Let us realise that when we say we do not accept the principle of language of re-distribution of States.

I would also like to say that the acceptance of the principle of linguism does not deprive me of the territories to which we lay claim. I say that because in the other House the hon. Home Minister stated that if the principle of language was accepted, then Bengal would not be entitled to the territories that are sought to be transferred to it in this Bill. I say, Sir, that this is fallacious logic. It is fallacious because I do not accept the criterion which the Home Minister has put forward. I do not accept the criterion which was put forward by the Dhar Commission or by the States Reorganisation Commission that only when 70 per cent. of the people speak a particular language will that territory be transferred on the ground of language to the other State concerned. People who have not accepted the principle of dividing States on the basis of language have no right to lay down a criterion for myself and, therefore, Sir, I say that the criterion that I have laid down will sufficiently prove that the territories which have been given to Bengal and the territories which were claimed by it should have been transferred to it.

The second preliminary observation that I want to make is that I shall make no appeal to sympathy or sentiment. I do not want this House to be moved by any sentiment or sympathy in assessing the case of Bengal. I shall not refer to them; nor shall I ask this House to be moved by such facts as that Bengal had been partitioned thrice in the past, that when we had achieved our independence, the price had to be paid primarily by West Bengal and Punjab; nor shall I refer to or hold Bihar by the plighted words of their leaders like Deep Narayan Sinha. Sachidananda Sinha, Nand Kishore Lal and Parameshwari Lal, nor do I want this House to be moved by the fact that Bengal is burdened with the refugee problem. I say that, because the States Reorganisation Commission has not been moved by any of these considerations.

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

The States Reorganisation Commission had not been moved by sympathy. Here is a Member of the States Reorganisation Commission. I challenge him to say that on any item, the Commission had been moved by sympathy for Bengal's plight; they have applied to Bengal a standard which they had applied to any other State and if certain territories have been proposed to be transferred to Bengal, it is not because they have been moved by the difficulties which Bengal has to face on account of the refugee problem or the sufferings which Bengal has undergone in the course of the struggle for Indian independence but it is because Bengal's case is patently just in the light of the criteria which the States Reorganisation Commission themselves had put forward.

Now, Sir, having said that, I come to the territories that are sought to be transferred to Bengal.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: They have laid down a criterion but what is the criterion that you have laid down?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: My criterion is language primarily; also, other considerations that may be relevant. I say that I stand by my criterion even as regards the territories that are proposed to be transferred to Bengal. I am confining myself to those territories only. I say that if any sympathy has been shown either by the States Reorganisation Commission or by the Government it has not been in favour of Bengal but it has been in favour of Bihar and I shall demonstrate why I say that.

Let us, Sir, first take the question of Kishanganj. I say that even on the question of language, it cannot be said that this territory should not have been transferred to Bengal because whatever my hon. friend who just now sat down had said, it is well known that there is dispute about the language composition of the people in this area. I may just quote what the States Reorganisation Commission themselves have said about this. Because of the difficulties or the rival claims of the two States on the ground of language, the States Reorganisation Commission stated thus:

"We do not feel called upon to review or to decide this question. The affinities between Kishanganj or Sirpuria as spoken in the extreme east

of Purnea district, on the one hand, and Bengali on the other, seem to be close. But this dialect is written in the Kaithi script, which is allied to Hindi, and as one proceeds westwards its affinities with Maithili and Hindi become more marked."

They, therefore, do not take the question of language into consideration because they feel that on the ground of language, it cannot be settled either way; not that they have rejected, I say, the claims of Bengal or Bihar on the ground of language but because it is a question where they say the facts do not, according to them, conclusively support either one party or the other.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: There is just one clarification I seek. Why then have they recommended a special status for Urdu in that region? It is not, I think, on religious grounds; it must be on linguistic considerations.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There is the Urdu speaking Muslim population there. Their recommendation is not for the population as a whole, for the whole area, but it is only for a certain section of the people which, they say, is Urdu speaking Muslim population. As I stated last time, I think that that reference was unfortunate and I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Humayun Kabir, who also expressed the same sentiment. Now, Sir, the reason why this territory was sought to be transferred to Bengal was that there should be geographical contiguity. I had stated that the States Reorganisation Commission had been partial—if I may use the word, not in a bad sense; let me say, it had been more favourably disposed towards Bihar. The reason why I say that is this, that even with regard to Kishanganj in the south, they recommended that the national highway in the Gopalpur thana should be the southern boundary. No, that does not subserve the purpose which the Commission themselves had set forth, and for which this territory was sought to be transferred to Bengal. I would like to quote the Chief Minister of Bengal here, not that his arguments, to me, are any more convincing because he is the Chief Minister but I quote the Chief Minister because I feel that he will carry more conviction with Members opposite as he occupies a high place in the Congress hierarchy. Today, whatever my friends' opposite may say, it seems

that they attach importance to arguments in accordance as they issue from the mouth of a person who occupies a particular position in their hierarchy. The higher his position in the hierarchy, the more influential appears to be the argument. Incidentally, this would appear to be an operation in practice of the much maligned cult of personality. Anyway, this is what the Chief Minister of Bengal stated:

"The States Reorganisation Commission has recommended that the transfer of a portion of the Gopalpur revenue thana will enable West Bengal to construct feeder roads connecting the national highway to the other territories and to control the road traffic to Darjeeling and other places in the north. The territories referred to in this paragraph are Malda and West Dinajpur districts of West Bengal and unless the district of Malda has any contact with the national highway such feeder roads of these districts will not be possible."

The boundary which the States Reorganisation Commission had proposed does not provide this contiguity of North Bengal with Malda. There is no direct link between the national highway and Malda district but still the States Reorganisation Commission did not recommend the whole territory to the east of Mahananda to be transferred to Bengal. Now, here, Sir, I may refer to some of the arguments which were advanced by my friends here who said that one set of criteria had been applied in the case of Bengal and a different set in the case of Bihar.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: May I ask two questions of Mr. Ghose?

The first one is, what is the distance between the Pakistan border and this national highway? The second question is, after all, it is a national highway. Supposing it does not go to Bengal, will Bengal feel any administrative difficulties so far as the northern portions of Bengal are concerned in point of fact?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: As regards the first point, I do not know the actual distance. Probably, Dr. Kunzru may say as to what the actual distance is between the national highway and the Pakistan border. On the second question, the Chief Minister of West Bengal has stated—as I will quote from his speeches presently—that there have been serious

administrative difficulties experienced in the past because there has been no link and the reasons also, if I may quote now, are given in paragraphs 650 and 651 of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. There they say as follows . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Were those difficulties experienced after 1947 or were they experienced between the years 1912 and 1947 also?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: After 1947 obviously. It does not require any answer; it is so palpable.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: What about the period between 1912 and 1947?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Before 1947 there was no question excepting that there should be redistribution of States on linguistic basis, but there was not that administrative difficulty; that is obvious. Sir, this is what the States Reorganisation had stated . . .

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): There was no missing link then?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There was no missing link.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But it is a contiguous territory.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: This is what the Commission had stated: "Apart from the inconvenience in administering geographically detached areas we must take note of the fact that the continued isolation of the northern districts from the rest of West Bengal will tend to foster and accentuate separatist trends in these districts. West Bengal, therefore, has a good case for a geographical integration of the northern areas." The States Reorganisation Commission continues, "Besides, even if the Bihar Government extend full co-operation in facilitating traffic between the north and the south of West Bengal, certain difficulties are inherent in the existing arrangements. These difficulties will be eliminated if portions of the Kishanganj sub-division and the Gopalpur revenue thana are transferred to West Bengal. This will enable West Bengal to construct feeder roads connecting the national highway to its other territories and to control road traffic with Darjeeling and other places in the north, by eliminating avoidable delays and cumbersome and inconvenient administrative arrangements, and by liberalising, if necessary,

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

the present practice relating to road transport. West Bengal will also acquire control of the Indo-Pakistan border in this region along its entire length. From an administrative point of view this will be both convenient and desirable."

Now, Sir, as I stated, the purpose for which the States Reorganisation Commission had recommended transfer of this territory would have been better served if they had recommended that all the area to the east of the Mahananda river up to the junction with Malda district should be transferred to West Bengal, but they did not do that only on this ground, as far as I can see, namely, they felt that what they had recommended would provide for geographical contiguity, and they did not take into account the further administrative advantages that would have flowed if a further portion of territory were to be transferred to Bengal. The case of Bihar, however, is not the same. There had been, firstly, no geographical contiguity between the two areas of Bengal, but that is not the case with Bihar. In Bihar, although it may not be all along the highway, there is a direct link between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur and no question of any missing link is there. Dr. Kunzru had pointed out on another occasion that one of the reasons, only one of the reasons, why Seraikella and Kharsawan were not proposed to be transferred to Orissa was that in that case Jamshedpur would have become an enclave. Therefore the standards applied in both the cases have been the same. Further I may point out that there is also, on account of the retention of Patamda thana in Bihar, a missing link in a highway which connects two areas of Bengal between Midnapore and Purulia, the Purlia-Bandan road is about 15 miles long and for some 5 or 6 miles it passes through Bihar territory so that there has been no difference in treatment as between the two States, and to say that because there has been now provided geographical contiguity between north and south Bengal the position is the same in the case of Bihar is to ignore the actual facts.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Has the hon. Member now, after great effort, discovered the missing link?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: The missing links have been there and my friends opposite are more aware of them than we are,

because they have been talking about missing links.

Now, Sir, as I stated, the arguments that had been put forward by Bihar Members really do not hold water. I challenge the Member of the States Reorganisation Commission, who is present in this House, to say that they had applied in the case of Bengal a standard different from what they had applied in examining the case of Bihar. My Bihar friends, as I said last time, must remember that implicit in the formation of the States Reorganisation Commission was this fact that there should be reorganisation of States and transference of territories. Once we have accepted the States Reorganisation Commission, if you say not an inch of territory should be transferred from one State to another then why should the States Reorganisation Commission have been constituted at all, which you all have accepted. Now having accepted that then the question arises whether in any particular case, where a territory is proposed to be transferred, there is sufficient justification. Now, as I said, in the case of Kishanganj for the claim thereto even on grounds of language there is sufficient justification, but for those who do not accept language, there is the argument that the States Reorganisation Commission had advanced, namely, administrative grounds. I say, Sir, that the States Reorganisation Commission has been more favourable towards Bihar because of the boundary which they proposed in the south and I say that the Government has also been favourable to Bihar because they have further truncated the territory that was proposed to be transferred to Bengal in this area. I ask you: On what considerations have the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission been modified?

PROF. G. RANGA: Compromise.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: What is the compromise?

PROF. G. RANGA: Between you two.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There was no compromise; there was no agreement. I ask my Congress friends here and the Bihar friends here to say whether they agreed, and even if they had, it had been the agreement between Congress Members. That has been the bane of Government policy in regard to the recommendations of the States Reorganisation

Commission. The Congress has treated the Report as a domestic affair of the Congress. Whenever they felt that the quarrels within the Congress would not be resolved by a certain proposal, they have altered it without considering the effect this will have on the country at large. Once they have been able to satisfy some Congressmen or some Congress party or some Congress group, they always felt that that was a national solution forgetting for the moment that Congress is not the nation, and there had been the inevitable repercussions, say, in Maharashtra and Gujarat. You say hooligans have been behind all these mischievous activities. I ask you: Why is it that at one time there was trouble in Maharashtra and there was none in Gujarat and why is it that there is trouble in Gujarat now and there is none in Maharashtra? If the hooligans and the Opposition Parties were only responsible, if the facts were the same, why is there no trouble in Maharashtra to-day and why is it that there is trouble in Gujarat today? You explain that to me. There may be the hooligans and there may be the political parties, but unless there is a mass of popular feeling behind these demands, these hooligans and these political parties, these opposition parties cannot do anything. There are the opposition parties in Maharashtra today, but why is there no trouble? It is because you do something at a particular moment of time to resolve your Congress Party difficulties without taking into account the effect it will have on the people at large, and when the consequences follow, you are eager to shift the burden to somebody else and blame the opposition parties and hooligans. It does not become well of you as a party and as a Government always to shirk responsibility in that manner.

PROF. G. RANGA: Where did they shirk their responsibility?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Surely you take decisions to resolve your own differences without taking into consideration what effect those solutions will have on the people at large, and without resolving these difficulties either. You resolve the difficulty at one place and create it in another place. But, as I said, Sir, what is the ground on which the Government have further modified the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission. They say that there is the Urdu-speaking Muslim population. Now if

that is the ground, then accept language and reject what was administratively considered to be a sound proposition for transfer of territory. You are modifying it on the ground of the language of a section of the population at a particular place. You say that here are certain Urdu-speaking people, that their wishes should not be interfered with. If that is so—I do not know the facts—it there is Urdu-speaking Muslim population and on that ground you are not agreeing to a proposition which is administratively sound, then really you are giving more importance to the language in a very small area, while at the same time you shout from the house tops that you are not being influenced by the considerations of language. Then, Sir, may I point out the difficulties this modification . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: That Urdu-speaking population has an apprehension that if that area is handed over to Bengal, the refugees will come there in large numbers notwithstanding any statements or assurances to the contrary.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There is no question of refugees. I can tell the hon. Member that so far as the areas that are now proposed to be transferred to Bengal are concerned, there is no question of settlement of refugees. The refugee angle has not at all been taken into consideration in proposing the transfer of this area to Bengal and so far as Bengal's demand for these areas is concerned, it is not based on considerations of settling refugees on these areas. Their demand for a larger area was based among other considerations on that of the settlement of refugees. But that is a question apart.

Sir, I was pointing out the difficulties which this modification of the States Reorganisation Commission's recommendations will have and I can do no better than, again quote the Chief Minister of West Bengal when he stated as to what should be the natural boundary between States. He has stated:—

"In clause 3 (1) (b) of the Bill it is said that the National Highway in Gopalpur thana and the northern portion of that thana which lies to the north of the national highway should be transferred to West Bengal. Of all the features of geography made to serve the boundaries between different administrative units the road is the

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

least suitable—a road is the economic life-line of the area through which it passes. It draws traffic from both sides of its alignment, brings those areas closer to each other and integrates them to the economic fold. The very role of the highway is integration rather than separation of contiguous areas and the area on the two sides of the road must have a common economic existence and a common administration to sustain it. Until such areas on one side of the highway reach the geographical barriers of a river or a hill, their natural economic integration will be towards and across the highway rather than away from the areas on the other side of the highway."

Therefore, commonsense and administrative convenience should have dictated that the boundary of Bengal should have been where it was proposed to be made by the States Reorganisation Commission, namely, the Mahananda river, because when you have a roadway as a boundary between the two States it will be a paradise for smugglers. You will create more difficulties and you are creating more administrative difficulties. For what reason? To satisfy some people on grounds of language, even when you say that that is not the consideration which should weigh upon the Government. As a matter of fact all this has been done to satisfy some Congress people in Bihar. It so happens that Congress in Bengal is weak and the High Command probably feels that it may be written off and that it would be wiser to support Bihar Congress rather than support Bengal Congress, because that will pay more dividend later on. Otherwise, there is no reason as to why what is administratively sound and what should have been done, is now sought to be undone by an amendment which can have no reason to support itself.

Next I come to the Purulia portion. I do not want to say much about the language question; nor do I want to refer to the recent census that has been taken, resorting of census slips. I do not know as to why it was done, at whose instance it was done? How it was done? Why should a particular area, which was proposed to be transferred to Bengal by the States Reorganisation Commission, be subjected to this process and not other areas also at the same time to which Bengal had laid a claim. If you have a new census

at Purulia, why not at Santhal Parganas? Why not at Dhalbhum? And why not under absolutely impartial auspices? Why must you have it in this particular area which the States Reorganisation Commission had proposed to transfer to Bengal? I do not know if it was done at the instance of Bihar Government. Now to come and say that new facts have come out and, therefore, linguistically this is not Bengali-speaking.

SHRI T. BODRA: I may point out that the areas in the other districts were also taken into consideration by the Commission, see "Hand Book of Census of India, 1951", and village-wise sorting of the slips was done in those areas also.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If the hon. Member will have read the debates in the other House, he will have found that it was pointed out that many of these slips were unavailable, that they were lost, that the way in which the census was taken was most partial and not at all honest and under those conditions to base one's case on the result of the resorting of census slips which were packed away—one does not know where, where these are kept, and in what manner—and then say that they give results on which a new decision may be based, is to say something which is atrocious. We have had the 1931 census. The 1951 census gave figures which were amazing, as in certain cases even the States Reorganisation Commission had also to acknowledge. But as I say that even the 1951 census, which, it is said was to a large extent cooked, even that showed that these areas had a preponderant Bengali population.

Then, Sir, I said that the States Reorganisation Commission had been favourable towards Bihar. I say that because here when they recommended transfer of a particular territory, namely, the Purulia sub-district, they said the Chas thana should be excluded. Why should that be accepted? It came within the natural border as cut across by the Damodar river. It was on one side of the Damodar river, so that now you have a district which will have a portion on the other side of the Damodar river. That was not fair. And that is why I say that the States Reorganisation Commission favoured Bihar. But then their recommendation was further modified by the Government and the Chandil and

Patamda thana are now excluded. As the hon. Home Minister knows fully, he could not explain retention of Patamda in Bihar in a reasonable manner. He said that a reservoir which supplies water to Tatas come from there. Now, is that a sufficient ground? If a certain territory is to be transferred to a certain State, and because the water of a company or an industrial undertaking, however important it may be, come from that territory, should that be a ground for non-transference of that particular territory? If that is so, then why do you say that this is one country, India. No territory is going away from India. If for supplying of water to Jamshedpur it is necessary that Patamda thana should be in Bihar, that if it was in Bengal, Jamshedpur would not be supplied with water, if that is your contention then there is no basis for anything. Because then you do not believe in the unity of India. You do not believe that this is one country. Do you consider that it is administratively unsound, that the water of one State should come from another State? Now, Sir that is a very preposterous argument and, therefore, I think I have been able to demonstrate to this House that if there has been any modification in the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission, that has been all the time influenced by Bihar's interests or Bihar's demands or the effects upon Bihar Congress and it was not on any sound principle that any such modifications were made. It has been, as I stated already, to placate the Congress in Bihar and it has been done in the interests of the Congress, not in the interests of the country. I do not want to dilate on this matter any further, but I want to say two things in conclusion. One is that the claim that was made by the honourable Home Minister that the modifications that were made by the Joint Select Committee have been more acceptable to both the parties is absolutely untrue. It has not been acceptable to Bihar and certainly not to Bengal. It has not satisfied either party and there has been no sensible reason for the modifications made. Secondly, the honourable Home Minister stated that the chapter of transfer of territories should be treated as closed. I wish that could be so. That could have been so if we had been taking our decisions on right lines and on a national basis. Decisions which have been arrived at merely to

resolve differences within the Congress will never have a national character and will never satisfy the nation. Therefore, it is very unfortunate, Sir, that although a very good opportunity had presented itself before us for resolving our differences regarding the reorganisation of States on a sound and rational basis, because of the manner in which the Congress had acted, that opportunity has been lost. I do not know how many differences have been resolved but many more have been created, and I am afraid that reverberations will also continue in future.

SHRI T. BODRA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to submit to-day the Jharkhand Party's views on this Bill before us. I am an elected Member in this House from the Jharkhand Party, and as Purulia sub-division forms a part of the Chotanagpur Division—and even to the historians of the past the whole of the Chotanagpur Division and the States round about were known as Jharkhand—I feel and the Jharkhand Party feels also that a part of Purulia sub-division which is a part and parcel and integral part, of Jharkhand, is being given away to Bengal.

Before I come to the actual subject I cannot but make some special observations with regard to the mysterious and mystic solution of the problem of transfer of territories between Bengal and Bihar. Just on the eve of the visit of the States Reorganisation Commission, when the Members were expected at Patna aerodrome, there was a rumour two or three days earlier that the Chairman, Mr. Fazl Ali, was not coming. Then, Sir, when we went to receive the Members of the States Reorganisation Commission, we actually found that the Chairman was not there. We were told that he had suddenly fallen ill. Then, when the Commission went touring Purnea, Santhal Parganas, Purulia, Ranchi, Jamshedpur and other places, all of a sudden there was a rumour that it was a Boundary Commission and that they had come to find out as to which portions of the Purulia sub-division or of the Purnea district could be transferred to West Bengal. I was the last man to believe these rumours and I thought that this was the States Reorganisation Commission which had been entrusted with such a great and important work of finding out real and genuine administrative units and suggesting the reorganisation of States of

[Shri T. Bodra.]

India on that basis. But unfortunately, Sir, slowly and gradually I came to know that whatever rumours were afloat were all true. I still believe, Sir, that if the Chairman had been there—the Chairman, Mr. Fazl Ali is very well acquainted with Bihar and Orissa and also with Bengal; there were so many claims and counter-claims; for example, Orissa wanted some portions of Jharkhand Bengal wanted some portions of Jharkhand and Bihar also wanted some portions of Bengal and some portions of Madhya Pradesh—if Mr. Ali had been there, the decisions and the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission would have been absolutely different from what we find today.

Now, Sir, so far as the wishes of the people are concerned, I have already submitted to the House that the election results proved that only 1,66,306 voters for the Lok Sevak Sangh were willing to go to Bengal, whereas 3,15,212 people were against merger of this territory to West Bengal. Secondly Sir, when the Government of India sent this Bill and it was submitted before the Bihar Legislature, what did we find? They held a discussion over this Bill and, excepting six of the M.L.As. who belong to Purulia and who were elected on Lok Sevak Sangh tickets, all of them rejected this Bill. So, it was clear from the decision of the Bihar Legislative Assembly that the people of Bihar, even the people who are the inhabitants of those localities, the Jharkhand M.L.As., the Congress M.L.As., the Socialist M.L.As., all did not want this part of the territory to be transferred to Bengal. But very unfortunately, Sir, the wishes of the people of the very parts of the country which are going to be transferred to West Bengal and the wishes of the M.L.As. of Bihar were not respected by the Government of India.

Then we come to this plea of the Kasai river. I submitted the other day that we also have got river valley projects and also the Damodar Valley Project, and when the Damodar Valley project has been constructing the dams and has been taking up irrigation and flood control projects, this Kasai river area could have been given to the Damodar Valley Corporation, and I am sure that the Damodar Valley Corporation would have handled this problem very properly.

This portion Bengal needs because of the Kasai river and they want a catchment area. I do not think that is a valid ground for the transfer of this territory to West Bengal.

Then I come to the question of language. Again, I am shocked to find that when there is only 30·8 per cent. which is Bengali-speaking, the Government of India and Parliament are giving this part of the territory to West Bengal. Then, in regard to the administrative convenience what do we find? There had not been any riots, there had not been any lack of law and order in this part of the country. In past history there was not any sort of lawlessness that took place in Purulia sub-division, and it is wrong to say that there was no administrative convenience or that any such situation arose which the Government of Bihar was not able to control. If administrative convenience is the plea for the transfer of this territory to West Bengal, then I think only a small area should not have been given. If administrative convenience was the actual reason, the whole of the district of Manbhum or the whole of the Chotanagpur division could have been given to West Bengal. This small area never presented any sort of difficult administrative problems so far as I know.

So far as trade and commerce are concerned, on the north about 55 miles from Purulia you will find these Dhanbad and Jharia coalfields, and on the south at a distance of about 55 miles you have got the biggest steel town of Jamshedpur. All the trade and commerce of Purulia sub-division, specially those of the parts which are going to be transferred, are interlinked either with Dhanbad or with Jamshedpur. A parallel to this can be found in the fact that the trade and commerce of Gujarat and the trade and commerce of Maharashtra are interlinked with Bombay. So, if Jamshedpur is not being given to West Bengal, if Dhanbad is not being given to West Bengal, what is the necessity of transferring this small enclave to West Bengal? I do not understand how the economic conditions and other conditions of the local inhabitants of those places will ever improve if Jamshedpur is not given to West Bengal or Dhanbad is not given to West Bengal. A small portion of this territory which is going to be given to West Bengal will not serve any useful purpose in my humble opinion.

Next I come to the Constitution and the Welfare State. Who are the people inhabiting this part of the territory in Purulia sub-division which is going to be transferred to West Bengal? They are Kurmis, Santhals, Mundas, Bhumij, Bauris, Kumbars, Ahirs and Goalas, Bhuyas, Rajwars, Kalus, Kamars and Lohars. These are the persons belonging to the Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes and backward classes who are being transferred to West Bengal. The Bengali population there in the shape of lawyers or doctors are very very few. Now I would like to ask the honourable Home Minister whether Bengal wants this part of the country for its land or whether Bengal wants the people inhabiting that part of the country also. Well, Sir, if Bengal is in need of more and more land for rehabilitating and resettling the refugees, that cannot be done by making the local people a new set of refugees. I think Sir, if more and more land is given to West Bengal, then naturally the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes are going to be ousted from their holdings. And in that case you will be doing great injustice to all these people, for example, Kurmis, Santhals, Mundas, Bauris, Kumbars, Kamars, Lohars etc. I am of the opinion, Sir, that the refugees coming to West Bengal should not be rehabilitated at the cost of the lives of these Scheduled Caste people. That is my suggestion.

Now it appears to me, Sir, that the whole of this Jharkhand area has become a colony. It is just like Africa in which the British people must have their colony, in which the French people must have their colony, in which the German people must have their small colony, and so on and so forth. Orissa does not want the whole of Jharkhand. Orissa wants only some small areas. What for? Everything for the people. Similarly, Sir, Bengal does not want the whole of the area. It wants small pockets. They want only . . .

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): I am sorry, you are misrepresenting the whole thing.

SHRI T. BODRA: Similarly, Sir, Bihar does not want the whole of the Jharkhand area. It wants only small areas. Sir, I am asking one question, and that is this: Do they want to rehabilitate the refugees from Pakistan and make them thrive at the cost of these

tribal people? Sir, the Manbhum District formed part of Bihar since 1912, and no one can complain that the administration there has not been carried on properly. There have been no difficulties in the matter of maintaining law and order. How the transfer of this territory is going to give better results, is a thing which I fail to understand.

Sir, even under the Constitution, the tribal people are entitled to justice, social, economic and political, liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship, equality of status and of opportunity. The Constitution is intended to promote among them all fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation. This is what everybody—even an ordinary citizen—is entitled to under our Constitution, Sir.

But what is actually happening? The real problems of the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and the Backward Classes are not being considered at all. What is considered is, which portion should go to West Bengal, which portion should go to Orissa, which portion should go to Madhya Pradesh? I submit, Sir, that if the whole area had been put into one State, things would have been better. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, I will take only five minutes more and finish.

If I may be allowed to quote some figures, Sir, in Bihar we are 40,49,183; in Orissa, we are 29,67,334; in Madhya Pradesh, we are 24,77,024; and in West Bengal, we are 11,65,337

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: May I know, whom does this 'we' represent?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Scheduled Caste people, the Jharkhand people. Anyway, I think that is foreign to this debate. We are not considering the Scheduled Castes report.

SHRI T. BODRA: Sir, I mention all these things in order to show what amount of injustice has been done to these people.

Sir, in Bihar, we have got 33 reserved seats. In Orissa, we have got 28 reserved seats. In Madhya Pradesh, we have got 27 reserved seats. In West Bengal, we have got only 11. If we people in Bihar having 33 seats had been merged with the people of Orissa who have got 28 seats, we would have been far happier than what we are, because 33 plus 28 would have

[Shri T. Bodra]

given us 61 seats in a House of 140. Although we would not have been in the majority in that House of 140, with 61 seats, we could have been at least an effective minority, and we could have well represented the cause of our own people and we could have worked for their uplift and improvement. Sir, I still fail to understand why this portion of Manbhum District, which is part and parcel of Jharkhand, is being taken away to West Bengal.

Now, Sir, lastly I submit that the legitimate claims of the people of this particular part of the Purulia sub-division have not been considered. They are quite unwilling to go to West Bengal, and yet the Government of India is compelling them to go to West Bengal. I do not understand why this decision is being taken, because it will be very detrimental to the welfare of the local inhabitants of that part of the country which is going to be transferred. In my opinion, Sir, it is not yet very late for the Government to take courage in both hands and withdraw this Bill thus maintaining the *status quo* with regard to Bihar and West Bengal. If that is not possible, then let the Government of India grant Jharkhand, and let Bihar and West Bengal fight with each other then.

Thank you Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this occasion gives us an opportunity of settling the outstanding problems between the two important States in the eastern part of India, namely, West Bengal and Bihar.

Ever since Bihar was separated by the conjoint efforts of the Congress leaders of Bihar and Bengal from Bengal, and was constituted a separate province together with Orissa in 1912, this demand for the readjustment or the redrawing of boundaries on the basis of language between these two States has been outstanding. It would be a matter of gratification for us today to recall the statements made by eminent Bihari leaders of the time, Shri Sachidananda Sinha and Shri Parmeshwar Lal and others, in which they said that the Bengali-speaking areas, which had been separated along with Bihar from Bengal, should be restored to Bengal. It was a pronouncement of wisdom, statesmanship and courage, and through this pronouncement we heard the voice of democratic Bihar.

Sir, I am not one of those who seek to take credit for patriotism. I know the glorious part the people of Bihar have played in the struggle for liberation. They deserve the deepest sympathies and the most profound salutations from the people of West Bengal. The history of the people of Bengal and Bihar is one of common struggle by the two peoples against the common enemy. Even today, despite all the troubles and passions which the Congress leadership, because of its bungling, because of its callousness, has created in the country, we find that the Bihari and the Bengali workers are fighting commonly in the factories of Calcutta as in the factories of Jamshedpur. Who says that the people are disunited? Who says that they are fighting each other? The friendship of the people of Bihar and Bengal has been continuously going on in the field of struggle which they had been waging all these years. It is only the leadership at the top, because of their narrow politics, because of their game of power politics, because of their game of placating now this group and then another group, that is trying to create mistrust and misgivings in the minds of some sections of the people in order to advance their narrow political interests by rousing feelings between certain parts of the two States. For this I hold the Congress Party entirely responsible. If today there is some ill-feeling in our public life, it is the Congress Party which is causing it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have been fighting for the linguistic reorganisation of States all these years but now I find an hon. Member sitting there who claims to have been in the Congress Party for as long as my entire life but who forgets that the Congress passed resolution after resolution in support of the linguistic reorganisation of States. Perhaps he had been a little too long in the Congress to remember those resolutions. I would welcome him to come here to this side and refresh his memory about those resolutions that had been passed by the Congress Party. Here in the report of the States Reorganisation Commission itself it has been stated:

"The Congress election manifesto of 1945-46, which assured the people that provinces would be constituted on a linguistic and cultural basis . . ."

Then earlier in the same document it is stated:

"The Indian National Congress lent indirect support to the linguistic principle as early as 1905 when it backed the demand for annulling the partition of Bengal . . .

Again:

"It was at its 1920 session at Nagpur that the Congress accepted the linguistic redistribution of provinces as a clear political objective and in the following year the principle was adopted for the purpose of its own organisation."

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): I submit that a manifesto is not a resolution.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: All the same, let us congratulate Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for quoting this scripture.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If hon. Members think that the Congress has not passed such resolutions, they may take this up with the Member of the Commission who is from the U.P.

Again, we have been told about the Nehru Committee of the All Parties Conference, 1928. That Committee said:

"If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area difficulties will continually arise and the media of instruction and work will be two or even more languages. Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language as a rule corresponds with a special variety of culture, of traditions and literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the general progress of the province."

May I tell the gentlemen of Uttar Pradesh that this fell from the pen of Pandit Motilal Nehru and the other members of the Nehru Committee? Has anybody forgotten this? His son of all people may have forgotten it, but I may tell you that the people of India do stand by that principle, cherish this principle and that is why we have today the reorganisation of States on the linguistic basis except for two cases. Now, that has been the Congress position. Since that time, the Biharis and Bengalis have been trying to solve this problem, to settle this problem in a friendly, amicable and brotherly manner. Since

that time 44 years have passed. Did we quarrel? Did we fight with each other and create troubles and riots? Nothing of the sort. There is a long history, glorious history of a common struggle and friendship and fraternal relations. That is the story of these people. Does that show that they are fighting with each other? This is only adding insult to injury. That is all that I can say. Naturally, thirsting for power, the Congress changed its policy. The J. V. P. Committee observed that "no question of the rectification of boundaries in the provinces of Northern India should be raised at the present moment, whatever the merits of such a proposal might be." What does this mean? The merit of the proposals was something which these gentlemen could not deny, but they in their wisdom thought that such questions should not be raised. They wanted to shelve the issue as they have shelved all other issues. Now, naturally the people of Bihar and the people of Bengal and also the people of the other States did not submit to this, and a Commission was appointed as a result of popular passion. That demand became irresistible. What compelled the Government to appoint a States Reorganisation Commission was the demand for the rectification of boundaries, wherever such a rectification was necessary, on the basis of language, and that is how the Commission came into the field. Let us read that portion of the report which deals with the West Bengal-Bihar problem. Here the Commission states that 'the readjustment of West Bengal's borders has now become a major problem.' That is to say, even in the opinion of the Commission this question of readjustment of boundaries between Bihar and Bengal should not be regarded as anything but a major problem. But was the Commission addressing itself to the solution of this major problem? Did the Commission rise to the occasion and try to solve this problem? There, the Commission miserably failed. It generally accepted the linguistic principle, but when it came to the question of Bengal-Bihar boundary, it threw overboard that principle of language and culture and proceeded to judge the whole matter with a different outlook and on the basis of certain extraneous considerations. Naturally they landed themselves in troubles and found no solution to the problem. This is the most regrettable part of the whole thing. These three gentlemen of the Commission could have really tried to recommend a proper solution for this. Had

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
 they tried to do so, they could have found from the history, from the traditions, from the struggle of the people that the only solution to this problem was the solution of the redrawing of the boundaries on the basis of language and culture. Did they do it? Why I ask. I put that question. The hon. Member is not here. I would give the answer. The Congress Party became the sole concern for them. They received memoranda from other parties. They only listened to the ruling party. Besides the Congress there exist other political parties, mass organisations, representing the majority of the people, and it was the duty of the Commission to have listened to their points, their advocacy, to their argumentations and to their logic. But the Commission brushed aside their arguments and proceeded to settle the matter in the pattern in which the Government wanted it to be settled for them. Now you have got the recommendations. What happened? It satisfied none. It fomented certain people, it created on the one hand a great dissatisfaction in Bengal. On the other hand it provided certain opportunities and arguments and gave some handle to the ruling elements in the Bihar Congress leadership to malign Bengal, to raise the passions of the people and to mislead the people. It is a story of shame which I would not recall here, as to how the Bihar Congress leaders at the top misguided the great patriotism of the Bihari people. Those that followed the Congress did this. That sordid story, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am ashamed to recall in this House. What I find in Bengal is also a story of no less shame. You heard the speech from a Congress Member speaking from that side. The more I heard him, the more I felt that he was just assassinating a good cause in this way. Our claim has never been on the basis of language. It has never been on the basis of some territory which we wanted to grab from some people for solving some of our economic problems. Since when did we say this thing? I say 'Your Congress Party did it'. He was echoing the views of the Congress. I tell you that as far as our Party is concerned, all that we stated before the Commission and repeat here in this House is that we wanted a reorganisation of the boundary on the basis of language because we felt that that would help the progress of the country and yet at the same time, would strengthen the fraternal bonds that exist-

ed between our Bihari brethren and the Bengali people. That is how we viewed the matter. For the solution of this refugee problem, we don't want anybody's territories. Refugees will have to fight a battle in their own land and a solution has to be found. If anything comes in the way of the solution of the refugee problem in the West Bengal, I tell you very frankly in this House, that it is the policy of the Congress Government, it is their bungling, it is their lack of human qualities which are coming in the way. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, never will I turn to the land of Bihar and covet an inch of territory from them to solve the problem of the refugees. We know how to fight shoulder to shoulder with the refugees, with the goodwill of our Bihari friends for finding a solution to this problem on the soil of Bengal as it exists today. I know that should we require any help for solving the human problems, our Bihari patriots will not be grudging to give their hand of assistance in this matter. In that I have full confidence.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, they raised all other questions of catchment areas etc. Dr. Roy put our case into disrepute by raising this. We are told about unity of the country by the Congress. The Prime Minister is very much fond of reminding us of the great unity of Congress leadership. But how is it that these gentlemen in the Congress Working Committee, these two Chief Ministers could not settle this simple problem but they started recriminating against each other publicly, flinging accusations against each other in a manner which would put to shame even the people who get into scabbles, or get into a kind of bout in a bazaar or market place? Don't you know this? I appeal to the hon. Members on that side to read those speeches delivered by these Congress Chief Ministers in these two States. They vied with each other in running down each other, and running down the Congressmen in the other State. This is how they behaved all through. They had created all this bungling. I don't hold any brief for the Bengal Congress case because Dr. B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, ruined the case of Bengal. First he became a very great champion of the Bengali cause—a sort of *Prima donna* in the field, upholding the cause of Bengal claiming all types of territories. Sir N. N. Sarkar claimed 16,000 square miles. The West Bengal Congress preferred a claim for over 14,000 square

miles. The West Bengal Government claimed 11,840 square miles. You can easily understand that if for the same claim with regard to the same case, three lawyers get up or one lawyer appearing in three cases, gets up and puts up three types of claims, how the case is ruined in a court of law. These gentlemen, by putting forth tall, irresponsible and inconsistent claims ruined the case of Bengal and created the impression as if Bengal was a land-grabber. The Bengali people never shared their sentiment. We stood by the principles for which they stood. They required the readjustment of the boundary not because they meant any ill-will to the Bihari people but wanted to settle their houses and re-fashion their house in new conditions in a proper democratic way and thereby build new bridges of friendship with the Bihari people. This is what they wanted. But these gentlemen, by putting these claims have ruined the case of Bengal. What was the reaction in Bihar, I ask my Bihari friends? Dr. Sinha got up in the Bihar Assembly and said: "Not an inch of territory should be transferred and it was most unfortunate that a Linguistic Commission was going to be appointed for this purpose". This, he said even before the Commission was appointed. Then there was a little person called Mr. Devendra Mahato, who said: "Not an inch of territory would be transferred", at a public meeting. Posters were issued by them saying that blood shall flow if an inch of territory was transferred. That is how they reacted to certain demands. They took advantage of the irresponsible case of the Bengal Congress leaders in order to raise passions of the Bihari people and thereby to pose themselves as if they were the saviours of their States. That is how they behaved.

Then again similar speeches were made in Bengal. I can tell you, I have heard Mr. Atulya Ghosh—I don't remember the name of that gentleman, the President of the Bengal Congress Committee—accused the Bihar Congress in a public statement and said that they were using professional dancers in order to instigate the people, get audience and demonstrate against. They were distributing wines in order to get the people to protest against the proposals or the suggestions of the Linguistic Commission. In Bengal, of course, Mr. Ghosh is not a very small person. He said, 'I will march to Bihar.' Where is he now? Where is he marching? He voted like a

sheep in the Lobby, in the House and did not even have the courage to stand by the demands that they had themselves made, when it fell to the lot of the Opposition to uphold them, which Mr. Deputy Chairman, will have demonstrated before the country and brought out their cowardice. Then it was left to the Government of India. It was possible for your Government Mr. Datar, if I may address him through you, Sir, to change or modify this report in a manner that would help the solution of the problem. What did they do? In some corner,—I don't know perhaps in this great parlour of the rulers of the Congress Government,—discussions took place. Nobody knows what happened. Then we found a modification appearing in the press saying that certain other thanas were proposed to be retained in Bihar although the Commission had recommended their transfer to Bengal. I refer to the Patamda and Chandil thanas in the Purulia Sub-division. Dr. Roy agreed to this surrender. I don't know how. It is not as if Dr. Roy opposed it, and Mr. Ranga was quite right when he said that he did agree. He made a secret deal and capitulated to the Congress High Command because of the opposition there. It was an utter shame for Bengal that he should have done that but did he thereby win the heart of Dr. Sinha? It was not a malleable commodity. It could not be so easily won. Dr. Sinha went there and said that if any portion was to be transferred to Bengal, he would offer his resignation and it was commonly said that he was moving about with a resignation letter in his pocket to the right and to the left, to the gentlemen of the Congress High Command or some other people who were liable to such threats and said that he would resign if an inch of territory was transferred. (Interruptions.) We know that the son in Bihar, the Field Marshal of Bihar gentlemen follow that hefty per-Bihar, who was following a line of his own and the Government wanted to capitulate to him. It is good as far as they are concerned. Reason was there on their side to a great extent. Anyway, why was this heroic necessary? The only thing they created was ill-feeling in the country.

And now for the modification. You have to give an explanation to this House as to why Chandil and Patamda police stations were excluded from Purulia I want an explanation from the Government. Dr. B. C. Roy has given his explanation and that was that the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Tatas wanted it. Well, are the Tatas the Parliament in this country? Are the people of the Legislative Assembly of West Bengal there to treat his orders as final? Are we to accept the orders of the Tatas as final? Who are these people? Are the Tatas ruling our country? Are they our masters that we must submit to them? And yet Dr. Roy thought that he was trying to absolve himself of the responsibility when he referred to it and said that this was because of the Tatas and that the High Command had forced him to do so. Well, we were told that Dr. B. C. Roy was a tough person, a good match for at least Govind Ballabh Pant, if not for Jawaharlal Nehru. How is it that he has surrendered in cowering fear of the High Command, I would like to know. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the whole story is nauseating, it is a story of surrender, of capitulation, double book-keeping and betrayal of the cause of the people. Now, I do not know Shri Sri Krishna Sinha. But they say the Krishna of old could easily be won over, but not so this Sri Krishna. He could not be easily won over. He did not even dally. He stuck to his guns and said nothing should be transferred. Dr. Roy was in trouble. The two could not meet. They could not even meet together. They could not sit together, not even look at each other's face. I asked Dr. Roy once whether he had not to yield to Shri Sri Krishna Sinha. He could not say "No" to that, and then he said certain things not very complimentary to Shri Sri Krishna Sinha. This I asked him in Rashtrapati Bhavan at the banquet given in honour of Mr. Krushchev by the Prime Minister.

And then suddenly came the merger proposal out of the blue. All of a sudden it came and nobody knew about it. We were all startled by the news. How could two such men bring themselves to agree to this merger proposal? Would it be the solution of the problem? Mr. Deputy Chairman, take the merger proposal. The Congress modified this thing and then suddenly within a few days the merger proposal came. They say that West Bengal to a man protested against the modification. In the general strike of the 21st of January, they saw that this was not going down this time. So another conspiracy was on and the merger proposal was created and placed before the country in a most insulting

and humiliating manner. Mr. Deputy Chairman, then immediately got up gentlemen of the Congress Working Committee to welcome it as a sign of wisdom and foresight and there also got up the Prime Minister of India to say that it was a great lead to the country. And of course, in the Amritsar session of the Congress, there got up our great Home Minister to say: "I am no astrologer, but the merger of Bihar and Bengal is coming and I am sure it will come through." Well, at least on one occasion he has been proved a false prophet.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken half an hour, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will take a little more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish soon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: "Soon" is a very elastic term.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, if I go on then it will be finished.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take five minutes and finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will not be able to finish in five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are others to speak. I want to call the Minister at 5-30 P.M. and there are three more speakers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you call him before I finish, I will protest. I am speaking for the Opposition from Bengal where the merger proposal . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But you have taken half an hour. You may take another five minutes and finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will not be able to finish in five minutes. And if that is your ruling, I will walk out.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you can take ten minutes and finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is this? It is like Dr. Roy and Shri Krishna Sinha . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you will cooperate. Take ten minutes and finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Ten or fifteen minutes does not matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not more than ten minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me proceed. Then out of this merger proposal, we know what came. This was no solution which the people could accept. Twelve thousand people went to jail and it was proved that the might of the Congress rulers was not everything. On the 23rd of February, I said in this House that this merger proposal will be buried ten feet deep when the other gentlemen in the other House sitting on the Treasury Bench were telling the country that it will go through. Today, I can claim, with all respect to the powers of prediction of my hon. friends, that what I said has been proved right and they proved wrong. And that is not because I have greater foresight or anything of that sort. It is just because I had confidence in our people and they had lost their confidence in the people.

Sir, this was no solution. Twelve thousand people went to jail against the merger proposal and all this time was wasted. The Congress leaders could not come together and in consultation with everybody and mutually find a solution on the basis of language. Hon. Members sitting on the Treasury Benches behaved as if they were dealing with a certain endowment. They acted as if we had no interest whatsoever. The country is not your private property. It is not the property of any particular party. You cannot gamble with the fate of the people of Bihar and Bengal in your parlours as if they were no concern of others. And so they failed. It was bankruptcy all through. The only thing they were concerned about was how to keep the Congress house in order. How the people of Bengal felt or how the people of Bihar felt was no concern of theirs. How the followers of Shri Sri Krishna Sinha and the camp followers of Dr. Roy could be got together in the band wagon of the Congress ready for the elections, was their only concern. And they failed in this. Now, the Government could easily have improved the position if they had any statesmanship and if they had acted with confidence in the people, having regard to the wishes and desires of the people. And we could have helped the Government in finding a solution. Was it not possible for Congressmen, the Communists,

the Praja Socialists and their leaders to come together and come to common agreement and appeal to the people of Bihar and Bengal to accept a solution? Did you try such a thing? No. You did no such thing. You treated it as one-party matter, as a one-party business and you thought that a one-party solution would be acceptable to the people. So you failed to solve the problem. Not only that, you complicated the situation to our great sorrow and this is your record.

The Congress Government, of course, dances to the tune of the Congress Working Committee. Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is how they failed.

* * * *

Even now, they had an opportunity when things were being re-discussed but they did not do anything. Therefore, my whole accusation is against the Congress Party and the Congress Party discharge the responsibility in this manner because they sort of view this as a domestic matter of the party. They do not view it from the broader national angle. They do not consider the people of the States whose sympathies or whose expressions should have been taken into account. They, of course, did not take into account all these. We were also there in order to deepen and strengthen the fraternal bonds between the Bengali and the Bihari people and extend our full support to them in finding out a just and democratic solution of the problem. I would now make an appeal to my Bihari friends. I can quite understand that when certain territories are being transferred they may feel a little hurt. I can quite understand their sentiment, their feeling, etc. I respect that sentiment and that feeling but I would tell them that they themselves had, at one time, felt that it would not be good for them to remain in Bengal; they felt that for their own development and for their language to develop, they should have a big State and a big area to live in. When other people were in dispute, you were good enough, great enough to say that such areas should be given back but when it is within your power to redeem that debt, to translate into action what you have been preaching, to give expression to it in flesh and blood,—the noble sentiments that you expressed—is it not your duty to rise to the occasion and prove what great heritage

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

and tradition that our Bihari people have got? I implore upon you to consider it from that angle. I tell you that if any part of Bihar comes to Bengal, as some parts are going to come, the people there are coming as brothers. They shall bring with them all that is best in them and that best will mingle with all that is best in Bengal and, between them, they shall lead a life of happiness and peace. If anything goes wrong there, we shall be the champions for them. I have not the least doubt in my mind that whatever misgivings had been in the minds of the Bihari friends will be removed by the kind and fraternal attention given to them. Let there be no doubt about it.

I wish that the issue had been closed today but the Congress is keeping it alive and that is my regret. Dr. Bidhan Roy himself uses words like these that this is the first instalment. That being so, even the Bihari Congress leaders have not submitted to this thing; it will be so. Where is the solution then? You will ask me a question and I say that the solution is there. Consider it not today but tomorrow or even the day after, in your coolness and when you think it should be considered but do consider it. Return to the linguistic principle. I say that the whole of Purulia sub-division should go to West Bengal. Then, the Bengali speaking areas contiguous to Bengal in Dhanbad district, Dhalbhum sub-division in Santal Parganas and also in Kishanganj, if there are any, should be transferred to West Bengal. The name of Bihar will be greater still if they accept this principle and I know that thereby they will be making a positive and constructive contribution to the good neighbourly relations that already exist between our two States. (*Time bell rings.*) We feel that such a solution will be lasting. We have suggested in one of our amendments that a boundary commission should be appointed to go into that. In the debates of the Bengal Assembly, if you go through the speeches of the Communist Members, you will find that we have never made any tall claims. Wherever we can make out a definite claim on the basis of language and culture, we had made that; otherwise, we have asked for the matter to be left to the boundary commission for a happy and amicable solution through mutual consultation and understanding between the Bihari and the Bengali people. Have we been wrong?

Have we been unjust? Have we not taken into account the feelings? Are we so unpatriotic that we would not give due attention to your feelings and to your sentiments? Therefore, I say, leave it at that. I think Government should accept this proposal. This is one way in which you can solve the problem in future. A boundary commission should not frighten us; we want the boundary commission to be given a specific job of drawing the boundary on the basis of language. My words may be whispers, Sir, but I have the privilege of representing a powerful movement in Bengal. I do not claim to be a representative of a political party only, I also consider myself to be speaking on behalf of the Communist Party of Bihar which, throughout had been supporting the linguistic reorganisation of States and the re-drawing of boundaries on the same basis. You will be happy to hear that right from the very beginning of this question, the Bihar Communist Party and the Bengal Communist Party moved together, issued joint statements and spoke in one voice. Today, I say, that if we, the Bihar and the Bengal Communist Parties, could find a solution, it was not because we were something exceptional but because we held steadfast to the national heritage and the traditions of our country . . . (*Time bell rings.*) . . . and thereby found a solution. I feel that the same way is open to the Congress Members to take. In this matter, let us all meet and try to arrive at a solution for this problem, a problem that has to be solved. Biharis and Bengalis have been living in the best of friendship and they will continue to do so. Today, if you bring them together closely, India will profit by it and they will profit by it and it will all be to the glory of our country that everyone concerned in this matter will be profited by such a settlement. Therefore, Sir, I would request the Government to accept this thing as a national solution, a solution which is in the interests not only of Bihar and Bengal but also in the interests of the unity of our country and for the future of our great place.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shah Mohamad Umair. Just fifteen minutes.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: I am prepared to abide by your request. I will not copy. I assure you, my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. I want to see that the discipline and integrity of this House is maintained.

(Interruption.)

How can I speak loudly? The mike is there and I am here. What to do? I will not copy my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Sir, in taking that much time or this much time according to one's wishes. I am taking this much time also because I have to express that I don't feel very comfortable and very happy that in this august House we Members should take our stand in giving our own reasons and arguments when the Chair has given its ruling. I regret that this incident should have happened.

Now, Sir, I did not feel encouraged to speak on this Bill—I came to this House after lunch; there was no lunch hour at that time at two o'clock—I did not feel encouraged to speak on this Bill. I do not feel encouraged even now because of various reasons. On the one hand I see, Sir, that my friends from Bengal, are bent upon demanding a pound of flesh from Bihar.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Without bloodshed.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: But the flesh of Bihar contains blood. At the same time it is my surprise and regret Sir, that my Central Government is also a bit more courteous to accommodate my Bengali friends at the cost of the Bihar people.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: "My Government?"

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: It is my Government as well as yours. This is the case and it is that encouragement which has given you so much strength. It is my Government as well as your Government so long as you are here, so long as you are taking part in the democratic set up.

Sir, I do not want to quote figures and data in relation to the arguments in the debates which have taken place in connection with this Bill because I consider it futile. I don't want that I should take your time, Sir, and the valuable time of this House in quoting data, in quoting figures, in quoting certain descriptions of this place and that place, this river and that river. These are immaterial to me. Personally I feel, Sir, and if I would have been in a position to have my way I would have suggested to the Government that there is only one way out for the solution of this problem and that solution

is only the revival of the merger proposal which had died out now at the cost of Bihar and at the hands of Bengal. I still feel that if the Bengal-Bihar merger had taken place, very many problems of this country, which are going on today, would have been solved in the wake of this proposal of merger. I do not know what happened overnight and one fine morning or one very cloudy night, we heard that Dr. B. C. Roy had decided that no merger proposal would be any further entertained.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE: That morning was really fine.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Yes. I tell you that a fine morning will come which you cannot avoid. Either today or tomorrow that fine morning is bound to come and you will not fight me out, Mr. Banerjee, when I quote Dr. B. C. Roy himself when he says, "Even in the case of merger about which I have heard so much, I do still believe that the only solution for the problems of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa is the merger of the States." He himself says like this in his own speech. He does not stop there. He further says, "I still believe that. Only the time is not yet opportune. I am one of those optimists who can wait and watch events. I am very hopeful that the time will come when not I alone but all other members of the other States will ask for unity because without unity you cannot go ahead; nobody can go ahead. Disunity is the root of all evils." Therefore Dr. Roy himself is feeling that the time will come when the merger proposal will be revived. Some of my friends may not like it, but the practical theory and the practical solution is only this. Because I hold this view I do not want that I should quote various data and various details about lands and rivers and about this border and that border lines. It would have been quite legitimate if I quoted them to show that the taking away of those lands and those portions from Bihar has got no justification. So much has been said about language; so much has been said about administrative facilities, but may I ask you: Is there any reference in that Commission's Report upon which all these people harp, who want to take away something from Bihar State? There is not a word in the Report of the Commission that that part of Purnea has got any linguistic affinity with the people of Bengal. You say that

[Shah Mohamad Umailr.]

they have got affinity. Some of my friends have gone even so far as to say that the Muslims were extra loyal to the British and that because of this Bengal and Bihar were divided. Yes, there were a set of Muslims who made all this sort of bunglings and troubles. Let me tell my friends I hang down my head and while I say this I cannot do without hanging down my head in shame that in the time of the Britishers there were a set of Muslims, there were some Muslims who were not only loyal to the Britishers but who were out to divide this country, who were out to create a separate land. I don't hesitate to tell you that those Muslims were there, but those Muslims are now no longer here in this land. Let me tell you about those Muslims about whom my friend referred. They were under the banner of the Muslim League. They were under foreign domination. They propounded the two-nation theory and they demanded a different State and they were successful in getting a different homeland in the name of Pakistan. May I ask my friend: Are we today under British rule? Are we today under the British banner, but I see that that voice comes now from Bengal, as demand from Bengal. This shameful demand now comes from that great land, which has got its great hostoriac past. From that part of Bengal the voice comes, that Bengal and the Bengali people are a separate nation. This is what Dr. Ranendra Nath Sen said in his speech in Bengal Assembly. He is a Member of the Bengal Legislative Assembly. You hear what he says today and he says this when the country is free, when there is our own rule. At least you must admit that this is not good. You may say there is Congress rule and therefore it is not everybody's rule according to you but this much you will have to admit that it is not British rule and we are outside the British regime. Now when the country is independent, my friend Dr. Ranendra Nath Sen says, "**** But even after so much struggle, after so many movements, although the demand of the Bengali nation has been put clearly before the whole of India" etc. Now I say, Sir, if the people of every State and every part of the country are going to demand a separate nationhood for themselves what remains, what remains of the country which we have to pilot and which we have to take further on unitedly. It is not only this. He has

repeated this voice of Bengali nationhood at the end of his speech . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I explain, Sir, the words 'Bengali nation'?

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: When he was speaking, I did not interrupt.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: On a point of order, he is reading from a speech which was delivered in Bengali and translated into English. In Bengali the speaker said 'Bengal jati' and it has been translated into English as 'Bengali nation'. It is not the same thing.

(*Interruption.*)

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Whatever it may be in the Bengali language, all the expressions come from him. So, I say whatever the Muslims did in 1940 or 1941 was under the British banner, under the two-nation theory, under the banner of the Muslim League. That was a quite different thing and one like myself hangs down his head when he refers to that event. But what about that great Bengali nation as they call themselves, about that great Bengali people who still have got that historical greatness? I myself am proud of my Hindu friends Bengali friends; but at the same time to speak in terms of 'nation' is not doing the same thing, what the Muslim League did some time back. It is introducing the same theory—as my Bengali friends are now thinking—in terms of separate nationhood.

(*Interruption.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Muslims are in the whole of Indian nation. When we talk of Gujarati *jati* or Bengali *jati* that is different.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: It is all right.

(*Interruption.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: I am not going to that point for want of time. Please help me. You will have your

turn. Why do you disturb me? This is the blessing of that linguistic principle. I agree with you to this extent, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, that some time back the Congress also adopted this principle, but then Bengal also was behind it. It was because of Bengal that the linguistic principle was adopted. But that principle was not intended to be enforced so rigidly after independence. That was intended as a strategic thing when that was agreed upon by the Congress. But it was intended to be enforced according to time. Now, in this reorganisation of States how are you going to enforce it? You want every bit of your Bengali-speaking area to be combined together. In a way that 'Bengali nation' will grow more and more strong, so that it will become a separate nation. What the Muslim League did some time back, you may succeed in doing some time after. With all this I admit that this is not your fault alone. I also say that the States Reorganisation Commission's report is not less responsible for inculcating this sort of ulterior spirit behind all these sorts of demand and separate mentality which is being displayed today in different parts of the country and in you. I hold that the States Reorganisation Commission's report is responsible for bringing these curses. Now, our country is going to have all the States on a linguistic basis except here and there except in Maharashtra, in Gujarat. And now you are also trying to coerce Bihar and Bihari people on the question of a small strip of land. With all these things, I cannot say, that the States Reorganisation Commission report has brought any blessings with it for the country except curses. These are the curses from which we are suffering today under the terms and under the recommendations of that report. But you will excuse me, my Bengali friends, that you are not keeping up your greatness which you have proved historically. The genuine friendship between Bihar and Bengal was there and which is still there will be spoiled.

(*Time bell rings.*)

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: You will see after the area is transferred.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, you please deduct that time which my friends from Bengal have taken away.

(*Interruptions.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: What to say except this that even today I feel that that Bengal which produced so many great men—like C. R. Das, Netaji, Lal Mohan Ghose, Abdul Rasul, and even Surendranath Banerjee—you may condemn him but he was the first man who showed the way to patriotism, real nationalism to the country—they would not have allowed such things. But to that great Bengal which produced so many great men, I ask my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, what has happened leading to the present position today. The present position of Bengal and Bihar would have been quite different if they were living. They would not have allowed this sort of a small, petty question to stand between the relations—between the brotherly bond—of Bihar and Bengal . . .

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: We would have got some more territory.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: You want only territory. That is your aim. You are not out for developing national relations and cordiality between people and people. What is this territory? Sometimes you make that demand for strategic purposes. Was it justified for the Reorganisation Commission which reported to the Government that for administrative purposes you require certain areas from Purnea including that national highway? All the same those administrative problems and administrative convenience were ignored and were denied in the case of Bihar. (*Time bell rings.*) With all these things, you will find that it is the States Reorganisation Commission's report which gave you so much latitude that now you are thinking you should get more and more territories. I have got no time to quote. But I can quote from the speech of Dr. Roy in which he has said that this is the first instalment from Bihar.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji. Please close at 5-30.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May I make a submission? It is most unfair of you not to allow a group to speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What am I to do?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: It is for you to regulate and control . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am calling the . . .

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am recording my protest at such kind of discrimination . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: And this is most unfair of you.

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have already taken five hours and there are only six hours allotted. There will be only one hour left.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: We have taken six hours by sitting longer hours. It is not that we have . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are expected to sit long hours till the end of this month.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If we had, we would have finished at five today. It is only a question of half an hour. If you give that, the hon. Minister can reply tomorrow. We can extend the sitting. We can sit through lunch for one hour and one hour more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But we will not be able to finish all speeches within half an hour . . .

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is for the Chair to regulate the debate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am trying my best to regulate and I expect some co-operation from your side.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, you are not co-operating with us.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I hope you can ask the hon. Minister to reply tomorrow . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (To Shri Datar) Can you reply tomorrow?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I have no objection, Sir.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Mr. Mahanty might be allowed to speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahanty, you have made some allegation against the Chair. Please withdraw it.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It may be excused.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I have not . . .

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have been trying my best to accommodate all Members. I only gave first chance to Bengal and Bihar Members as they are mainly concerned.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: He is not alone. He is in good company with me. May I respectfully submit one thing, Sir, for your consideration?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have said "It is most unfair, you have not allowed a group to speak."

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May I make a submission? This morning I gave my name to the Chair. Still I maintain that it is unfair on the part of the Chair not to allow a group to participate in the debate. I am not going to withdraw it.

SHRI T. BODRA: You please withdraw those remarks, Mr. Mahanty.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am not going to withdraw.

SHRI T. BODRA: It does not befit the dignity of the House. I request him to withdraw.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I ask you in all humility, is it right to exclude a group from speaking?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not excluding any group. After all for this Bill the Bengal and Bihar Members must get accommodation. If there is time, Members from other States will get accommodation. I have been trying my best to save as much time as possible. The Members do not want to restrict their time and at the same time they want that everybody should speak. How am I to manage? The Business Advisory Committee's decisions are flouted. This is not the way. I expect that hon. Members will behave. I request you Mr. Mahanty, to withdraw that remark.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I meant no reflection to the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You said "it is most unfair on your part not to allow a group . . .". I have not excluded any group from speaking.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Our group has been practically excluded.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would expect you to withdraw that.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I meant no reflection, but it is a fact that the Democratic group which has 13 Members in this House in the opposition has been excluded from participating.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bodra has spoken and there is no other Member from Bihar or Bengal to speak. This is a Bill which concerns mainly Bengal and Bihar, and I must in all fairness give chance to them. I want to know whether you would withdraw your remark.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Before I withdraw, I would like to make a submission. This Bill may relate to Bengal and Bihar but it should not be suggested thereby that no other representatives of other States of India should have anything to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I did not mean that. I have said clearly that first Bengal and Bihar Members will get the chance and afterwards if there is time, then other Members will get a chance. In fact I have got seven or eight others. You are not the only person who has been excluded. I am really sorry, but I cannot help it. We have to stick to the time schedule and we have to show some preference to Members who come from Bengal and Bihar. Under the circumstances I expect you to withdraw those words.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I withdraw.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN (Uttar Pradesh): The hon. Member must apologise to the House. It is an insult to the dignity of the House. He must not only withdraw but he must apologise to the House. He has insulted the dignity of the House and it is his duty to apologise to the House. Your dignity is the dignity of the entire House and we are interested in maintaining it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: What I was humbly submitting for your serious consideration, if you feel like considering it, is whether you consider that the debate is full and proper when none from

any State outside Bengal and Bihar participates. The Bill primarily concerns them but perhaps Members from other parts of the country can take a more dispassionate view of things, and perhaps their suggestions and submissions may be of some use and value in bringing about and restoring good feelings between the people of these two States. I know, Sir, the time is short. But the question is more important. We may stick to the time, the debate might continue up to six; we might sit during lunch hour tomorrow and continue till six or seven. That is more important than merely sticking to the time. It is for your consideration whether Members from other States who are very anxious to speak on this Bill, to bring about closer and better relations between these two big States, can do so.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You know the Business Advisory Committee has allotted the time, and as far as possible we have to stick to it. It is a Committee of the House and if we do not respect the decisions of the Business Advisory Committee, it means that we do not respect the decisions of the House. We have to respect them. It is as much my duty as it is yours. As far as possible I have been trying to accommodate all parties. In fact on the other Bill, the States Reorganisation Bill, I have given chances to many speakers. Even the States which were not concerned, on which it had no effect at all—The States Reorganisation Bill had no effect on the U.P.—still five or six members from there had spoken. I am not excluding anybody. I have been trying my best to accommodate all members. If hon. Members still feel aggrieved, I am really sorry for it.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am not making any grievance of it. I appreciate that the hands of the chair are tied down by the decisions of the Business Advisory Committee. But the wishes of the House must override even the decisions of the Business Advisory Committee. If you in accordance with the wishes of the whole House extend the time, that would not be an insult to the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Of course the House is a sovereign body, but it does not mean that it should override all rules and regulations. It has imposed certain rules for its own procedure and we have to follow those

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

rules and I expect every Member to follow them. We have to stick to the time schedule. We have to stick to the recommendations of the Business Advisory Committee and we have to get through the business. Otherwise how can we conduct the proceedings? It is most painful that an elderly Member like you should also agree with Mr. Mahanty in his remarks that pained me most.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am very sorry to cause you any pain. It was in the larger interests of the country that I was making this appeal to you. I thought that in making the appeal with the qualifying words humbly and respectfully, I would not be accused of causing any pain to you. I am respectful to the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You made an earlier remark that you agree with Mr. Mahanty. That pained me most.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Never, never.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You said "I am also in his company".

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: When he said he was not called upon to speak, I said he was in good company with me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I misunderstood the thing. All right. Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): I feel some hesitation in having to take part in a debate which has been marked by some expression of feeling. In fact in the atmosphere that has been created I am reminded of the very great political principle laid down by Edmund Burke. In fact I feel constrained to violate a wholesome parliamentary convention which expects a Member of Parliament to represent the interests of the country as a whole and not the interests of a mere locality or a section. And perhaps considering the heat that has been created in this House I may just put before the House a very healthy political principle which was first formulated by Edmund Burke, and he has thus formulated it: "Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain as an agent and an

advocate against other agents and advocates. But Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation with one interest that of the whole, where not local purposes ought to guide but the general good of the nation as a whole." If I may go a little further in the presence of my lawyer friends, in a well known judgment of the Privy Council of England delivered by Lord Shaw in the case *Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants vs. Osbourne*—and I have got the reference to the law reports—the Judges cited this classical passage of Edmund Burke to hold that the principles of community representation can find no place in the body of English public law. Now, in that connection, Sir, I wish to say that I consider the problem of Bengal from the point of view of the whole of India. Pray, do not misunderstand that I am out here only to advance the claims of Bengal as a State against the interests of any other State. That is not my point. My point is this. Please consider dispassionately the conditions that have been created in Bengal under circumstances beyond the control of the Bengalees.

Bengal has suffered from three partitions in her recent history. The first partition of Bengal was made by Lord Curzon. For a political motive he wanted to suppress the rising spirit of nationalism in Bengal, and therefore he dismembered the whole race. He divided the Bengal people into two parts, so that the people may get weak and incapable of any kind of national resistance under the tyranny of the British rule. Therefore, Sir, the province Eastern Bengal and Assam was created, with the result that the entire people stood partitioned. It is not a question of territorial partition, but it is a fundamental question of cultural partition. And against that, Sir, you know how Bengal was moved in order that that partition might be annulled.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The whole of the country was moved, not Bengal alone.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Sir, I speak with considerable hesitation lest my friends there . . .

(Interruption.)

Now, sir, the first reply to that partition was given by a young man named Mr. Khudi Ram Bose on the sacred soil of Bihar, and Bengal is eternally

grateful to the enlightened Bihar Government for the way they have been able to immortalise the memory of that great patriot. Now that was not enough.

In 1911 came the second partition. The real motive of this partition was not the creation of the Province of Bihar, but the real motive was to safeguard the interests of the British rule. The British Government wanted to get out of the clutches of Calcutta as a centre of terrorism, and therefore they thought that they should remove the atmosphere of sedition and terrorism obtaining then. Now, Sir, in effecting the second partition, the Britishers had a far more ulterior motive, namely, to create Bengal somehow as a Muslim-majority Province. That was their main purpose. Let it be remembered here that they were not out to recognise the national sentiments of Orissa or of Bihar. Their real object was to create a Muslim-majority Province. It was the policy of 'divide and rule' that was at work. And therefore what happened was that the Bengali-speaking areas, which were organically parts of Bengal in her long history, were all tagged on to the new Province of Bihar and Assam. Let the hon. Members please dispassionately consider the historical facts as they are.

Sir, when this partition was effected, the great leaders of Bihar thought that by this partition justice was not being done to the truncated State of Bengal. I am simply placing before you certain historical facts which, I hope, will be above all controversy. The first step that the Indian National Congress took against these arrangements was that in December 1911, it was resolved at the Congress session that the Government should transfer the Bengali-speaking areas from Bihar to Bengal. And this particular resolution was proposed by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru—of saintly memory—whose son we are all very happy to welcome as a Member of this House. Now, after this, there was a regular statement, a considered statement, issued by all the leaders of Bihar on the basis of certain incontestable facts as they appeared to them in those days. In terms of that Congress resolution, they issued a statement where we have got listed all those Bengali-speaking areas which should be transferred to Bengal. Sir, at this stage I do not propose to enter into all sorts of details and rake up that controversial question. But the

fact of the matter is that that Congress resolution was sought to be implemented according to that most responsible and statesmanlike statement issued by those leaders in those days.

Then, Sir, I come to certain historical documents. In pursuance of the pledge that the King Emperor gave at the time of this partition to appoint a regular boundary commission to go into the whole question of these areas that are sought to be transferred from one State to another, the Government of India sent a despatch dated 25th August, 1911, and in that despatch also they clearly mentioned the list of the Bengali-speaking areas, not merely in Bihar, but also in Assam. You know all about that. (*Interruption.*) Please do not have any kind of feeling in regard to what I am saying in a most objective and scientific manner.

Sir, Bengal started with an initial area of 1,10,000 square miles and more. At each partition Bengal lost some of its territory with the result that at the time of that infamous Radcliffe Partition, Bengal was reduced to an area of 30,000 square miles. Fortunately the Bengali population of 6 crores still lives, although it is distributed among Pakistan and India. Still there is a loss of territory, and today, Bengal has been reduced from the status of a State possessing more than one lakh square miles of area to the status of the smallest State among the Part A States, namely, with a territory of 30,000 square miles. Now I wish to ask one question. For whom has this sacrifice of territory been inflicted upon Bengal, and for what purpose? It has been done for an all-India purpose, for the purpose of achieving for India her political freedom by compromising with the British Government. Bengal cheerfully paid the price for the liberty of India. She sacrificed herself at the altar of India's freedom. And there is the consequent moral obligation for the rest of India to stand by Bengal in her hour of distress. There is no question here of begging or sympathy, or anything else. Please have a clear idea of these facts. One individual and isolated State should not be made to suffer for the advantage of the whole of India. We are prepared to suffer and we are prepared to undergo any amount of suffering, but pray, give us some living space. And what was the consequence of this partition? The consequence was that this partition

[Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.]

created a sort of one-way traffic, for which the Government of India are yet unable to find a proper solution. It was left to the genius of Sardar Patel to say, 'Pakistan should remember that people must not come away empty-handed after being expelled from Pakistan. They must come with land.' His logic was very sensible, viz. this: That the Radcliffe partition as between East Pakistan and West Bengal was based on the existing population belonging to the two areas. But now, East Bengal has divested itself of the burden of maintaining that population, 50 lakhs of Hindus having been expelled from that State. The official figures estimate that it is between 35 and 40 lakhs, but unofficial figures make a higher estimate. I may tell you, friends in this House, because you represent the interest of the country as a whole, that this exodus of Hindus from East Pakistan will not end with 50 lakhs of people. I am afraid that the Hindus there will find the conditions not at all tolerable for a life of honour and self-respect, and therefore probably West Bengal may have to receive a much vaster population numbering about 1 crore at least. At least half the Hindu population of East Bengal would be expelled by the Islamic State of Pakistan.

This occasion is a most important one for the future of India. The map of India is being redrawn for ever, and therefore at this juncture I must voice the innermost feelings of the whole country, viz., that the time has arrived when you should have the principle of equality of States of the Indian Union. We stand for the principle of the equality of the sexes, the principle of social equality among the classes and the masses . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Do you want equality of seats for the States here?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: In this welfare State we should accept the principle of equality among the States that make up the Indian Union.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Let all States be as big as U.P.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Because you are satisfied you should not say, 'Let Bengal be contended with 30,000 sq. miles of territory, in

spite of its past history. Let them be victimised. We have got our freedom. Let Bengal be victimised.'

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Have it as big as U.P.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: If you really agree with me . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: I have not yet touched the fringe of the problem. If you agree with the principle of the equality among the States of the Union, pray consider the case of Bengal. I do not claim any area for Bengal. I want the Government to frame a synthetic and comprehensive scheme whereby there could be some element of equality as between the areas of all Part A States.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: What is your solution?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Solution? I leave the solution to the wise heads of the Ministers, Mr. Datar and others. They are full of solutions, but they have yet to apply them to the case of West Bengal.

My next point is this: There has been talk about accommodating these refugees in the other States of the Indian Union. We are all very grateful for this generous hospitality offered to the Bengali refugees in distress, but please remember that mere economic rehabilitation is not at all adequate for the problem of the hour. What is more important than the economic rehabilitation is the cultural rehabilitation of a cultured people, the Bengalis. If they have to settle in the wilderness of Travancore-Cochin, they are prepared to stay there, provided you send them at least as a colony of 5000 people, so that these 5000 colonists living together might carry with them their manners, customs, language and so forth.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: May I ask how the Punjabi refugees find it easy to accommodate themselves almost anywhere in India and why the Bengali refugees find it hard to accommodate themselves anywhere except in Bengal or territories adjacent to Bengal?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Because the Bengalis are proud of their language and literature which they

regard as their most precious spiritual possession which they must carry everywhere.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Will they forget it if they go elsewhere?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: I have already hinted that the sacrifices that we have undergone must be shared by the rest of India. Perhaps Bihar could give a push towards U.P., U.P. could give a push towards further west and so on, so that the Indian Union will be able to frame a comprehensive scheme at this great hour of our national history for a more equitable distribution of areas on the basis of equality of States.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahanty.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, I feel very grateful to you for having called upon me to speak at this late hour, but I regret to say that I have not the mood to speak. Therefore I may kindly be excused.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): In the debate on this Bill hon. Members have traversed the whole ground from 1905 about partitions and various other things. I cannot understand how all this is relevant. However eloquently we try to convince others that there was some agreement in 1912 that certain areas should be transferred, yet we must realise that in the last 44 years on account of the Bihar Government being there, people have migrated. It is quite possible that in 1912 in these border areas there were a large number of Bengali-speaking people, but during the last 44 years they have gone back to Bengal. When we are discussing this Bill, the problem we have to consider is whether from the administrative point of view certain areas should be transferred or not. Regarding the question of language, if it is to be done on the linguistic basis, in the northern part of Purnea it is an established fact that the percentage of Bengali-speaking people is only 3 to 5. If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta insists that it should be done by a boundary commission only on the basis of language, irrespective of any other consideration, I am afraid he will be the loser. Administratively it is important that these two parts of Bengal should be joined, especially when those two parts are separated by the intrusion of Pakistan. It has been pointed out that smuggling

is being carried on through this border into Pakistan. The goods are purchased in Bengal, transferred to Bihar and then carried into Pakistan. The Bihar Government does not know anything about it, because the goods have been purchased in West Bengal. The West Bengal Government cannot do anything because it is through Bihar territory that the whole thing is done. It is very essential that these two parts should be joined up, but the question is how much of it should be given, whether it should be a strip of five miles or whether it should be right up to the highway or it should be right up to the river Mechi and Mahananda. Hon. Members have quoted the S.R.C. report, and have pointed out that the mistake was committed on account of a wrong map. Leaving aside the linguistic composition, I maintain that the two parts of Bengal should be joined together especially when it is a border territory. Therefore I would go further and say that the river Mechi and Mahananda should form the boundary because thereby you will give a strip 20 miles wide. Unless this strip has a width of twenty miles, it is not sufficiently wide for proper administrative convenience. Therefore I will once more submit that for the northern part in the Purnea area, it is not a question of language at all, it is only administrative convenience and for that the best solution is that the river Mahananda should be the boundary and where Mahananda is later jointed up by the Mechi river, that should be the border.

I come to the southern part. Here also it is not a question of linguistic consideration. Even in the Commission's report it has been pointed out that it is the economic consideration that has weighed with them. Because in that area, large part of the population is tribal who speak some sort of a dialect and there is great argument about it that it is more like Bengali and the Biharis say that it is more allied to Bihari. If you consider the administrative convenience, there is the traffic between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur. Coal is supplied to Jamshedpur. There is continuous traffic going on and so I submit that in the Manbhum area, the whole of Purulia sub-division should not have been transferred; only half of it should have been transferred—only that half of it which is obtained by having a highway right from the northern part of the district board road where it joins the Manbhum

[Shri Kishan Chand.]

area to where it leaves the Manbhum area. In this way we will be sticking to one principle. If it is administrative convenience, we should stick to that principle. At least in this transfer of territories, on linguistic basis there will be no justification for transferring of any territory. We should really come down to only administrative convenience and when we claim administrative convenience for Bengal in joining up the two parts, we should give equal administrative convenience to Bihar by not taking away from them such a large part of Purulia sub-division. We should have at least left the catchment area of the river Kusai. Inclusion of the whole area is absolutely unjustifiable. Can I continue till six?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. Mr. Saksena wants to speak.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I will say that as regards the general question of the rehabilitation of refugees, the hon. Minister did not accept my proposal. I tried to introduce it in the States Reorganisation Bill where I wanted to transfer certain territories to Bihar in order to provide for subsequent transfer of territory to Bengal. So it is not a question of refugee problem, I think that with certain modifications, this Bill should be welcomed by both the parties. We should request Bihar people that in the interest of the country and in the greater interests of the nation, they should forego these areas, not on linguistic grounds but as a sacrifice for the better administration of Bengal. With these words I support the measure.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, to a 43 minutes banging of my friend Mr. Gupta, I have to give only one sentence in answer and it is this that the division of the country on linguistic basis for administrative purposes has been buried fathoms deep and I hope and trust that it will never raise its ugly head back again.

Now so far as my support to this Bill is concerned, I give it and I am happy that the transfer is being effected with certain conditions and I would avail myself of those conditions and would like this portion of Bardwan police station and post office area in Manbhum district which is going to be transferred to West Bengal to be conditioned by certain things which will go

to satisfy the wishes of the people residing in those areas. They are all aboriginals. They are tribal people. They have got no culture, no civilization, they are not vocal, they have no agencies to ventilate their grievances and their feelings and act on their behalf, and they look up to me perhaps as a helper of the weak and the poor. They have sent me a telegram and a registered letter, a copy of which they have also sent to the Prime Minister and with your permission, I will place these on the Table of the House. In this connection I would simply appeal to my friends both from West Bengal and from Bihar to remember the very noble sentiments expressed by the hon. Home Minister only on Saturday last when he advised us to have no trial of bitterness, no rancour, no feeling of frustration left in us and to learn to live like brothers and friends.

With the speech of my hon. friend Mr. Ghose, which I always listen to with rapt attention and respect which he deserves, I was sorely disappointed and I am very sorry that I remain unconvinced in spite of his able advocacy for the territories being transferred from Bihar to Bengal. I must inform this House that I feel that Bihar, in this reorganisation business, has been the worst sufferer and I hope that due consideration will be kept in mind always by the Government for the wounds that have been unnecessarily inflicted on innocent Bihar, a State where the Head of the Union or the President of the Union resides.

Next in the matter of suffering comes Orissa. My friend Mr. Mahanty was distressed that Seraikella and Kharasawan were not given back to Orissa and I have my full sympathy for him. Last of all comes the question of flouting the declared opinion of the people of a certain area. Now here is a case of a portion of Vindhya Pradesh, known as Baghelkhand, which wants to go to Uttar Pradesh and not to Madhya Pradesh. Now the Government is of the people, for the people and by the people and the wishes of the people of any territory or any area or any patch of land cannot be flouted like this and therefore, I hope that it will still be possible for the Government to accede to the wishes of those areas—the three districts of Rewa, Satna and Sidi—which want to merge with Uttar Pradesh and not with Madhya Pradesh, and that request, I hope, will also be taken into consideration (*Interruptions.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is over now.

The hon. Minister will reply tomorrow.

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR
APPROPRIATION BILLS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 162(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, the Chairman has allotted thirty minutes each for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return

by the Rajya Sabha of the following Bills, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any to the Bills:

- (i) The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1956.
- (ii) The Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1956.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 28th August 1956.