

I had a happy and brief stay in Ireland with which country we have much in common in respect of the background of our struggle for our national freedoms.

Sir, I was out of India for a full month during which despite a crowded programme of receptions, visits, conversations and conferences, India, a modest sense of pride in her, in our own endeavours and our achievements in the creation of the new India, as well as an overwhelming although invigorating sense of the tasks ahead, has always been with me.

The friendly and enthusiastic reception which my daughter and I and our party received not only from Governments and at official gatherings but also from peoples everywhere was a constant reminder to me of the tasks ahead of us and of the vast and deep expectations that this country of ours, in the short period of her freedom, has aroused in the peoples of the World. It is a happy feeling to be aware of this, but it is even more an overwhelming one. The enthusiasm of peoples, their desire for understanding and friendship, their responses to our approach to the problem of peace and cooperation, the prevailing recognition of a resurgent Asia—all this was exhilarating. It helped me to realise more and more how shrunken the world has become and how much nations and peoples really must belong to each other.

The onward march of history has brought continents together: and yet the sharp struggles and conflicts divide them. The overwhelming weight of deadly weapons and the menace of atomic destruction have rendered peaceful co-existence the only way of survival in the immediate future. This was borne in on me by my talks with people and Governments during my travels, and I have come to realize that this is our imperative need today. For this we need goodwill and tolerance as between nations. We can make our best contribution by our example and by our persistent endeavours to promote peace and cooperation."

THE PRESS COUNCIL BILL, 1956

THE MINISTER FOR INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR. B. V. KESKAR): Sir, I beg to move.

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to establish a Press Council for the purpose of preserving the liberty of the Press and of improving the standards of newspapers in India."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to establish a Press Council for the purpose of preserving the liberty of the Press and of improving the standards of newspapers in India."

The motion was adopted.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE NEWSPAPER (PRICE AND PAGE) BILL, 1956

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Sir, I beg to move:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the regulation of the prices charged for newspapers in relation to their pages and of matters connected therewith for the purpose of preventing unfair competition among newspapers so that newspapers may have fuller opportunities of freedom of expression."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the regulation of the prices charged for newspapers in relation to their pages and of matters connected therewith for the purpose of preventing unfair competition among newspapers so that newspapers may have fuller opportunities of freedom of expression."

The motion was adopted.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: We get back to the original discussion. Mr. Sinha, you have taken already forty minutes.

SHRI B. K. SINHA (Bihar). For us it is a matter of life and death.

MR. CHAIRMAN Every issue on which we are talking is a matter of life and death Go ahead

SHRI B K P SINHA Mr Chairman, I briefly dealt with the arguments of Shri Datar that the borders of India with Pakistan should fall in one State I pointed out that this has not been achieved and cannot possibly be achieved on our Western Border It is not proposed to be achieved on our Northern Border and it cannot possibly be achieved on our Eastern Borders, because Assam has a sizeable territory on the border of Pakistan and there is no proposal to mulct Assam of this territory. Security should be an important consideration in a measure of this nature It has been rightly pointed by one hon Member from Bihar if it would be proper to have a disaffected population on the borders with Pakistan For, it is well known that the population speaking Bengali in this area comes to only 2 to 3 per cent 97 per cent are non-Bengali speaking They don't want to be transferred to Bengal In the circumstances this transfer will create serious discontent among them Then again, after this transfer, with communications being what they are, shall this area be accessible easily from Bengal or Bihar? History affords us some guidance in this respect

[MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Late in the nineteenth century trouble was brewing in Darjeeling Sikkim cast covetous eyes towards this territory And then the army that was rushed to this area to Darjeeling was not the army from Fort William in Bengal, but it was the army that was taken from Dinapore in Bihar It was the Bihar Army that was rushed to that area That clearly and explicitly proves that this area is more easily accessible from Bihar than from Bengal.

Sir, I have already said that more than 80 per cent of the people who populate Kishanganj are Muslims I know there are Muslims even in Bengal, and that Bengal is as much a multi-communal province as Bihar is But there is nothing in common between these two Muslims, between the Muslims who populate Kishanganj and the Muslims who are settled in Bengal There is history behind these Muslims these sturdy people who are now settled in Kishanganj. Sir, when the intrepid

Behari peasant, Sher Afghan, as Emperor Sher Shah ruled in Delhi, he was faced with the problem of incursions into his territory by the Nawabs of Bengal, from the Nawabs and Sultans of Bengal whose depredations were numerous Then, to protect his territories from these depredations, the Emperor physically transported thousands of Muslims from the heart of Bihar and eastern Uttar Pradesh and settled them in Kishanganj And these have been our sentinels for the last four hundred years They have had bitter fights with the Bengali Muslims Is it proper then, I ask this House to consider, to force them to throw their lot with the Muslims of Bengal? Sir, I am constrained to say that the Commission, composed as it was, of men of eminence and scholarship, looked at this problem with some superficiality That will be apparent to you, Sir from what I am going to relate They wanted to establish links between the two parts of Bengal, and with that end in view, they proposed the transfer of certain areas It has been rightly pointed out by Bidhan Babu and the West Bengal Assembly that even if these recommendations of the Commission are implemented, communication will not be there between the northern and southern parts of Bengal Communication can be established only if a further 125 sq miles of territory round about Kishanganj is transferred to West Bengal This fact makes it abundantly clear that probably they did not have the map of that area before them, the map of the area which they sought to transfer from Bihar to West Bengal That is the way in which they were dealing with a problem which is so momentous to us

The question arises then, as to why the States Reorganisation Commission, composed as it was of men of eminence and scholarship proposed these adjustments at the cost of Bihar The clue to that is to be found in a remark or in a line from Pascal

"The heart has reasons of which reason has no knowledge" They are swayed by sympathy They are swayed by propaganda and the Report of the Commission itself shows that they had been swayed, not by reason, but by their sympathies Sir, I will briefly refer to a few paragraphs of the Commission's Report On page 172, para 633, they say:

"Partition has created many problems for West Bengal Apart from

the influx of refugees from Pakistan, which may now be estimated at about three and a half millions, the entire communications system of Bengal has been disrupted since 1947."

Then again on page 174, they deal with the feelings of Bengal and this is what they say:

"This feeling is based partly on the fact that from 1905 onwards the State has steadily lost territory."

"I would ask this House to mark these words in particular: "lost territory". And then they say on page 175, in para. 646 :

"We feel, however, that quite apart from the special background of the West Bengal claim and its psychological aspect, there is no denying the fact" etc., etc.

So what is it that swayed them ? The background of the West Bengal claim and its psychological aspect, namely, that from 1905 onwards Bengal has been steadily losing territory. So far as this question of refugees is concerned, that is an all-India problem, an all-India liability and an all-India obligation. Just as the refugees from West Punjab were an all-India obligation, the refugees from East Bengal are an all-India obligation. They are being settled and they ought to be settled in the different States. The money that is being spent for them comes not only from the pockets of the people of West Bengal, but from the people of Bihar and the various other States also. I have already appealed to the House to mark the words "lost territory". That is what has weighed with the Commission. But what is the meaning of something being lost to somebody ? If a thing belongs to somebody as a matter of right, and he is deprived of it, then that is a loss to him. But if the thing did not belong to him as a matter of right, and somehow or other he has to part with it, he cannot say that he has lost it. Bengal Presidency was something like the "sick man of Europe". You know, Europe had two "sick men"—the Turkish Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire of old. They were a conglomeration of nationalities, and a small section of the people dominated others more numerous than themselves. These "sick men of Europe" started dying in the nineteenth century and finally they died in the twentieth century. And out of their ashes rose, like the phoenix the robust States of Austria, Hungary and

Turkey. Similar was the case of the Presidency of Bengal. It was not the province of Bengal or the linguistic area of Bengal. It was the Presidency of Bengal lost territory from 1905 onwards, regions, namely, Bengal proper and then Orissa, Bihar and Assam. But when the brothers came of age, they demanded separation. They wanted to lead an independent life, and they came into their own. Can it then be said that Bengal lost territory from 1905 onwards, as stated by the Commission ? That, I respectfully submit, is not a proper angle from which an issue of this nature ought to be judged. But as I have already said, they were swayed by sympathies.

Let us see how this partition has affected Bengal. I will refer only to a few figures. The area of composite Bengal before partition was 77,000 sq. miles and after partition it came to 28,000 sq. miles.

The population of composite Bengal was six crores while, after Partition, the figure comes to two crores. It comes to this that after Partition West Bengal was left with about 40 per cent. of the area and less than 36 per cent. of the population of undivided Bengal. In this process, they did not lose. When East Bengal was separated, it was done so because the people of that area wanted to live a separate existence not only from West Bengal but from India as a whole. Let us see what has been the effect of this on the density of the population in Bengal. While in undivided Bengal, the density was 772 per square mile, in West Bengal, after Partition, the density is 709 per square mile. Here also, they are gainers. Now, even after the heavy influx of refugees, it is only 750 per square mile, that is 22 per square mile short of the density of undivided Bengal. What is still more important is that in West Bengal lies the entire mineral wealth; about 99 per cent. of the electrical energy and most of the tea growing tracts are also included in the present West Bengal. That State has also got the city of Calcutta, the emporium for the whole of North East India and a commercial and a financial centre.

Let us now come to the revenues. At the time of Partition, undivided Bengal had a revenue of Rs. 44 crores with a population of 60·8 million people. After Partition, West Bengal was left with a revenue of about Rs. 31 crores—a shortage of only Rs. 13 crores—and a population of 21·8 million people.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Will the hon. Member kindly let us know the name of the document from which he is quoting?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: You can get it and check up on the authenticity of what I am saying.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you reading from any document?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Yes; it is the speech of Dr. Sri Krishna Sinha in the Bihar Assembly.

After Partition, West Bengal was left with two-thirds of the revenue and with only one-third of the population of undivided Bengal. This means that the *per capita* revenue available to West Bengal was doubled as a consequence of this Partition. Far from being crippled, West Bengal gained in this process.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should close now, Mr. Sinha.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I shall be very brief.

Let us now compare West Bengal as it is today and Bihar as it is today. The average cultivated land per agriculturist in Bengal is 0.83 acre while the average in Bihar is 0.64 acre; cultivable waste and fallow is over 1 acre in West Bengal but it is less than 0.9 acre in Bihar. While the proportion of landless agricultural labourers to the total population in West Bengal is only about 12 per cent., the corresponding figure for Bihar is 22 per cent. We have a larger proportion of landless agricultural labour. While the percentage is more than 86 per cent. in Bihar in regard to people dependent on agriculture, the figure for West Bengal is about 50 per cent. against an all-India average of about 70 per cent. While dependence on agriculture in West Bengal is decreasing, it has increased by 13 per cent. in Bihar during the last decade. Let us take the figures of production; production other than cultivation is 15 per cent. in West Bengal while it is less than 4 per cent. in Bihar. This may be compared with the all-India figure of 10.6 per cent to have an idea of the industrial development of West Bengal and the backwardness of Bihar. West Bengal's *per capita* revenue exceeds Rs. 15 while the *per capita* revenue is only Rs. 8.5 in Bihar.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: We have been supplied with a copy of Bihar Assembly Debates. Is it necessary to read it here?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not read the whole document. You have already taken fifteen minutes. After all, they are printed documents and they have been supplied to Members.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I have to impress a few facts upon the House.

Similarly, while the *per capita* expenditure on social services in Bengal is Rs. 5, the corresponding figure for Bihar is just about Rs. 2. The *per capita* development expenditure in West Bengal is about Rs. 7.5 while that in Bihar is only Rs. 4. That is the picture and I would like the House to judge as to who deserves sympathy. Is not Bihar even now weaker of the two States? Should we not in fairness expect the sympathy of this House and the sympathy of the Joint Committee? It has been rightly said "A prejudice is a vagrant opinion without visible means of support." I would add, sympathy, likewise, is a vagrant thing. In this case, the Commission was carried away by appeals to sympathy, the appeals when scrutinised would clearly have left but one conclusion, that there was no basis for them in fact.

Sir, people talk of miseries and sorrows of Bengal. I wish Bengal could become happy and prosperous. But in human calculus, miseries do not cancel out; they add up. The wounds of Bengal will not be healed simply because you inflict greater wounds on Bihar. If the wounds of Bihar would have healed the wounds of Bengal, we would have readily agreed but I am afraid they will not. And this is not the end of the story. Do the demands of Bengal end here? They do not. I have the testimony of a person no less than Bidhan Babu. I do not want to charge him with anything. He strides like a Colossus the stage that is India. He is a member of the Congress High Command. The obligations of his office impose on him an all-India approach and an all-India outlook. He is not an alien to Bihar: he was born in Bihar; he was brought up in Bihar and was educated in Bihar, but see what he has to say. I am quoting from page 121 of the Debates on the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill. He says:

"As I said, the demand before the States Reorganisation Commission was placed by the Government of West Bengal and the Government, although at the present moment they are placing before

the House their recommendations regarding the Bill as framed by the Government of India for consideration of the Parliament for expressing our views, it is not correct to say that we have withdrawn our original demand."

They had asked for 11,000 square miles; the States Reorganisation Commission recommended near about 4,000 while they are getting near about 3,000 square miles. What he says is this: "While I accept 3,000 square miles, my demand for the remaining 8,000 square miles remains". At page 122, referring to another hon. Member's speech, he says, "I can understand my friend . . . suggestion. He says, 'here is my suggestion; whatever I have got I take and then I plead and ask for more'. I can understand that." He can understand the demand for more. It is not the end of our sorrows, the sorrows of Bihar. At page 124, in paragraph 2, Bidhan Babu says, "...in principle and in theory, there is no difference." He is referring to the attitude and speeches of the Members of the Opposition and of the Congress Party who wanted that Bidhan Babu should claim more from Bihar. He says, "in principle and in theory, there is no difference. The only question is the pace and the time when the further instalment of our demands may be made and achieved." When Adolf Hitler invaded Poland and established connection between East Prussia and the main bulk of Germany, he said, "I have no further territorial demands in Europe." He must be turning blue with envy in his grave if he lies in any grave, for reports are that he was burnt after death.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Is the comparison appropriate here?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time to close, Mr. Sinha?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I will close, Sir.

Now, Sir, had we been sure that this was the end of the dispute between Bengal and Bihar we might have looked at the problem from a different point of view, but there is the feeling in us that this is not the end. For us, for the people of Bihar, this is the beginning of our end. The hon. Shri Datar appealed to us in the name of nationalism. I have assured him and I assure him again at the end of my speech that in the interests of nationalism, in the interests of India we are prepared to make any sacrifice that you demand, but let this

House and the Select Committee judge whether what is demanded, whether what is sought to be achieved is in the interests of India, in the interests of Indian nationalism. I have said already and I again repeat that if the interests of India demand, we are prepared to disappear from the map of India as a State. The hon. Shri Datar need not remind us that we are the bearers of the traditions of Asoka, Buddha, Mahavira and last but not least our President of India, Rajendra Prasad, though I feel that that statement needs some modification. It is not that the people of Bihar have inherited the traditions of these great men. The traditions were there. The traditions as it were sprang from the soil of Bihar. These great men have simply been the crystalization and embodiment of those great traditions. Those great traditions are still living in us. If the nation demands it, we are prepared to be obliterated from the pages of history. In that case I would simply expect Shri Datar to put an epitaph, not in letters of gold, not on a gold plate but on a rough unhewn stone, on the border of the present Bihar, bearing the inscription, "Here lived a people who did not hesitate to obliterate themselves from the pages of history when the interests of Mother India, the Imperishable One, demanded it".

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, normally I would not have taken part in this particular debate because I come neither from Bengal nor from Bihar; but, as I listened to the speeches both yesterday and this morning, I felt that perhaps one who is far away from these areas may look at it from a different point of view. So far as the States Reorganisation Commission's Report is concerned, so far as the linguistic provinces' proposal is concerned, my view is quite clear. I am one of those traditionalists that do not believe in the creation of linguistic provinces. But that does not count on this occasion and I shall confine myself to a few remarks on the present Bill.

Now, Sir, the tone of speeches that I have heard distresses me very much. It looks as if we are invading hordes trying to conquer territories or hordes that plead that no defeat should be taken and that the territory should remain. I cannot understand this point of view.

As I was listening to these speeches my mind went back half a century when I was a student in college, when the

[Dr. A. R. Mudaliar.]

partition of Bengal was first promulgated. I was amazed to hear that the partition of Bengal was the result of agitation of different States, which are now differentiated but which once formed part of the Bengal Province. I thought it was a device by the then Government to break up the unity of the people of Bengal, to create dissensions where there were none, to carve out the States so that people could be pitted one against the other. I remember those days very well. Sir, those were not the days when there was either Samyukta Maharashtra or greater Gujarat or any of the other areas, Tamil Nad or Andhra. When the partition of Bengal took place what happened in the whole of India? The memory of those days is crystal clear in my mind. There was no difference between one Indian and another in opposing the partition. Throughout the length and breadth of this country, from Cape Comorin right up to the Himalayas, Bihar, which is now a separate State, the United Provinces which is Uttar Pradesh now, Bombay, the Madras State, every part of India, the people of every part of India agitated against this partition and passed resolutions against it, condemning it as a manoeuvre of the British Government to divide the unity of Bengal, to put down the political aspirations of the people of India and, more than all, to put down those who were considered at that time of political leaders of the whole of India. There were leaders in other parts, but Bengal was the foremost in the agitation for the independence of India. It was in Bengal that the cry of Swaraj was first raised when Dadabhai Naoroji presided over the Congress there. We at least, men of my generation had grown under the inspiration of the political leaders of Bengal of those days—Surendranath Banerjee who is no longer honoured except by a few people in his own province, Motilal Ghosh, Lalmohan Ghosh and a number of people, stars of the first magnitude in the political firmament of this country. They were our inspiration. Their speeches, their addresses at Congress were repeated by us, got by heart by the students, particularly Surendranath Banerjee's masterpieces of eloquence of language and above all of political sentiments. That was the Bengal, the partition of which we deplored and we unsettled the act of the British Government, the act of a powerful foreign Government, and the unsettling of the partition of Bengal came about, as you know, Sir, in 1911. 40

years later we were parties to the partition of Bengal—let us remember that. We gained independence by cutting Bengal into two and agreeing to that vivisection of the province of Bengal. Have we no responsibility to the people whose lives had been separated in this way, of father and daughter, brother and sister, even husband and wife, separated by this partition? Every part of India has a duty towards these people. I will come to West Pakistan a little later, but East Pakistan presents a peculiar problem. The Bengalis were a united nation. Muslims and Hindus together lived, and in 1906 when the partition was declared the Muslims were equally strong in condemning it. Many a Muslim leader was equally strong in condemning the act of the partition of Bengal. I remember my old friend, an esteemed colleague of the other House, Abdul Halim Gaznavi, the *chela* of Sir Surendranath Banerjee in those days, who was described as the wrong Gaznavi by Sir Blomfield Fuller. I remember, Sir, Abdul Halim Gaznavi taking a leading part against the partition of Bengal. We have accepted the partition today, after 40 years of the fight for unifying Bengal. We have thrived on that partition, if I might say so, because the rest of India, most parts got independence because of the acceptance of that partition. I am not going back on that decision; I am not criticising it, but I venture to think that on each of us there is an obligation cast by the very fact that we have divided the people who wanted to be united. High politics made that course inevitable, but I venture to emphasise over and over again that we have got an obligation. And what an obligation! What is the state of West Bengal today? I happen to spend some days every month in Calcutta, the capital of West Bengal. My hon. friend was referring to the great industrial progress in that area. Various industries have been started. I do not want to raise any clash of interests between community and community but he surely knows that the Bengali proper has very little to do with the industrial development of West Bengal or with the concerns that go as highly developed industries there. It may be his fault; it may be his lack of adaptability to the industrialised life which other communities have taken to easily and so swiftly but the fact remains there. And to add to all other troubles, there is the continuous influx of refugees from East Pakistan. My hon. friend spoke lightly of the refugee problem. He said, "we are prepared to give money. Bihar will contribute as well as

the other parts of India to the rehabilitation of the refugees. We shall also pay taxes." Sir, is money going to be the test of how the refugee problem is to be settled? It is a palliative, a very poor palliative, a palliative that hardly touches the fringe of the problem. Here I have got a paper just distributed this morning about the rehabilitation problem in East Pakistan and in West Bengal. In the first six months of 1954 40,000 migrants came over to West Bengal; in the first six months of 1955, 136,000 came; and in the first six months of 1956, 200,000 people came. Can you imagine the problem that it poses to the administrators of West Bengal and to my esteemed friend Dr. Roy in particular who is the life and soul of the Administration of that province and who carries a burden, if I might say so without any disrespect to any other Chief Minister, next only to that of the Prime Minister of India? Have we given any thought to the problems that he has to face with this large migrant population?

There is one peculiarity about the Bengali, if I might say so. In the old days when the Government of India moved from Bengal to Simla, a large contingent of Bengalis, clerks, officers and others, moved right from Calcutta to Simla and thus the northern belt has been a little more familiar to the Bengalis than any other part like the southern part of India. They have adjusted themselves to the life in Bihar, in Uttar Pradesh and in Simla. All that migration stopped when the capital was shifted to Delhi and the Bengali has become unable to adapt himself to conditions either in Madras or in Andhra or in Mysore or in other southern areas. But that is not the case with the refugees from West Pakistan. Sir, you are well aware how a number of refugees have come and settled in the State of Mysore from Sind and Punjab. I have some little acquaintance with those who have settled down in Andhra and Madras areas. But take a Bengali to Orissa even; he is unable to settle there and you know recently the settlers had to go back to Bengal because they were not able to find conditions satisfactory to them. You cannot suddenly make a people adjust themselves to any climatic conditions or to any food conditions or other conditions. Migration is a very difficult problem. The refugee problem is difficult all over the world; it is not going to be easy and it has not been found easy in this part of the world either. What is the good of talking of sympathy if we are

not able to translate that sympathy into action? People might ask: Am I prepared to allow Bengalis to come and settle in Tamil Nad? I have no right to speak of Tamil Nad. I can only give my personal opinion. I am quite willing to see that they come and settle down in Tamil Nad but that is not the problem here. The problem is merely this; a small area—and this Bill recognises that it is a small area—is just to be transferred. My friend said that while Bengal's demand was for 11,000 sq. miles, and while the Commission recommended 4,000 sq. miles this Bill actually gives about 3,000 sq. miles. The hon. Member said that it was a question of life and death that these 3,000 sq. miles should be transferred to West Bengal. Surely, we must have some sense of proportion in these matters. My friend, I was almost going to say, shed copious tears that the Muslims of that district who are in a majority would be handed over to the tender mercies of the Muslims of West Bengal. Surely, anybody who knows the affinities that can easily be created among the Muslims can see their way of life, their conduct, their behaviour is just the same whether they are in Trichinopoly, or in Amritsar or Lahore or in Bihar or West Bengal. And what is going to happen to them? My friend used all sorts of comparisons about Hitler's regime but I believe there is one thing that Hitler said. If it had been sanctioned earlier in a reasonable way probably that might have averted many things. They talked of lebensraum in those days—a little more living space—and that is all that Bengal wants today. It has an expanding population which cannot be contained. If you go and see Calcutta as it is today overcrowded, and the way in which people are living there and the refugees that are coming over, then you will have a little more sympathy for their demand that a little more space may be given to them which they can develop for the refugee population which is coming in such large numbers and which nobody with all the negotiations between the East Pakistan Government and ours has been able to arrest.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: But the areas that are sought to be transferred are not less thickly populated than the areas of Bengal. Is it the hon. Members' suggestion that people in that area should physically retreat inside Bihar and leave that area to the refugees?

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR: I could not have made any such suggestions; nor do I contemplate any such suggestion.

[Dr. A. R. Mudaliar.]

But it is possible to so rearrange the population and to so develop the areas that these things can to a certain extent be a help in solving the refugee problem. I have no doubt about it and my esteemed friend Dr. B. C. Roy, for whose ability to solve these problems I have the highest respect—I have seen him at work—could not have made an absurd demand which would not bring him any tangible results at all.

Sir, we are all willing to call ourselves nationalists—I exclude myself from this category of course—but I do venture to think that the exhibition that the nationalists have made is a revelation to me and is a reflection on India wherever it is known abroad. We have just had the opportunity of listening to a speech of the Prime Minister. Let us think of the reputation that India has obtained, the high place that it occupies in the councils of the comity of nations. I have myself had the privilege of witnessing something of this, I was there when the Prime Minister made his last visit both to the United Kingdom and to West Germany. Of course, as a humble non-official I had even better opportunities of assessing the reactions of the West German public on the statements and speeches of the Prime Minister which I had the privilege of hearing in Hamburg in particular where he received a double degree, and in the Senate Hall at dinner where he made another speech and on various other occasions and I can tell you, Sir, that the language in which the Prime Minister has estimated the appreciation of the country is far from exaggerated; it is indeed an underestimate. Now, this particular Bill the report of the States Reorganisation Commission and the discussions on these must make painful reading for anybody who has had contacts with any country outside India. And coming from one party which was organised, which was united, which fought for independence and which stuck together through those dark days, for them to show this sort of animus against each other—I venture to repeat a word which was not properly used in another connection in another place—this animus that is evident between section and section, between the people of one province and another, amazes an Indian who has had something to do, though from a distance, with the Congress Party, and must confound everybody outside the country. Speeches like these on matters which must be considered after all of minor importance—a 3,000 sq. mile area being

transferred to a neighbouring province and it does not go away anywhere—are regrettable. My friend spoke of people being annihilated and being wiped off the map of India; where to? Into the arms of the Bengal Government. Does he consider that annihilation? Does he consider that being wiped off the map of India Language like this reiterated abroad, exploited by those who are not too friendly to our country, does create some amount of problem, does create an impression which no genuine nationalist can afford to look on with equanimity. Sir, I beg of all Members of the House, at least so far as this Bill is concerned, to look at it in a realistic sense, not to fall victims to feelings which might easily be evoked but which I venture to think are not quite justified, to look upon it as they say from the nationalist point of view, to look upon it from the point of a party which has fought for independence, which has shown its unity, but which according to critics is now showing the cloven hoof. That is the adverse criticism that is addressed against the Congress party. I have no intention of detracting from its strength; I have no desire whatsoever that the Congress should lose in its strength and its unity. Therefore, as an outsider who sees most of the game as one who is not attached to any party, as an individual who has for the last fifty years followed the politics of this country, I venture to make a very earnest appeal that this sort of language in describing this measure or in describing the motives of those who are behind it may not be indulged in and that after sober reflection people will come to think that after all this is not such a bad measure and we have discharged our responsibility—I am talking of the non-Bengali population of India—by accepting this measure. I thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, **MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar for the very kind sentiments expressed in regard to Bengal, and for taking up our case. But I do

not want this House to understand that Bengal's case depends upon sentiment or sympathy. I do not wish to base my case either on sympathy or on sentiment. A lot of passion has been roused on this issue, but I shall try to eschew both passion and sentiment and present certain bare facts to this House, so that hon. Members may form their own judgment on the merits of the case. Not that, Sir, we do not need sympathy. We need all the sympathy of the rest of India particularly to solve the refugee problem. But apart from that, I want you to consider the basic facts of the case. Before I come to that, probably it is necessary to refer to one point which was reiterated more than once by my very dear and esteemed friend, Shri Braja Kishore Prasad Sinha.

Sir, he said that Bihar does not mind being obliterated if it should be necessary in the interest of India. And he repeated that more than once. Many Members have also said that it does not matter where a piece of territory lies within the country, because it will still be in India. But the fact of the matter is that when it is a question of transference of certain territory from Bihar to Bengal, there is all this opposition. There is no question of whether that territory is going out of India or not, or whether it is necessary for Bihar to be obliterated or not. So, let us not indulge in sentiments or expressions which carry no meaning. The fact of the matter is that when a portion of territory is going from Bihar to Bengal, there is all this opposition. The question whether that territory will continue to remain in India or not is forgotten then. So, I leave it at that.

Now, so far as the facts of the case are concerned, I shall base my arguments on the cases presented by the respective Chief Ministers, as I believe they present the most representative and also the majority points of view of the two States. The first question is with regard to reorganisation. I believe, a Bihar Member stated that there should have been no reorganisation. That is a sentiment which has been echoed by many Members, both in this House and in the other House. But that is a question apart. I should like to say that that is a sentiment which is not shared by the Chief Minister of Bihar. In his speech in the Assembly, when a Member had opposed the formation of the Commission, he says that it is forgotten that Pandit Nehru is a great democrat

and he loves to follow democratic ways. A persistent demand was made from all over the country for the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission and it was but meet and proper on his part to have acceded to the demand that the States Reorganisation Commission should be constituted.

The next point is that the States Reorganisation Commission was constituted for the reorganisation of the States. Its purpose was not to maintain all the States in the form in which they existed. If that was the contention, then there would have been no necessity of setting up the States Reorganisation Commission. Implicit in the acceptance of the constitution of the States Reorganisation Commission is the fact that certain States required to be reorganised. Then comes the question of merits of each case and the criteria by which the reorganisation should be given effect to. I am not now voicing the opinion of the Chief Minister of West Bengal. But our demand was that the States should be based on language. Now, that demand has not been accepted by the States Reorganisation Commission, although all the Bihar Members who have spoken here have impliedly accepted that demand, because when they oppose the transfer of any piece of land from Bihar to Bengal, their argument is "Ascertain the wishes of the people". They base their argument on the ground of language. But their Chief Minister has not accepted that ground. I again read from the speech of the Chief Minister of Bihar. On the question of language, he states as follows :

"It is a matter of great regret that separatist tendencies in India today appear to be on the increase. It is wholly improper and harmful that people in West Bengal should think in terms of Bengal only, for those in Bihar should think exclusively of Bihar. The salvation of India lies only in the creation of bigger units consisting of speakers of different languages."

He was of the opinion that the readjustment of boundaries on the basis of language was not, in every case justified. Now that is the position. Incidentally, I may say that we have always argued that language should be the primary consideration. Not that it should be the only consideration. There are other factors which have got to be taken into account. But the Commission's approach

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]
has been that language is a consideration, but it is only one of many, and probably it plays, according to the Commission, only a subsidiary role.

The next question, as I said, is: What are the criteria on which the States should be reorganised? In the terms of reference to the Commission, four criteria were set out. They were (1) Unity and solidarity of India, (2) Language and culture, (3) Financial, economic and administrative considerations, and (4) Considerations arising out of the development plans. Now let us judge the case of the transfer of the territory recommended for transfer, by the Commission from Bihar to Bengal, by these standards. If any Bihar Member has got any other standards, he can by all means suggest them, apart from that of language which their own Chief Minister has not accepted.

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR (Bihar): The Commission has accepted it partly.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: It should not be based on language. If you say that it.....

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR: I say that the Commission has partly based its judgment on language also.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I agree, and I have already said that they have not neglected language. But they have not given it any predominant influence.

I come now to the discussion of the territories which have been proposed to be transferred. First, let us take up the question of the Purulia sub-district. Now the reason which the Commission have advanced for the transfer is set out in their report. I am afraid, my friend, Shri Sinha, did not correctly represent the Commission when he stated that the Commission based their recommendations merely on sympathy and the fact that Bengal had lost some territory. What the Commission were doing in those paragraphs was to present Bengal's case. As a matter of fact, they said so. It was not their version of the case, but they were presenting the case as represented to them by Bengal.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: They have presented the Bengal case with sympathy.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am sure that, when the Bihar case was presented as against the Bengal case, they also presented the Bihar case with sympathy.

Then, on the general ground as to why the areas should be transferred, they say this:

"We attach great importance to the geographical compactness of administrative units, because we are of the view that the physical integration of such units is vital to their real political and administrative integration."

I am afraid this refers to Kishanganj area, and since I have taken this part, let us take the Kishanganj area first. The S.R.C. Report goes on:

"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.

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, 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."

The first thing that I want to urge is that the recommendation is not based upon consideration of just one factor. The recommendation is based upon a consideration of many factors. But my Bihar friends have pounced upon only one particular factor and judged the whole case by that one particular factor.

Much has also been said on the question of a corridor. This is very mischievous. It is not a question of a corridor at all. A corridor is relevant only as between foreign countries. It is not a question of corridor at all as between Bengal and Bihar. It is a question of administrative convenience. It is a question of geographical compactness, which is necessary for some administrative purposes, and to say that this is tantamount to giving a corridor as between Bihar and Bengal is simply misrepresenting the whole case and shows an attitude of mind which is very unfair, I should say.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I point out to the hon. Member that on page 175, paragraph 646, of the S.R.C. Report, dealing with administrative convenience, the Commission says :

"It may be possible as the Bihar Government has contended to mitigate these difficulties within the existing constitutional and administrative framework,"....

without transferring any area.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: It is the Bihar's case that the States Reorganisation Commission is presenting with sympathy.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It is the Commission's own opinion. You read it carefully.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: It is the contention of the Bihar Government. I was coming to that, when my friend intervened. I would say what the answer to that is from Bengal side. The West Bengal Chief Minister has said.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Whom you do not admire.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Certainly, but if there are certain facts which are true, one must accept them. As I said once, I repeat that I am presenting the case here on the presentations made by the Chief Ministers of West Bengal and Bihar, because they represent the two States. I do not admire him, because I want to oust him from there and I want to have my own administration.

This is what the West Bengal Chief Minister has said :

"It is true that one might theoretically say that it is the duty of the Bihar Government to see that smug-

gling does not take place. But the difficulty is that things do not go from Bihar; they go from Calcutta; they are taken by trucks and by trains. They go through Kishanganj. It is no use shutting our eyes and burying our heads like the ostrich. It is happening."

Unless the whole area comes within the administrative jurisdiction of a particular State, it becomes difficult to administer it efficiently. There is also a feeling in Darjeeling district that that district is being neglected, and that feeling has been generated by the fact that there is no direct link between the north and the south of West Bengal. So, I wanted to say that, when people talk of a corridor, they are simply misrepresenting the case. It is not based on that. It is not based either on the fact that the security question is involved. That is an important factor. It is probably desirable that the whole area should be under one State, because it is on the border. I am sure that, if that was the only consideration involved, if that was the only factor involved, then the States Reorganisation Commission would not have recommended its transfer. But, since so many other factors were also involved, the Commission came to the conclusion that the area should be transferred to Bengal. But there is one thing to be said about this area in Kishanganj and that has been pointed out by the Chief Minister of West Bengal that unfortunately it does not achieve the purpose which they have had in view. The main purpose of this recommendation was that a part of Purnea District should be transferred to Bengal so that certain objectives might be fulfilled. They were :

(i) That the national highway should be placed at the disposal of the West Bengal Government so that it may be possible to have feeder roads connecting the highway with its other territories, and

(ii) that the transfer of area from Purnea District should be such as to provide geographical contiguity between the two disconnected parts of West Bengal.

But it seems that there is some difference of opinion about the map on which this recommendation was based. Dr. Kunzru is here. I may say that last session I asked him, 'Was it the intention of the Commission that there should be geographical compactness provided

[Shri B C Ghose]
by the recommendation and, if for any reason that was not fulfilled and if ever they were to review the case, would they recommend transfer of additional area necessary for assuring geographical compactness?" and he said that that was the intention.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar) : My hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, cannot interpret the Commission any more.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE. It is clearly stated in the SRC Report that "The details of this transfer will have to be left, therefore, to the Government of India acting in consultation with the State Governments concerned." They have said that the territory that is actually to be transferred will have to be decided later on by the Government of India in consultation with the State Governments concerned so that the objectives they had in view could be achieved I leave Kishanganj at that with this suggestion that the proposals made by the West Bengal Government in this connection deserve the most serious and sympathetic consideration of the Select Committee

Now, I come to Purulia. Firstly there is a very interesting fact A charge was made in the other House against the Prime Minister that he has sometimes treated questions in a rather cavalier manner Now, it appears that—I don't know whether the Prime Minister was involved here—the Government of India has, in coming to the decision on the States Reorganisation Commission's recommendations in regard to Purulia, treated the Bengal Government in a cavalier fashion Because in regard to their decision that the Chandil thana and Patamda thana should be excluded, it appears that the procedure they adopted was this I quote again from Dr. Roy's speech in the West Bengal Assembly.

"What happened was that after the States Reorganisation Commission's Report was placed before the Government of India there was only one message that was sent to me on the 16th January afternoon from Delhi saying that the Government of India ultimately had decided to take these two portions away from us That was the message that was sent to me My opinion was not asked for except to say that if I agreed the whole scheme

would be put before the country over that evening's radio by the Prime Minister I am one of those who believe

सर्वनाशे समुत्पन्ने अर्थं त्यजति पंडित

When I am afraid of what is going to happen with regard to the bulk of it—we felt whether we agreed or not that portion was to go—and it was better to say, in good grace, 'yes I agree'."

That is the way that the Government of India proceeds in such a vital matter—that the State Government concerned is not at all consulted The Chief Minister is just intimated what the decision is and he is not given an opportunity to present his point of view before arriving at the final decision and if that is not treating the State Government in a cavalier manner, I don't know what it is.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: They have treated the Government of Bihar in a worse manner

SHRI B C GHOSE Then you represent your grievances I have no objection

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh). Equitable treatment to both.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE. Two wrongs do not make one right I will first take up this question of the transfer of Purulia and its merits The grounds on which it was sought to be transferred by the Commission were grounds relevant to the prosecution of river valley projects. That has been admitted to be a valid ground Now objection has been raised from various points of view. Let me take first some of the inconsequential points One is stated to be, according to Shri Sinha, what is sauce for the Bengal goose is not sauce for the Bihar gander or *vice versa*, meaning thereby that while you want a link between North and South Bengal, you are cutting off the link here in Bihar and you are not treating both States equally Unfortunately Government are treating both the States quite equally.

By taking away Patamda thana, they are disconnecting the route between Purulia and Midnapur There is no straight route now and I may tell you

that there is this difference in the attitude of the West Bengal Government that when the Chief Minister was criticised in the Assembly as to how it was that he acquiesced in a proposition where direct road link is not maintained between the area that is now being given to Bengal—because there will be an area of 6 to 7 miles passing through Bihar territory, he did not place this case on a par with Kishanganj case. . . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : Purulia is proposed to form part of Bankura district not Midnapur. Midnapur is not important industrially either.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: It is not a question of the merits of a particular place as to whether there is industry or not but there is no direct link between Purulia and Midnapur.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore). The missing link is there in Bihar.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But in the Bengal Assembly what did the Chief Minister state? I could quote from him but the essence of it was that this is a matter which also requires consideration but he would refer the matter to the Government of India and leave it to their discretion but he did not, as in the other case, say that geographical compactness must constitute an essential condition in the transfer of territory as it did in the case of Kishanganj because that was essential for securing a link between the northern portion of Bengal and the southern portion particularly Darjeeling, Dinajpur and Malda districts. Without that it becomes extremely difficult to administer that territory efficiently and we know that for going from Purulia to Midnapur, we shall have to pass Bihar territory and we have not made such a great row or fuss as hon. friends from the other side have done in regard to the question of providing a link between north and south of Bengal.

The next question is about the linguistic composition of this territory. It has been stated that although originally in the 1951 census the Bengali-speaking population was 52 per cent., a fresh census was taken later on which shows that the percentage of Bengali-speaking people is now only 30 or 31. There are two dialects involved, Khotta and Kurmal, and there is a difference of opinion as to whether they are akin to Bengali or Hindi. Authorities have been

quoted in favour of either view, which would show that this would not lead to any conclusion. But there are certain interesting facts which I should like to place before this House. I should like to know from the hon. Minister as to why this census was considered necessary and why this census was taken just before the States Reorganisation Bill came before the House. Although the census was taken under the auspices of the Census Commissioner, who were the officers concerned who took the census? Did they send officers from the Government of India or were they Bihar officers, as is the usual custom, who undertook the census? If it was the Bihar officers then he will understand that the report would, to a certain extent, be suspect and they would be suspect for a very good reason because I am told by my friend in the other House, who is a Member of the Other House and comes from this area—his name is Shri Bhajahari Mahato and he comes from a village called Jitang in the Police Station Bandhawa that there are 400 families and all these 400 families are Bengali-speaking but in the census return not one person from that area has been shown to be Bengali-speaking. All are shown as Hindi speaking I give you this fact. Verify it. Anybody could go and verify. How much reliance do you want us to place on a census which has been prepared on this basis?

Then a lot was spoken about an election which took place in that part some time ago.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I seek one information only? Is there one man in Bengal proper who is Kurmi by caste and who bears this title Mahato?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Yes, there may be. In Bengal I must say that even now I come across surnames which I would never have thought were Bengali. There are all kinds of surnames particularly when you go to the Scheduled Castes and tribes areas. Mahato would certainly be there.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: They are in Midnapur district. He can find them there.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That answers it. Because there must be. I was coming to that by-election to which a lot of importance was attached as showing or as reflecting the people's will. Now,

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

under what condition was the by-election held? Was there a Lok Sevak candidate? As hon. Members know very well, at that time the leaders of the Lok Sevak Sangh had been out on a trek to Bengal to protest against the decision of the West Bengal Government in favour of a merger. No Lok Sevak candidate was set up. Secondly, although the Congress candidate won the opposition candidates polled more than the Congress candidate. So on the basis of the theory proposed by my friend Shri Bodra, we might say that the votes were against Bihar because there were 12,000 votes against. The Congress candidate polled 10,000 or 9,000 and odd. I don't say that is a very fair argument. I am not basing my case on that argument.

3 P.M.

Thirdly, what was the constituency? The constituency was just Chas, Chandankheri and Para. Of these three police stations, Chas and Chandankheri are in Bihar and they will continue to be in Bihar. So only Para is to be transferred to West Bengal. So, to have a valid argument, one would have to say that in Para the votes cast in favour of the Congress candidate were more than the votes cast against him. Although the election was not fought on this issue, the Congress candidate had not made that an issue, still I say that it might possibly have been a valid argument if it could be shown that in Para thana—for the other two thanas are in Bihar and so it does not matter if they voted to be in Bihar, for we are concerned only with Para thana—they voted that way. I am told that if you were to examine the votes cast at the Para thana, you will find that the opposition candidates got more than the Congress candidate. Does this not immediately invalidate this argument? But as I said, this by-election does not prove anything. Therefore we have to come back to the position as represented by the States Reorganisation Commission. They took all these things into consideration. They said that the argument of language was there. A large part—the largest concentration as Mr. Datar put it, of Bengali population was there.

Then there is the river-valley argument and it was on the river-valley argument more than on the population composition that they came to their conclusion.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I inform the hon. Member that I remember—I have not got the papers with me here and I have been looking for them—in that Para itself the opposition candidate got 710 votes and the independent and Congress candidates who stood against the transfer of Para got 4,260 votes.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But this is misrepresentation, because, my facts....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I will give you the details for I had the list of votes.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But let me finish.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Why has the hon. Member gone over there?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: These facts are given by Shri Bhajahari Mahato who ought to know.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: But I can quote from Government publications, giving the number of votes in the different thanas and in every constituency.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: You cannot have any such Government publication.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I have got it, the votes cast in every constituency.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: It cannot be a fact for in no elections are the votes of separate thanas shown separately.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I can hand it over to you, you can see.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But when you say you are quoting from a Government publication, that cannot be true, for....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I can hand it over to you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, Mr. Sinha, you are not in your seat and you are unnecessarily interrupting the speaker.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: And Mr. Sinha was a member of the Select Committee also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You go on, please do not be disturbed by interruptions.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: To any reasonable interruption I am prepared to listen and to answer; but an interruption simply because it comes from a member of the Party does not become reasonable.

Sir, I was saying that this by-election does not prove anything. It does not reflect that the people of the territory which is going to be transferred to Bengal are against such transfer. As a matter of fact, the major portion of this constituency is in Bihar.

Now, I come to the question of the portions which have been excluded by the Central Government. I was reading what Mr. Datar had said. I could understand what he said about Chandil, for what he said was based on the river-valley argument. But when he came to Patamda I could not follow him. This is what he said :

"Then Sir, there was another portion known as the Patamda police station of the Barabhum thana. Now, so far as this police station is concerned, in this area there is a reservoir which furnishes water to Jamshedpur town and the Tata Iron and Steel Works. We look after the convenience and the facilities of the poor workers there. Tatas can bring water from anywhere."

If this can be done, what is the sense? If that is the argument on which the territory is sought to be retained in Bihar, with whom is the sympathy and to which State is Government partial? Is the Government partial to Bengal or to Bihar? The argument is that there is a reservoir which gives water to Jamshedpur town, that Government looks after the facilities of the workers and, therefore, Patamda thana which is absolutely Bengali-speaking, should remain with Bihar. I understand this will create a lot of difficulties for the population of this area, because they will have to go to Chaibasa for many things which is very far away from Purulia. If they have a suit to file they will have to go to Chaibasa which will cost them Rs. 8 to and fro whereas for going to Purulia it will cost them only Rs. 2. Surely this is not a ground sufficient to revise the recommendation of the Commission. If there had been a sufficient ground I could have understood the stand. I do not say so much about Chandil. But I say that if there is any partiality on the

part of the Government, then on the facts as they stand before us today, I say, it is in favour of Bihar and not in favour of West Bengal, although as everybody agrees here, it is Bengal that needs more sympathy than does Bihar. That is the position with regard to the merits of the case. I therefore, want this honourable House to consider whether the case of Bengal is not absolutely sound on merits, once you have conceded that there should be reorganisation of the States.

Unfortunately there has been something said about Kishanganj and that is about the Muslim population there. It is very unfortunate that a lot has been spoken on this issue, not only by ordinary Members, but even by responsible leaders like the Chief Minister of Bihar. This reference is absolutely mischievous. If anybody is solicitous about Muslim interests, does he mean to say that the Muslims ever stood by the question of language only? When there was the partition, what was the basis on which the Muslims wanted it? Did they feel that they were part of a particular territory? Did they want to be in one State or the other because they lived there for years and years and for ages and ages? No, it was on the ground of religion. And we all believe that whether he is in Bihar or in Bengal, he will find compatriots quite sympathetic.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR : You cannot generalise like that.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I make one point clear? Of course I have made it clear twice in this House, once when I spoke in January or February of the States Reorganisation Commission Report, that our stand is never on communal grounds. And I have made it quite clear that the Muslims of Kishanganj are distinct from the Muslims of Bengal. That is why I want it to remain in Bihar.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That is exactly what I contest, that so far as the Muslims are concerned, I am sure they do not feel that they are separate from the Muslims in Bengal. I believe that the Muslims who are a minority community, wherever they are, whether in Bengal or in Madras or in Bihar or any where, will have their interests adequately protected. Their interests will be adequately and more than adequately protected. But I also know that in the Kishanganj area there are Muslims who

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]
are Bengali-speaking, because the portion which borders East Pakistan is all Bengali-speaking. There are Bengali-speaking Muslims there. Therefore, I would say that though there may be Urdu-speaking people, there is no danger of anything happening to the language.

SYED MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar): What is their population in that area?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I do not know, but

SYED MAZHAR IMAM: Only three per cent.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : The States Reorganisation Commission had all these facts before them and therefore I have a grouse against them when they mention that the Muslim population deserves safeguards, as if the West Bengal Government would not do their duty. I am sure that so far as the West Bengal Government is concerned, whatever may be the complexion of the Government, there need be no fear. Therefore, so far as these two areas are concerned, I have not come across any reason which would indicate that the recommendation made by the Commission was unfair.

Now, that brings me to the end of the case as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission. I will add a few words only and that is, so far as we are concerned, we are not satisfied with the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: May I just seek a clarification?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you disturb him now?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I want to seek a clarification with your permission. If you permit me, I would do it; otherwise, I will resume my seat.

I want to know from the hon. Member as to whether this Kishanganj is not the same place which was recommended by the Muslim League of that State to be given over to Pakistan. May I also know whether it is not a fact that the President of the Muslim League of those days is an hon. Member of this House now and is also to work on the Joint Select Committee.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : I accept the information given by the hon. Member. He knows these things much more than I do.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA : Am I do understand that the hon. Member has no information?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I have heard something like that but I will not vouch for every word that you have said without knowing the actual facts.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR (West Bengal): What is the relevance of this?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Although this portion of Bihar is proposed to be transferred to Bengal as recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission, we are not satisfied ourselves and when we say 'we', I should like also to include therein the Congress in Bengal because of the reason that we have always held that States, when they are going to be reorganised, should be reorganised primarily on the basis of language. You may not accept it but that is our attitude and, therefore, there are other areas which should on that basis have been transferred to Bengal. It is only in that context that the Chief Minister of West Bengal has said that this is not the whole of our demand. As a matter of fact, the West Bengal Government did make a demand before the States Reorganisation Commission. That is there for everybody to see; that is not something which is secret. Or, is it the contention of the Bihar Members that the West Bengal Government should say now that the demand that they had made before the States Reorganisation Commission was not justified or was unfounded? They stand by the demand that they had made but their demand has not been accepted by the States Reorganisation Commission and whatever little the States Reorganisation Commission thought fit to transfer to Bengal has been further modified by the Central Government. There the position stands. As I said, it is not on grounds of sympathy alone that we are entitled to this territory. I had given you the reasons but if there are reasons of sentiment, if there are grounds of sentiment also, I say that they should also influence you in favour of West Bengal. As the hon. Dr. Mudaliar said this morning, we are an unfortunate State. We are a State which has been partitioned; refugees are coming over. A lot has been said that the Bengalis

are parochial that they try to hold together, etc. That is probably our fault but that is a fault from which I am afraid all of us suffer. In Calcutta I find that there is a Kerala Association, there is an Andhra Association, there is a Maharashtra Niwas and so on. There are all kinds of associations of people from different States but that is as it should be. In any place if a number of people from a particular State or community speaking a particular language live, there is certainly an affinity which brings them together and they hold together. Moreover, it has been stated that we do not want to go outside. That is entirely a wrong impression. You will find Bengalis not only all over the place but also in countries abroad. If you go from Mexico to Russia,

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: We did not say that. Dr. Mudaliar said that in your support. You reject arguments advanced by him in your favour.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I said that there is some misunderstanding about the Bengali people not wanting to go out. I am telling you this because that will help you in understanding the question. The Bengali agriculturists who are coming over from East Pakistan are accustomed to certain conditions of climate in which they alone could farm and pursue their avocations. When they are sent to other places where the climate is absolutely different, they cannot acclimatise themselves to those areas. So far as the intelligentsia or the educated people are concerned, they have gone not only all over India but even outside India. The peasants and agriculturists who are coming over cannot acclimatise themselves to other areas. Therefore, they want to stay near about Bengal but that should not give the impression that the Bengalis as such do not want to go out and that they are not enterprising enough to go to other areas and find a living. An agriculturist must pursue his avocation of agriculture and to do that he wants certain conditions which he does not find in other places. This has been the trouble. I have finished and I leave the entire case with a clear conscience to hon. Members of this House and of the Select Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I want to make a statement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I do not allow it. I have already called Dr. Kunzru.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I want only a few minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may place them before the Joint Committee.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I only wanted to give certain figures. Will you permit me to place them on the Table of the House?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You may pass them on to Mr. Ghose.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I shall pass them on to Mr. Ghose.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, as I was listening to the speeches delivered yesterday and today, I thought of the arguments in favour of the Bengal view and in favour of the Bihar view as they were presented to the States Reorganisation Commission. The questions that the States Reorganisation Commission had to consider were not of a mathematical nature. It was not possible to arrive at a solution which would convince all the parties concerned that that solution was the only solution that could be suggested for the removal of the difficulties under consideration. There is no way, when you consider such questions, of making the partisans of a particular view realise that their view is not the only view that could be taken or not even the best view that could be taken in the interests of the country. It is not surprising, therefore, that the differences of opinion that were exhibited by the States Reorganisation Commission continue to find expression but it is surprising to find that hon. Members of this House attach no importance to the fact that a Commission which they called impartial, after considering the evidence placed before it came to a conclusion which on certain points differed from the conclusions of the partisans of this view or from those of the partisans of the other view. Both the Bihar and the Bengal representatives have blamed the Commission for not doing this thing or that thing. My hon. friend, Shri Mazumdar, for instance, when complaining that the States Reorganisation Commission had not accepted even the legitimate demands

{Shri H. N. Kunzru.] that were put forward on behalf of Bengal, gave the instance of Dhalbhum.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I quoted from the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: And I shall quote from the same Report, Sir.

My hon. friend said that the Commission did not transfer the Dhalbhum sub-division to Bengal on the ground that the district of Singhbhum of which it formed part did not have a Bengali majority although it admitted that the Bengalis were in a majority in that sub-division. Now, I contradicted him when he made this statement and pointed out to him that the Commission had never made such a statement.

He said he could quote from the Report of the Commission itself. Well, as he was so sure, I read once more the paragraph, paragraph 667 on page 180, in which the Commission had dealt with Bengal's claim to the Dhalbhum Sub-Division.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Also please go through my speech in the proceedings, because I suggested something else.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I am now concerned with the statement attributed to the States Reorganisation Commission.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I am being misquoted. I said that if a village is taken as the unit then the areas which are predominantly Bengali-speaking can be demarcated. Therefore I suggested a boundary commission. Dr. Kunzru was not here at that time.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I was here and I listened to every word of what he said, that the Commission did not accept the village as the unit.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: That was my main approach.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: on which the reorganisation of the States should be based. My hon. friend, Shri Mazumdar, first attributed the statement I have referred to to the Commission and then explained the view of the party to which he belongs.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I suggested a certain procedure.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The procedure was suggested after the charge had been made. I shall now read out what the Commission said on this particular point. "We pass next to Dhalbhum. From a linguistic point of view, Singhbhum district is the meeting ground of Ho, Oriya, Bengali, Hindi and Santhali. These languages are important roughly in the order named. In the Dhalbhum sub-division considered separately, Bengali is the largest language group" not that the Bengali-speaking people are in a majority. "but it cannot by any means be considered to be predominant; and a *prima facie* case for a boundary adjustment in favour of West Bengal has not been made out either on the ground of linguistic affiliation or on any other grounds." This makes it clear, Sir, that the Commission did not transfer the Dhalbhum sub-division to Bengal merely on the ground that the Singhbhum district of which it forms part does not have a Bengali majority.

I shall now come to some of the arguments advanced by those hon. Members who come from Bihar. A great deal has been heard of the argument that democratically the areas to be transferred to Bengal in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission cannot be transferred because the vast majority of the people living there are against this transfer. Sir, I am myself a firm believer in democracy, but if for every little change that is made the consent of the people concerned must be sought, it is obvious that things must continue to remain as they are; no reform whatsoever can be introduced; people will prefer to remain where they are living already. Now, if that is the ground, Sir, that is accepted by hon. Members, then Coorg should have remained as an independent unit instead of being asked to merge itself in the Mysore State. Similarly Ajmer, if a plebiscite were to be taken, could not be merged in Rajasthan. Yet neither of these States is going to be allowed to continue to have its separate existence. We must therefore look at these questions, which are small in comparison with the bigger questions considered by the Commission, in their proper perspective. Now, take the case of the Kishanganj, sub-division, a part of which is to be transferred, in accordance with the Commission's recommendation, to Bengal. I am amazed to hear the arguments that have been put forward. I

sympathise with the feelings of the people, who live in the area that is to be transferred, from one side to the other, but anybody listening to the speeches that have been delivered would think that the people of the area to be transferred were being delivered bound hand and foot into the hands of their enemies. I think, Sir, statements of this kind do nobody any good. They do no good to the people concerned and they do no good to the State whom the protagonists of such a view represent.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LAL (Bihar): Why don't you recommend the transfer of those areas of eastern U.P. to Bihar? They were not going to be transferred.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Bihar never put forward that demand and the States Reorganisation Commission could not consider it. But I am sure that, had Bihar asked for the transfer of some eastern territories of U.P. to Bihar, the Commission would have given the question its impartial consideration. The Commission had no reason, Sir, to consider a question that was not raised unless it could be shown that such a transfer was absolutely necessary.

Now, Sir, I shall speak of that portion of the Kishanganj sub-division which is to be transferred to Bengal. It has been said, as the Bihar Government said to the States Reorganisation Commission, that the national highway that would pass through this sub-division would be a Central highway and that therefore there was no case for transferring any portion of that sub-division to Bengal.

And my hon. friend, Mr. Braja Kishore Prasad Sinha, in order to strengthen this argument quoted the following words from the Commission's Report: "We feel, however, that quite apart from the special background of the West Bengal claim and its psychological aspect...."

He stopped there. He did not complete the sentence. He used these words in order to make out that the Commission was guided in making its recommendation merely by these considerations, that is, the special background of the question or its psychological aspect. But I shall read out the whole sentence to the House so that hon. Members may

judge whether this was a correct representation of the Commission's views :

"We feel, however, that quite apart from the special background of the West Bengal claim and its psychological aspect, there is no denying the fact that the present distribution of territories between Bihar and West Bengal is such as to give rise to some administrative difficulties from the point of view of West Bengal."

Then when my hon. friend Shri Bimal Coommar Ghose was speaking he read out a sentence from this very paragraph. That sentence was this:

"It may be possible, as the Bihar Government has contended to mitigate these difficulties within the existing constitutional and administrative framework."

And he interpreted this to mean that the Commission had admitted that the Bengal Government's argument was correct.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Bihar Government's?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I did not quote this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was Mr. Sinha who quoted it and said that that was the opinion of the Commission.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: But all that the Commission has said is that it may be possible. It did not accept this view and this has been made plain by the next sentence:

"However now that an opportunity for a general settlement has presented itself, it will be desirable in our opinion to find more lasting solutions."

Mind you, Sir, all that the Commission said was that it may be possible to mitigate these difficulties. It did not say that it was possible to remove all the difficulties. Therefore it said that as an opportunity had presented itself for the removal of all the difficulties and suggesting a lasting solution, there was no reason why another course should not be adopted, why the Commission should not attempt to offer a lasting solution.

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

There is another argument against the transfer of a portion of the Kishenganj sub-division to Bengal that was urged yesterday by my hon. friend, Shri Tajamul Husain who, unfortunately, is not here today. He said, "does not the central road pass through the territory of India? If so why should the Commission have indulged in special pleading in favour of Bengal?" Now, Sir, the Commission has not used any line of argument merely for one State. The arguments that it has employed are of general application, as I shall show immediately from the case of Bihar. When the Commission came to the conclusion that a certain portion of the Purulia sub-district of Manbhum district should be transferred to Bengal it saw that it would no longer be possible to go from the Dhanbad sub-district to Ranchi and Chaibasa through Manbhum. What did the Commission do? The Commission saw that it was possible for Bihar to have another road in order to go to these areas but in the case of Bengal no other solution of the question than that proposed by the Commission was possible. If there had been physical contiguity between North and South Bengal, the Commission, I am sure, would not have transferred any portion of the Kishenganj sub-division to Bengal merely because it would be more convenient to Bengal to make use of the central highway passing through Kishenganj. The Commission agreed after a full consideration of the matter to Bengal's claim merely because there was no other way in which physical contiguity could be secured between north Bengal and south Bengal but in the case of Manbhum it was possible, and it is possible, for Bihar to construct another road for a certain distance. Some expenditure will no doubt be incurred. But physical contiguity between the Dhanbad sub-district and Ranchi and Chaibasa exists still.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LAL: What would have been the harm if the Bengal people had to pass through Bihar?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: We have dealt with that in the Report and I cannot go over that ground again and again. If hon. Members do not read the Report, the fault is theirs, not mine.

Now, Sir, I come to another question. The Commission after considering the case of Seraikella and Kharsawan came to the conclusion that these territories

should not be transferred to Orissa. Now, it came to this conclusion on several grounds. But one of the grounds which I ask hon. Members to note is that if these areas were to be transferred to Orissa, it would not be possible for people living in Bihar to reach Jamshedpur except through Oriya territory. Therefore you will see that although this was not the only argument on which the Commission declined to transfer Seraikella and Kharsawan to Orissa, it treated Bihar in the same way as it treated Bengal. Because unless Seraikella and Kharsawan were included in Bihar it would not be possible for the Bihar Government to construct a road that would enable people living in Bihar to reach Jamshedpur through Bihar territory. Physical contiguity between certain portions of Bihar and Jamshedpur would have been disturbed thereby. Thus it is quite clear that we have treated Bihar in exactly the same way as we have treated Bengal.

Now, Sir I come to the case of Purulia sub-district. I have already dealt in part with it, but I should like to point out that the Commission—although it took note of the fact that fifty-five per cent. of the people living in the area that it recommended for transfer to Bengal had Bengali as their mother tongue—based its proposal for the transfer on economic grounds. The Commission in the chapters dealing with general considerations has laid down that an area can be supposed to belong to a particular linguistic zone only when seventy per cent. of the people of that area speak the language of the zone to which it claims to be transferred. Therefore, even if fifty-five per cent. of the people of the Manbhum sub-district or of that portion of the Manbhum sub-district which in the Commission's opinion should be transferred to Bengal spoke Bengali, it would not have made this area a Bengali zone.

Now, a great deal of stress has been laid on the re-examination of the census slips. So far as I know, there has been no census in recent times when the question whether Kurmal and Khotha are allied to Bengali or to Hindi has not been in dispute. No one has settled that question yet and no census superintendent can settle such a question. It is only the linguistic experts that can settle the question. It will be difficult even for linguistic experts to settle the matter finally, because in

border areas it is inevitable that the people should speak the language of their neighbours on either side of them. How is it to be decided whether Khotha and Kurmali are allied to Bengali or to Hindi? Words of both these languages will inevitably be found in these languages and I do not think that you can base any conclusion on that. But let me repeat that the Commission was well aware of the dispute with regard to the linguistic affiliation of these languages. Even what has been done has not settled the question finally. All that has been shown is that in this area thirty per cent. of the people speak Bengali; twenty four per cent. speak Hindi; and twenty five per cent. speak Kurmali and Khotha. This is all that has been settled, but the economic question still remains.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Twenty one per cent. speak Adivasi languages.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Of which I have not mentioned. You cannot say that they are either Bihari or Bengali.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: They want to remain with us of course.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Adivasis want their own State. They do not want to live either in Bengal or Bihar.

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): We do not want to live either in Bengal or Bihar.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The Adivasis do not want to live with Biharis. They have presented to the Commission the claim that they should have a State of their own, called Jharkhand.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: If no separate State is given, they want to live in Bihar.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: We did not accept their claim. That is why they are still in Bihar. And my hon. friend, Shri Braja Kishore Prasad Sinha, cannot infer from this that the Adivasis are in love with the Biharis. There is a political ferment amongst them. They have been taught that they will be able to improve their position considerably if their areas could be constituted into a separate State. The Commission gave its very careful consideration to the arguments that were urged on this score, but it came to the conclusion that no

good would be done either to the Adivasi area or to Bihar or to the country by the separation of the Adivasi area. I was saying that the Commission has based its recommendations primarily on economic grounds and these grounds still hold. The Commission was aware of the fact that a Bill for the development of river valleys was going to be introduced in Parliament. It was aware of some of its provisions. It was discussed in this House last year. While it improves the existing state of things, I do not think it will be claimed by Government that the Bill will prevent difficult questions in connection with the development of river valleys from arising in future. There might be disagreement between the States in which the river valley is to be developed; and the Commission after considering the matter thought that when it had an opportunity of proposing a solution that would put an end to such difficulties for ever, there was no reason why it should not adopt it. I have listened very carefully to the arguments put forward by Shri Braja Kishore Prasad Sinha and other Members from Bihar. I have given full weight to them and have mentally gone over the whole ground again, but I have honestly come to the conclusion that no better solution than that recommended by the Commission can be suggested by anybody.

Sir, I might just say one word more with regard to the area proposed to be transferred to Bengal in order to bring about contiguity between north Bengal and south Bengal. When the Commission considered the matter, the maps that it consulted did not make it quite clear that even if that portion of the Kishanganj sub-division which lies to the east of the Mahananda river were transferred to Bengal a gap would still remain between north and south Bengal. Had the maps made this clear there is not the slightest doubt—in view of the reasons given by the Commission for recommending the transfer of a portion of the Kishanganj sub-division to Bengal—that it would have given some more territory to Bengal in order to bring about contiguity between north and south Bengal. Now, the Bengal Government has stated that in order to remove the gap between the territory to the east of the Mahananda river and the Darjeeling district, the Mechi stream should be accepted as the boundary between Bengal and Bihar. I have consulted the map and I find that there

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

is another stream which lies between the Mahananda and the Mechi. Both of them are tributaries of the Mahananda. Now this stream which lies between the Mechi and the Mahananda is known as Changa, and if this territory—it is, I think about six or seven miles wide—is transferred to Bengal, contiguity would be brought about between north Bengal and south Bengal. If West Bengal's claim is accepted, I think an area of 125 square miles with a population of 47,000 would have to be transferred to Bengal. But if the proposal that I have suggested is accepted, only an area between 70 and 80 square miles, with a population of about 25,000, would need to be transferred. I hope that this matter will be carefully considered both by the Government and by the Select Committee, so that the area that I have suggested may be transferred to Bengal, in order that the central highway which passes through that area may enable people from one part of Bengal to reach Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri and Cooch-Behar. This is absolutely necessary in order to prevent separatist tendencies in the northern districts. If my Bihar friends think that by opposing the transfer of this area they will be able to persuade the northern districts to throw in their lot with Bihar, they are mistaken. Two of these districts, at any rate will ask that they should be constituted into a separate State. They will not agree to go over to Bihar. And I am sure it will do no good to India if any arrangement is allowed to continue which is likely to strengthen such a separatist feeling and present the Government of India with a serious problem. The Government of India has such problems already on hand, and it will be doing no service to it to throw another such problem on its hands.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): Sir, I had no mind to take part in this debate, because I am in a very peculiar position.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You don't want to speak? Your name is here.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: I like to speak Sir.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the States Reorganisation Commission recommended the transfer of 3,812 square miles. But this Bill has recommended only about 2,500 square miles. After all, Sir we have to come to some finality. The

Government of India, after taking everything into consideration, constituted this Commission with three responsible and impartial gentlemen to go into the whole question of reorganisation of States. They went from place to place and made extensive enquiries. After making extensive enquiries they submitted their report. That report was examined by the Cabinet, and now this Bill has been brought forward. A number of difficulties suffered by the truncated State of West Bengal are attempted to be mitigated, if not removed altogether. Sir, in view of that, is it not proper for us to support the recommendations that have been made in the Bill and thus bring about an atmosphere of tranquility? So far as I know, the people do not mind this transfer, and they do not mind whether they are governed by Bengal or whether they are governed by Bihar. (*Interruption.*) It is no use saying 'No, no', because I also belong to that part. The whole point is this. Unfortunately the word 'State' has been used. We say 'Bihar State' and 'West Bengal State'. If we had called them 'provinces', these things would easily have been agreed to. There is no reason why we should not try to bring about a feeling in the country that nothing wrong is being done, and whatever is being done is in the interest of the country as a whole. We should not forget that we are citizens of India. Let us look at the question from that point of view. We should not allow selfish and narrow interests to come in the way of the interests of the country as a whole. I will appeal to my friends from Bihar and Bengal to apply their mind to the whole question from that point of view and to try to bring about a certain amount of friendly feeling, so that this Bill may pass the Select Committee stage and ultimately it may be enacted. That is my appeal to them, and I hope that they will certainly attach importance to this point of view. Of course, Sir, there may be some friends who may be making speeches from the point of view of future elections, or something like that. They may be wanting to put forward something from their own point of view. But I would appeal to them to look at the question calmly and dispassionately and they should support the recommendations that have been embodied in the Bill. And I hope the Select Committee will also take all these things into consideration and will come to correct conclusions. Thank you, Sir.

4 P.M.

श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज फिर स्टेट्स रिआर्गनेजाइजेशन बिल के ऊपर बहस हो रही है। जो बहस पहले भी हुई थी वही फिर रेपिटिशन में आ रही है और उससे भी ज्यादा उत्तेजित रूप में आ रही है। यह विल स्टेट्स रिआर्गनेजाइजेशन बिल के साथ ही लाये गये होते तो आज इतना एक्साइटमेंट न होता जितना कि है। इतने एक्साइटमेंट का कारण यही है कि यह बिल खाली बंगाल और बिहार के लिये लाया गया है और उसके लिये एक अलग सेलेक्ट कमेटी बनाई गई है। इसीलिये यह नया जोश पैदा हो गया है।

आज हम देखते हैं कि बंगाल ने जो इतने वर्ष तक सैक्रीफाइस किया और उसको जो इतने वर्ष की सैक्रीफाइस के फलस्वरूप एप्रिमियेशन और सहानुभूति मिलनी चाहिये थी वह नहीं मिल रही है बल्कि उसके बदले में एक दूसरा मनोभाव, एक दूसरी मनोवृत्ति उत्पन्न हो रही है। बंगाल ने अपने प्रदेश का पार्टीशन (बटवारा) किया। किसके लिये किया? पूरे हिन्दुस्तान की भलाई के लिये किया, केवल बंगाल के लिये नहीं किया था। बंगाल अगर उस वक्त यह एटीट्यूड लेता कि हम पार्टीशन करने वाले नहीं हैं, हम हिन्दुस्तान के लिये क्यों अपने भाई और बहन को और अपने प्रदेश को अलग करे, तो आज हिन्दुस्तान की क्या हालत होती? आज हम इतनी जल्दी स्वाधीन न हो पाते और हिन्दुस्तान को आजादी के लिये न मालूम कितना झमेला भोगना पड़ता। हिन्दुस्तान के लिये वेस्ट बंगाल ने इतना सैक्रीफाइस (त्याग) किया और इतनी कुर्बानी की। आज पश्चिमी बंगाल के उत्तरी भाग से दक्षिणी भाग का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है जो कि होना चाहिये। हमें बिहार के जग्गिये से ही जाना होता है और इसीलिये हम लोगो की डिमांड (माग) यह है कि बिहार का थोड़ा पोर्शन (हिस्सा) हम लोगो को दे दे। यह डिमांड इसलिये है कि इससे नार्थ और साउथ में लिंक (सम्बन्ध) हो जायगा और इससे हम लोगो को एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में तकलीफ नहीं होगी। केवल इतनी ही हम लोगो की डिमांड (माग) है। यह तो नहीं है कि हम बिहार को लेकर के बंगाल में मिलाना चाहते हैं और बंगाल भारत से बाहर जा रहा है। ऐसी सकीर्ण मनोवृत्ति भारत में कभी भी नहीं थी। यदि भारत में ऐसी मनोवृत्ति रहती कि हम क्यों देश के लिये, इसके लिये या उसके

लिये सैक्रीफाइस करे तो हम कभी भी उस जबरदस्त लड़ाई में सफल न होते जिसमें कि बिना एक बटूक को उठाये ही फारेन रूलर्स को देश से बाहर निकाल दिया गया; वह हम नहीं कर पाते और उनको हम बाहर नहीं भेज पाते। हमारे देश में एक यूनिटी थी, एकता थी और देश को बलवान रखने के लिये एक ताकत थी। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि आज वह ताकत आहिस्ता आहिस्ता निकलती चली जा रही है। आज हम बम्बई के लिये लड़ रहे हैं और बंगाल और बिहार का झगड़ा कर रहे हैं। यह सब नहीं होना चाहिये। बम्बई के लिये कहा गया है कि वह पांच वर्ष के लिये सेटर में रहेगा और पांच वर्ष के बाद महाराष्ट्र में ही चला जायगा। खाली पांच वर्ष के लिये कुछ सुविधा करने के ख्याल से ऐसा किया गया है, लेकिन वहां के भाई कहते हैं कि चाहे हमारी गर्दन चली जाय लेकिन हम इस पर सहमत नहीं होंगे। यह मनोवृत्ति क्यों हम लोग अपना रहे हैं? हम लोगो के यहां एक कहावत है। एक घर के सब भाइयो ने बोला कि हमारा हिस्सा अलग अलग दे दीजिये, हम घर से अलग रहेंगे, हम अपना हिस्सा मांगते हैं। ऐसा सब भाई अपने पिता को बोलने लगे। पिता ने सब भाइयो को बुला करके समझाया कि ऐसा करने से घर कमजोर हो जायगा, तुम लोग एक साथ रहो और घर को मजबूत बनाओ जिससे कि बाहर के दुश्मन देखे कि हम लोगो में यूनिटी है, एकता है और एकता होने के कारण कोई घर पर हमला नहीं कर सकता है। उस वक्त उन लोगो ने पिता की कोई बात नहीं सुनी और बोलने लगे कि हम लोग यह बात सुनने वाले नहीं हैं, साथ रहने से बड़ी तकलीफ होती है इसलिये अलग कर दीजिये। तो ऐसा इन लोगो का विचार देख कर पिता ने सबके हाथ में एक एक स्टिक दे दी और कहा कि इसको तोड़ो। सबने एक एक करके उस स्टिक को तोड़ दिया। इस पर पिता ने कहा कि अलग-अलग रहने से कोई स्ट्रेथ (बल) नहीं रहती है। तुम लोगो ने एक-एक स्टिक को तोड़ दिया है क्योंकि उसमें कोई ताकत नहीं है और वह टूट गई है। फिर पिता ने सबसे एक एक स्टिक लेकर के इकट्ठा कर लिया और सबको मजबूत बना दिया, तब कहा कि अब तोड़ो। उसको वे लोग तोड़ नहीं सके और उसके लिये बहुत परिश्रम करना पड़ा। इस पर पिता ने कहा कि देखो यूनिटी (एकता) का क्या फल होता है। तो हम लोग आज देश की यूनिटी (एकता) को तोड़ रहे हैं। इसका बड़ा खराब परिणाम होगा। इसका परिणाम

[श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री]
 यह होगा कि देश छिन्न-भिन्न हो जायगा और हमारी न कोई शान होगी और न कोई हमारा मान ही रहेगा। तो यह संकीर्ण मनोवृत्ति कैसे आ गई? हमें तो यह पता नहीं है। यह हमारा देश है, यह आर्यभूमि है। इसमें सैक्रीफाइस (त्याग) करने के अलावा और कुछ नहीं सिखाया जाता था। आज सैक्रीफाइस (त्याग) करने की बात तो दूर रही हम अपने भाइयों के लिये थोड़ी सी सहानुभूति दिखाने में असमर्थ हैं। कहा गया है कि "विनाशकाले विपरीतबुद्धिः", जब विनाश काल आ जाता है तो मनुष्य की बुद्धि भी विपरीत हो जाती है। तो हमारे देश के लिये क्या यह विनाश आ रहा है या क्या आ रहा है यह तो हमें पता नहीं है किन्तु विपरीत बुद्धि होने लगी है। अगर एक प्रदेश का कुछ हिस्सा दूसरे प्रदेश में इसलिये कर दिया जाय कि उसका थोड़ा बंदोबस्त अच्छा हो जाय तो इसमें इतनी गरज की बात क्या हो रही है वैसे तो बंगाल के लिये ८२,००० स्क्वायर माइल्स थे और अब उनके बदले में ३०,००० स्क्वायर माइल्स ही रह गया है जहां आबादी कितनी बढ़ी है और कितने रिफ्युजीज आ रहे हैं? यह रिफ्युजीज का प्राबल्य किस लिये हुआ? होल इंडिया के लिये हुआ, वेस्ट बंगाल के लिये तो नहीं हुआ। इसलिये रिफ्युजीज का सेटिलमेंट करने के लिये किसकी जिम्मेदारी है? होल इंडिया की यह जिम्मेदारी है, खाली बंगाल के जिम्मे ही यह नहीं है, खाली बंगाल की रिस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी नहीं है, इसकी रिस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी होल इंडिया के ऊपर होनी चाहिये क्योंकि होल इंडिया के लिये बंगाल ने अपने प्रदेश का पार्टिशन (वटवारा) किया था। रोते हुए या हंसते हुए या दिल में दर्द लेकर के किसी तरह से उसको किया और करके दिखलाया। देश की उन्नति के लिये, देश की एकता के लिये, देश की रक्षा के लिये हम लोग जो कुछ भी सैक्रीफाइस कर सकते थे उसको करके दिखलाया। तो अब इसके बाद रिफ्युजीज को भी हम लोग सम्भालें, हम लोगों को रास्ता भी नहीं मिले, और बंगाल के लिये यह नहीं होगा, वह नहीं होगा, ऐसी बातें तो चलने वाली नहीं हैं। और चलाना भी उचित नहीं है। हमारे बिहार के भाई लोग बोलते हैं कि बिहार के जग्गिये में अपना लिक बनाओ, हमारे बिहार से रेलगाड़ी निकाल कर ले जाओ। यह होने वाला नहीं है। इससे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में तकलीफ हो जाती है। जब रेल आती है तो बिहार की पुलिस खड़ी हो जाती है और उसमें बंगाल की पुलिस भी खड़ी

हो जाती है और उसमें झगडा होता है। कौन पुलिस को या किसको क्या बोलें। मभी अपनी डियूटी पर है। स्मर्गलिंग की डिफिकल्टी हो जाती है और न मालूम कितना झमेला हो जाता है। इसलिये थोड़ा थोड़ा हिस्सा इधर उधर दे करके जो कि पश्चिमी बंगाल का भाग है अपना बडप्पन दिखा देते तो अच्छा होता। आपकी यह उदारता देश के लिये उदारता होती; अपने लिये उदारता होती। अभी तक जो उदारता दिखाते आये हैं उसी उदारता का आज नमूना रखते तो इतना एक्साइटमेंट, इतना झगडा नहीं होता। अगर हम लोग अपने घर में झगडा करे तो बाहर के देश वाले क्या बोलेंगे। यह समझ करके झगडा करना हम उचित नहीं समझते हैं, इसके कोई माने नहीं होते हैं। हम लोगों ने यह कोई ज्यादा भी मांग नहीं की, ८,००० स्क्वायर माइल्स मांगा था और उसमें से ३,००० स्क्वायर माइल्स से भी कम मिलने वाला है और एस० आर० सी० ने जो वह थोड़ा सा ही टुकडा है देने की सिफारिश की है, उस थोड़े से टुकड़े के लिये यह कहा जा रहा है कि इसके लिये जान चली जायगी, यह हमारे लाइफ एंड डेथ का सवाल है, यह सवाल है, वह सवाल है? यह सवाल तो यहां उठना नहीं चाहिये था और यह कोई उठाने की बात भी नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूत बनाने के लिये ही स्टेट रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन बैठा था, इस कमीशन के लिये हजारों रुपया खर्च हुआ है और हमारे कमीशन के माननीय सदस्यों ने देश के कोने कोने में जा करके, तकलीफ उठा करके, सब सोच समझ कर बड़े परिश्रम उठा करके अपनी रिपोर्ट दी है तो हमें कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को मंजूर करना चाहिये और उसको बेलकम (स्वागत) करना चाहिये।

जो भी हो, बंगाल और बिहार के लिये एक अलग बिल आया है और एक अलग सेलेक्ट कमेटी बनी है। हम आशा करते हैं कि वह कमेटी सब बातों को सोचेगी। हम अपने बिहार के भाइयों से अनुरोध करते हैं कि वे झगडा न मचा करके बंगाल को यह टुकडा दे दें। बंगाल एक टुकटेड स्टेट रह गया है, इसकी भौगोलिक अवस्था बड़ी शोचनीय है और एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की अवस्था भी एकदम शोचनीय है क्योंकि नार्थ बंगाल में जितने टी गार्डेंस हैं उनके साथ पाकिस्तान का बार्डर है, नेपाल का बार्डर है, भूटान का बार्डर है। इतने बड़े बार्डर के बीच में अगर नार्थ बंगाल को और वेस्ट बंगाल

को एक न किया जाय और उसको एक व्यवस्था में न रखा जाय तो देश बहुत ही कमजोर हो जायगा। देश में या घर में अगर कोई दरवाजा कमजोर हो जाय तो उसकी सुरम्मत बरना जरूरी होता है। स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन ने देश के दरवाजे को कमजोर करने के बजाय उसको रिपेयर (सुरम्मत) करने के लिये चेष्टा की है। तो हम चाहिये कि कमीशन ने जो कमजोर दरवाजे को रिपेयर (सुरम्मत) करने के लिये चेष्टा की है उसको और मजबूत बनायें और इस तरह से देश को मजबूत करें। हमारा यही अनुरोध है।

SHRI M. M. SUR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the question of the demarcation of territories between West Bengal and Bihar has been discussed by several speakers and hon. Dr. Kunzru has also said that in considering the demarcation of territories, he has taken into consideration the question of language, administration and also the development of the river valley schemes but what about this huge refugee problem—the vast number of refugees that are coming in since this report was published? The situation is getting worse and you can see that the people who were transferred from Bengal to the adjoining areas are coming back to Calcutta and are crowding the streets of Calcutta and that is a great problem for the Bengal Government and the situation will get worse when further refugees will come. What consideration has been given to this particular problem—this problem that can be solved not by giving money but by giving more land? The portion of territory that was recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission has also been taken away. So what should be done is, not only that portion which was taken away should be given, but as Mr. Kunzru has now mentioned, for administrative convenience, in the Kishanganj area a little more territory should be given up to Mechi river so that there may be contiguity of territory.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Not up to Mechi but up to Changa.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kapoor, you want to speak?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: That is what I meant when sending the name.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you will be short. I want to finish this Bill today. How is U.P. interested in Bengal and Bihar?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: U.P. may not be but I am more interested than Dr. Mudaliar in Bihar or Bengal because I am both a Bengali and Bihari and something more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please try to finish before 4-30. You can have fifteen minutes.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, at the outset I would like to express my gratitude to my hon. sister Shrimati Maya Devi Chettry for having relieved me considerably of the heaviness which had been hanging over me ever since this Bill had been introduced in this House, by the very homely and patriotic advice which she has tendered to all of us by quoting a very homely story that in unity lies our strength. I hope her advice will go home both to Members from Bihar and Bengal, as a matter of fact, to every Member of this House to whichever State he belongs. Because that advice will be useful when we consider the other Bill which is shortly to come before us....

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: When we consider the case of Baghelkhand.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I have been feeling very sad over this measure because associated as I have been both with Bengal and Bihar for very many years, it hurts me very much to see the Bengali and the Bihari fighting in a manner the exhibition of which we had in the House today and also on a previous occasion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You did not hear Mr. Sinha.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I think it was not something very fine which I should have heard. This Bill has arisen out of tragic circumstances. I call it tragic because not long ago we had rather the very pleasant and happy news that the Chief Ministers both of Bengal and Bihar had arrived at a sort of settlement, the result of which would have been that Bengal and Bihar would have stood united today. It is tragic indeed that this patriotic and pious wish could not fructify and the result is that we find before us representatives of Bihar and Bengal quarrelling with one another as if they belong to two different countries. I consider this Bill neither to be in the interest of Bihar nor to be in the interest of

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.]
Bengal and I would request every Member of the Select Committee seriously to consider whether they should not report to this House and to the other House also, Joint Committee as it is, that this Bill should be withdrawn altogether. It is never too late to do a good thing. Let it not be said that in the matter of States Reorganisation we have gone much too far now and there is no use saying that we should retrace our steps altogether. The humble advice that I am tendering in respect of this measure I would tender in respect of the other measure also and I would beg of every Member of this House and also of the other House seriously to consider whether in view of the past history of the last six or eight months, in view of the bitterness that this question has created in the country, in view of the fact that this question has acted as an apple of discord in the otherwise peaceful atmosphere of the country, it is not worthwhile to retrace our steps and let things remain as they are at present, subject to one condition only that if there is any agreement arrived at between two States, that agreement might be implemented otherwise the *status quo* should remain. Sir, it was a sad day for the country when the notion went about—I should say 'notion' only—that the Congress stood for linguistic States because I have not been able to find any definite resolution of the Congress on the subject saying that the States should be formed on linguistic basis. No doubt the Congress Provinces were reorganised in 1921 or thereabout on linguistic basis but beyond that I have not been able to find from the records of the Congress anything to indicate that the Congress has committed itself definitely to the view that administrative States should be based on language.

The Indian National Congress has circulated to us copies of the resolutions on the subject of States reorganisation since 1920 to 1956. These are easily available even to those who are not members of the Congress Party, and if one goes through these pamphlets from start to finish, he will find it mentioned definitely what exactly was the view of the Congress. Soon after we had our independence, we find from stage to stage, the Congress and all the committees appointed by the Congress and even the committee appointed by the Constituent Assembly have been expressing themselves against linguistic States; rather against more than for the

establishment of States on a linguistic basis. The time at my disposal being short, I would not recapitulate what the Dhar Committee said, because as hon. Members know, that Committee's recommendation was against the formation of linguistic provinces. I would not also recapitulate what the J.V.P. Report has said. I will only come to the latest stage when we find the Indian National Congress recently at the last Amritsar session passed a resolution definitely committing itself to the view that in the larger interests of the country, the States should be formed, as far as possible, on multi-lingual basis. Sir, with your indulgence and with the indulgence of the House I would like to read out a few sentences from that resolution. I am reading out from the pamphlet which I have just mentioned. On page 21, para. 2, it says:

"More than thirty years ago, the Congress encouraged the formation of linguistic provinces."

They only encouraged, and in what way? "From the point of view of its own constitution", nothing beyond that, "and such Congress provinces were constituted regardless of State administrative units", because the question of administration was not before the Congress when it was re-forming the Congress provinces for its own purpose. And then in para. 3, it says:

If language is allowed to encourage separatist tendencies, then it does injury to the basic conception of the unity of India."

And then it goes on to say later on :

"If linguistic demarcation of the States leads to conflicts between the States and to considerations of provincialism, over-riding the vital necessity of the unity and the good of India as a whole, then linguism is overstepping its proper sphere and it becomes a danger."

And further it says :

"Any attempt to have rigid unilingual States will be unjust to the bilingual areas and will come in the way of the movement of populations which naturally takes place in a rapidly developing country. This unilingual rigidity will itself tend to fix an unchanging pattern in the country which may conform to a static condition, but which is wholly out of place in a dynamic and developing economy.

Even more limiting is the mental approach which results from narrow provincialism applied to political considerations and administrative boundaries."

And lastly, this is the most important part of the resolution:

"In the circumstances existing in India today and for the rapid development of various areas, it is desirable to encourage where possible, the formation of bilingual States, with regional councils for such linguistic areas."

And in the same strain, it goes on to say something more, emphasising that the good of the country demands that in the light of the experience that we have gained, we should have bilingual and multi-lingual States and not unilingual States, as far as possible. That being so, I want to put it with all humility, but with all earnestness and emphasis and I want to ask all hon. Members of this House and the Congress leaders, whether standing as we do by the Congress, should we not see that this decision of the Congress so recently arrived at Amritsar in the early part of this year is implemented even in relation to these two measures that we are considering?

Sir, let it not be said that we have gone too far. No doubt, we have gone far. And it is merely because of the fact that we have gone far, because we have travelled so much that we have realised now that we have been treading a wrong path. Is it the part of wisdom, I ask you to continue in the same direction? If we want to go to Bombay and after going a thousand miles we discover that we are going towards Calcutta, that we are on the wrong track, will it be wise for us to proceed further towards Calcutta, though our destination is Bombay? Should we not retrace our steps and come back to the point from which we started and proceed towards Bombay? Sir, wisdom lies in profiting by experience. Let no one stand on prestige. I do hope none is standing on prestige. I hope the Government is not standing on prestige, because from time to time it has been changing its views and rightly too, because there should not be and there has not been any rigidity about this affair. Now, when we have arrived at a stage, when we have definitely come to the view, as expressed by this

resolution of the Congress, that experience has shown that this language question has led us to fissiparous tendencies in the country which are threatening the unity of the country, leading us in a direction which is the reverse of the one we intended to go, then should we not stop and seriously consider as to what we should do now? Sir, I do not claim to myself the credit for tendering this advice. Shri Rajagopalachari, a wiser man than whom, of course, it is not easy to find in this country, has tendered this advice. The other day Acharya Kripalani tendered this advice in the other House. Many others in the country, elderly statesmen, have been tendering this advice, an advice which we find to be sane, wise and patriotic. What we find in the country now is dissatisfaction and disruptive tendencies growing. Sir, I have no doubt in my mind; and I hope this view of mine will be shared by at least all those who are present here, and also by those not present on this occasion, that if a secret ballot were to be taken from all Members of both Houses of Parliament the overwhelming majority would record their vote in favour of these measures being withdrawn subject to the condition, of course that where agreements have been arrived, there they might be implemented. I know in some parts of the country which are hoping to get some areas here and there, there may be a little disappointment at the suggestion that I have made. But by and large, I am sure hon. Members of Parliament will be echoing the wishes and views of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country if they vote in favour of these measures being withdrawn. Sir, have I a few minutes more?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, I have only one more word to say and that is to my friends from Bengal. If this suggestion of mine does not find favour with the authorities, with Parliament and the Government, though I still hope and earnestly hope that this will find favour with them, but if it does not, then I will earnestly appeal to my friends from Bengal to seriously consider wherein lies their interest. It has been said, and rightly said, that Bengal is in a tight corner because of the refugee problem. For long I have been concerned with this problem and I have been studying it in my own humble way.

[Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor.]

My advice to them is that if they alienate the good-will of the people of Bihar then they have everything to lose and nothing to gain. Even if they get this small area from Bihar, is that going to solve their problem? Surely not. Lakhs of refugees are coming in and many more lakhs have still to come if things continue to be as they are in Pakistan. Then where are they going to settle these refugees? Not in these small areas, a few hundred square miles but the whole of Bihar should be available to them. Even other States should be available to them but more particularly the whole State of Bihar should be available to them. Now, either they should unite with Bihar, as Bihar is prepared to unite with them or have good relations. With all respect I may tell them that not wanting to unite is a short-sighted policy not of their leaders but of persons who do not want to bring about unity of the country. Unity between Bengal and Bihar is a step towards the greater unity of the country. The greatest of their leaders, Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy was definitely of the view that it would be in the interests of Bengal and Bihar and the larger interests of the country if Bengal and Bihar could unite but in a weaker moment, if I could say so with all respect to Dr. Roy he yielded to—I do not want to use strong language—pressure from quarters which do not want unity of the country. That has been an unfortunate thing. A brave and bold man like Dr. Roy should have given up what he considered to be wise and proper in quiet moments is an unfortunate thing. I would beg of him and of other friends from Bengal to again seriously consider this question and agree to the unity of Bengal and Bihar. Should they not agree to this then they must depend on the good-will of the people of Bihar and not insist on small areas so that lakhs of refugees who come flowing from East Bengal may be allowed, in a very friendly and sincere manner by the people of Bihar to be settled in the entire State of Bihar. Otherwise, if this pound of flesh is demanded—I will not say this but say—if small areas are demanded from Bihar, what will be the feeling of people in Bihar? Mr. Ghose and even such a wise statesman as Dr. Mudaliar have said that for the settlement of refugees this small area is necessary as if it was, at the same time, sufficient. Bihar will say, "Well, you have this area for the refugees....."

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Kapoor.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR It is an unfinished sentence, Sir. Let me finish it. They will say, "You have got what you wanted for the settlement of the refugees. We are not going to allow the Bengalis to come and settle again in any border area, for we have learnt enough by experience. Whenever large number of Bengalis come and settle in the border areas, you will demand that area also to be amalgamated with Bengal." In the interests of Bengal, I appeal to them not to insist on getting this small area but to leave the whole question to the good-will of Bihar and I am sure, generous and large-hearted that the Biharis are—Bengalis are too not less generous and large-hearted—they will give ample space for the refugees to settle.

قاضی احمد حسین (بہار): جناب والا—

آپ کے سامنے بہار کے بارے میں جتنی باتیں آچکی ہیں میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ حکومت کو ان سے پورے طور پر مطمئن ہو جانا چاہیئے۔ یہ ہماری بدقسمتی ہوگئی کہ ہمارے خیالات دلی کی سرکار میں قبول نہ کئے جائیں۔ اس وقت جو صورت حال ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ بہار اور بنگال کے معاملہ کو حل کرنے کے لئے جتنی بھی صورتیں ہو سکتی تھیں وہ سب بہار سرکار اور ہم نے آپ کے سامنے پیش کیں۔ لیکن اس بل کے آنے کے بعد یہ معلوم ہوا کہ بہار کا کچھ نہ کچھ ٹکڑا اس سے الگ کیا جا رہا ہے۔ اس سے بلاشبہ بہار کے رکنے والوں کو بڑی تکلیف ہے۔ اور اس تکلیف میں سب سے بڑی بات یہ ہے کہ بہار کے عام لوگوں کے اندر بہار کی حکومت کے خلاف بڑا غصہ پیدا ہو گیا ہے۔ وہ یہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ انکی حکومت نے ان کو دھوکہ دے کر کے اور طرح طرح کی باتیں کہہ کر کے دبائے رکھا۔ اور انہوں نے وہ بائیں نہیں کیں جو بنگال میں ہوئیں یا بمبئی میں ہوئیں۔ وہاں کے عام لوگوں کا یہ خیال ہے کہ اگر ہملوگ بھی یہی کرتے تو ہمارا بھی بھلا ہوتا۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ انکا یہ سمجھنے کا طریقہ

صحیح نہیں ہے۔ لیکن عوام میں ایسا خیال ہے۔ اب چاہے یہ خیال اچھا ہو یا برا ہو لیکن آنے والے وقتوں میں اگر اس کا اثر ہو تو ہم سب لوگوں کو نقصان اٹھانا پڑیگا۔ یہ بات میں آپ کے سامنے رکھ دینا چاہتا ہوں جو کہ وہاں کی صورت حال ہے۔

دوسری بات جو میں آپ کے سامنے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ باوندری کمیشن نے جو تجویزیں رکھی تھیں ان میں پورنیا اور کشن گنج کے زبان کے مسئلہ کا خاص طور پر ذکر تھا کہ وہاں کی زبان اردو اور ہندوستانی ہے اس کے لئے کچھ نہ کچھ پروٹیکشن ہونا چاہئے۔ میں اس سلسلہ میں اس بل میں کچھ نہیں پاتا۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ سلیکٹ کمیٹی میں اگر اس کی طرف دھیان رکھا جائے تو شاید وہاں کے لوگ کچھ نہ کچھ مطمئن ہو جائیں۔

تیسری بات رفیوجیز کو بسانے کے متعلق جو طریقہ اختیار کیا گیا ہے اس کے متعلق کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ اگر کشن گنج یا دوسرے سرحدی ایریا میں رفیوجیز کو بسانا کیا تو اس سے بہت سی تھینکٹیز پیدا ہوں گی۔ جہاننک بہار کا تعلق ہے اس نے فراخدلی کے ساتھ آنے والے رفیوجیز کو بسانے کا انتظام کیا ہے۔ بہار میں جو بہترین جگہیں ہیں وہاں ان کو بسایا جا رہا ہے۔ مثلاً چمپارن ضلع میں جو کہ زراعت کے معاملہ میں بہار کا ہارت ہے، قلب ہے اور جہاں بہترین زراعتی زمینیں ہیں وہاں رفیوجیز کو بسایا جا رہا ہے۔ یہ میں نے آپ سے صرف اس لئے کہا ہے کہ بہار اس بارے میں جو زیادہ خدمت کر سکتا ہے وہ کر رہا ہے۔ لیکن اس سے یہ ناجائز فائدہ اٹھانا کہاں تک ٹھیک ہے کہ پہلے تو سرحدی جگہوں پر رفیوجیز کو بسایا جائے اور پھر یہ کہا جائے کہ اتنا حصہ کٹ دو۔ تو اس طرح کہیں بہار بالکل ہی نہ کٹ جائے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ جہاننک

کمیشن کا تعلق ہے اس نے بھی انتظامی ضرورت سے سفارش کی تھی اس کے متعلق کچھ لکھا بھی ہے۔ اب اگر سلیکٹ کمیٹی میں بھی آپ اس کا لحاظ رکھیں تو بہتر ہوگا کہ رفیوجیز وہاں نہ بسانے جائیں۔ ہم لوگ سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہم لوگ دلی کی سرکار کو مطمئن کرنے میں بالکل ناکام رہے ہیں۔ جتنی باتیں اور دلیلیں ہو سکتی تھیں وہ سب پیش کر دی گئی ہیں۔ اب میں غالب کی زبان میں اتنا کہہ کر ختم کرتا ہوں۔

”یارب وہ نہ سمجھے ہیں

نہ سمجھیں گے میری بات

دل اور دے ان کو جو . . .

نہ دے مجھ کو زبان اور“

†[काजी अहमद हुसैन (बिहार): जनावेवाला, आपके सामने बिहार के बारे में जितनी बातें आ चुकी हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि हुकूमत को इनमें पूरे तौर पर मुनमइन हो जाना चाहिये। यह हमारी बदकिस्मती होगी कि हमारे खयालात दिल्ली की सरकार में कबूल न किये जायें। इस वक्त जो सूरते हाल हैं वह यह हैं कि बिहार और बंगाल के मामले को हल करने के लिये जितनी भी सूरतें हो सकती थीं, वह सब बिहार सरकार और हमने आपके सामने पेश की। लेकिन इस बिल के आने के बाद यह मालूम हुआ कि बिहार का कुछ न कुछ टुकड़ा इससे अलग किया जा रहा है। इससे बिला शुवा बिहार के रहने वालों को बड़ी तकलीफ है। और इस तकलीफ में सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि बिहार के ग्राम लोगों के अन्दर बिहार की हुकूमत के खिलाफ बड़ा गुस्सा पैदा हो गया है। वह यह समझते हैं कि उनकी हुकूमत ने उनको धोखा देकर के और तरह तरह की बातें कह करके दबाये रक्खा। और उन्होंने वह बातें नहीं कीं जो बंगाल में हुई या बम्बई में हुई। वहां के ग्राम लोगों का यह खयाल है कि अगर हम लोग भी यही करते तो हमारा भी भला होता। मैं समझता हूँ कि इनका यह समझने का तरीका सही नहीं है। लेकिन अवाम में ऐसा खयाल है। अब चाहे यह खयाल अच्छा हो या बुरा हो लेकिन आने वाले वक्तों में अगर इसका असर हुआ तो हम सब लोगों को नुकसान उठाना

[काजी अहमद हुसैन]

पड़ेगा। यह बात में आपके सामने रख देना चाहता हूँ जो कि वहाँ की सूरते हाल है।

दूसरी बात जो मैं आपके सामने अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि बाउन्डरी कमीशन ने जो तजवीजें रखी थीं, उनमें पूर्निया और किशनगंज के जवान के मसले का खास तौर पर जिक्र था कि वहाँ की जवान उर्दू और हिन्दुस्तानी है, इसके लिये कुछ न कुछ प्रोटेक्शन होना चाहिये। मैं इस सिलसिले में इस बिल में कुछ नहीं पाता। मैं समझता हूँ कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी में अगर इस तरह ध्यान रखा जाय तो शायद वहाँ के लोग कुछ न कुछ मुतमइन हो जायें।

तीसरी बात रिफ्युजीज को बसाने के मुतल्लिक जो तरीका अग्लिनियार किया गया है इसके मुतल्लिक कहना चाहता हूँ। अगर किशनगंज या दूसरे सरहदी एरिया में रिफ्युजीज को बसाया गया तो इससे बहुत सी डिफीकल्टीज पैदा होंगी। जहाँ तक बिहार का ताल्लुक है इसने फराख-दिली के साथ आने वाले रिफ्युजीज को बसाने का इन्तजाम किया है। बिहार में जो बेहतरीन जगहें हैं, वहाँ इनको बसाया जा रहा है। मसलन चम्पारन जिला में जो कि जरायत के मामले में बिहार का हार्ट है, कल्व है और जहाँ बेहतरीन जरायती जमीनें हैं वहाँ रिफ्युजीज को बसाया जा रहा है। यह मैंने आपसे सिर्फ़ इसलिए कहा है कि बिहार इस बारे में जो ज्यादा से ज्यादा खिदमत कर सकता है वह कर रहा है। लेकिन इससे यह नाजायज फायदा उठाना कहाँ तक ठीक है कि पहले तो सरहदी जगहों पर रिफ्युजीज को बसाया जाय और फिर यह कहा जाय कि इतना हिस्सा काट दो। तो इस तरह कहीं बिहार बिलकुल ही न कट जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि जहाँ तक कमीशन का ताल्लुक है इसने भी इन्तजामी जरूरत से सिफारिश की थी इसके मुतल्लिक कुछ लिखा भी है। अब अगर सिलेक्ट कमेटी में भी आप इसका लिहाज रखें, तो बेहतर होगा कि रिफ्युजीज वहाँ न बसाये जायें।

हम लोग समझते हैं कि हम लोग दिल्ली की सरकार को मुतमइन करने में बिलकुल नाकाम रहे हैं। जितनी बातें और दलीलें हो सकती थीं वह सब पेश कर दी गई हैं। अब मैं सिर्फ़ गालिब की जवान में इतना कह कर खतम करता हूँ :

“यारब वो न समझे हैं
न समझेंगे मेरी बात,

दिल और दे उनको

जो न दे मुझको जबां और।”]

THE MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, since yesterday we have had a fairly long debate in which a very large number of hon. Members from Bihar have taken part and have discussed this question from their own point of view. Others also have contributed, and I am happy that Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar has also made a very valuable contribution to the debate and pointed out certain fundamental principles on which all such questions have to be approached. I am also happy to find that one of the Members of the Commission, Dr. Kunzru, has also made certain points clear. In particular, he stated that had certain further facts been before them, then perhaps they would have given some more territory so far as the question on which they were unanimous was concerned. Now, that is a question which has to be considered solely by the Joint Committee and the Joint Committee has also to take into account the principle on which portions in Kishanganj were recommended to be given over to West Bengal by the Commission. All these questions will have to be considered. Dr. Kunzru has pointed out that instead of taking the Mechi river as the western boundary, we might take a small rivulet which lies in between the Mahananda river and the Mechi river. This question will also be considered because when discussing the question of giving over certain portions to West Bengal, the States Reorganisation Commission have definitely stated in the Report that they would like to give only that much portion which is absolutely essential. Therefore, I am quite confident this question also will be considered by the Joint Committee.

Then a number of points were raised : fundamental question were raised and points of detail also were raised by numerous Members. I should like to make a reference as briefly as possible in the short time at my disposal to these points and I would submit to this hon. House the considerations that weighed with Government for bringing forward this Bill. I would not go into the very large question as to whether Government ought or ought not to have undertaken this great task of the reorganisation of States. Now, so far as that question is concerned, Sir, the Government did take a decision. They appointed a Commission. The Commission toured

throughout the country, and after spending great labours and study over this question they furnished a report, which was fully considered, and, as you must have seen, Sir, either in this Bill or in the other Bill, we have to a very large extent accepted the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission. Under these circumstances I should put it to the hon. Members, Sir, to consider as to whether it would be proper at this stage, after having taken so much labour, after having gone over such a long ground, to go back upon or entirely to whitewash or to erase what we have done.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Or to jump into a well.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: There is no question of jumping into a well at all. Let not my hon. friend speak in such excitement. India has passed through greater excitements and I am quite confident that Indian genius and your patriotism would take us through all these difficulties. It is quite likely that sometimes we have to pass through the cloud. Perhaps the darkest hour is nearest the door, as they say, and though after this Report was published we had difficulties, we had the exhibition of violence and other unfortunate things in different parts of India, I assure this hon. House that after the Parliament has taken a democratic decision regarding the nature of the reorganisation, all things will settle down. They have got to settle down because, after all, it is the accumulated will of all the hon. Members of this House and that, which have to take a final decision, and I have no manner of doubt at all, Sir, that within a few months, after the passage of these two Bills, things would settle down. Maybe that certain portions of the Bills or the Acts are not entirely according to our desires or the desires or wishes of certain groups, but then those persons and those groups have to accept the position. They have to reconcile themselves to the position and I am quite confident Sir, that all of us, all the communities in India are patriotic enough and are democratic enough ultimately to accept what will be decided by the two hon. Houses. Therefore let us not be panicky. Let us not be also overburdened by a sense of nervousness that India is almost at the last edge of the ditch and India will fall into the ditch. Let my hon. friends understand it quite clearly, Sir, that we shall outlive all such nervousness, all such exhibition of passions

and excitement because, after all, India's heart is strong, and the two great provinces of West Bengal and Bihar will, I am quite confident, rise to the occasion and have good neighbourly relations fully restored between them. That is the way in which we have to approach all these questions and the Sovereign Parliament of India has to take decisions on great and momentous questions. This is one of them after the achievement of independence. We desire that the boundaries of the States should be rationalised and the process of rationalisation has to go through in the higher interests of the nation and if for example, during this process of rationalisation there are certain things which are not entirely according to the desires of certain persons or certain groups or, I might add, certain States, even then all these groups, persons and States, I hope, would rise to the occasion and would accept and would carry out what is necessary because, ultimately, you and I have to understand that the rationalisation of the country is only a means to a higher end and the higher end is the economic and cultural development of India as a whole and also of all the separate States. It is to this objective that all of us have to turn our attention.

Now, so far as the various criteria were concerned, as the States Reorganisation Commission have rightly pointed out, language was one of the numerous considerations and not the final consideration, and in the terms of reference they were given a wide choice to go through the whole ground and to consider all the aspects and then to make their recommendations and therefore, Sir, the Commission was not appointed for the purpose of carving out linguistic States. The Commission was appointed for the purpose of reorganising the States on a rational basis. Language, of course, was a very important consideration and therefore they took the language into account wherever it was possible, and where the other overriding considerations were present, then naturally, Sir, the States Reorganisation Commission had to take the other considerations into account. All these facts have to be very clearly understood. So far as the language is concerned, often times when the language has to be understood as one of the criteria, then naturally what is the language spoken by the people and where it is a dialect whether it is allied to this language or that all these questions also had to be considered by the States Reorganisation

[Shri B. N. Datar.]

Commission and naturally, Sir, as the hon. Dr. Kunzru has pointed out, this is not a question of mathematical consideration. This is also not a question of mechanical consideration and therefore, so far as the language was concerned, so far as the history of the language was concerned, naturally you have to depend, all of us have to depend not only on the census figures but ultimately on those authorities or experts who have given us their valuable opinions long before the controversy arose. You will find, Sir, that that particular statement has a great evidentiary value in a court of law. When that statement has been made long before the controversy arose, that is the reason, Sir, why when the question of West Bengal and Bihar had to be considered, they had to take into account to what extent the Bengali population was there. They had also to take into account the nature and the affinities of the various dialects that were being spoken on these border areas. That is the reason why certain authorities had to be quoted, and my hon. friend Kailash Bihari Lal was entirely wrong in decrying these great experts who took into consideration a number of factors which we have not taken into account, and these books contain material of value for all time to come and they cannot be moth-eaten at all.

* Therefore let my hon. friend take this factor into account and if these factors are taken into account we will find that there is a certain amount of justification so far as the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission are concerned either regarding the northern belt or regarding the southern belt. I have here before me the views expressed by these various experts long before the controversy arose, in 1903, in 1931 and at other times. Therefore their value had to be taken into account when the Commission made their recommendations.

Then, Sir, it was contended that so far as the census was concerned, there was certain revision of the census or resorting of the census and that has naturally made the population of the Hindi-speaking people to a certain extent higher than what it was. Then we were told that so far as these books or pamphlets published by the Census Officers were concerned, they were the final word. In this connection I would point out to this House that so far as the

opinions given by the Census Officers are concerned—they might have been the highest officers; they might be superintendents or commissioners or Registrar-General—after all, they are personal opinions and all these books and pamphlets only supply to us certain materials from which we have to come to our own conclusions. I would point out to the hon. House that when the Census Report of 1951 was published, the then Registrar-General of Census Operations in India, Shri R. A. Gopalswamy, stated as follows in the preface:

“As explained already the views expressed in the Report are of a purely personal nature and should not be understood to commit Government in any matter whatsoever.”

This is quite natural and we have to scan those figures and ultimately we have to come to our own conclusions. Therefore I would request this House not to take it that whatever has been published by the Census Department has the stamp of authority so far as the Government of India are concerned. It is open to hon. Members to come to their own conclusions on the material that has been supplied by the Census Department.

Then I would also point out to the House that so far as Manbhum and other districts are concerned, they are not the only districts where this resorting was resorted to. Some time before this Commission was appointed, a question had arisen. After the 1951 Census publications were before the public we received representations from numerous quarters to the effect that so far as language slips were concerned they did not give proper figures so far as the villages were concerned. At that time it was considered that so far as these language figures were concerned, they should not be confined to, or given in respect of, different villages but in respect of certain tracts and inasmuch as there was this question of different languages being spoken on the border and inasmuch as the claim for linguistic provinces was already in the air, when these representations were received, the Government took a general decision to have the language slips sorted village-wise in a number of districts—they might be more than 60 or 70—so far as the different States were concerned. And Manbhum and other areas in Bihar State were some of these districts in respect of which this resorting had been ordered.

Now, I should like to point out some other matter I wish my hon. friend Shri Kailash Bihari Lall had not spoken in the way in which he did about Bengal. It is perfectly natural for hon. Members from Bihar to make very strong speeches so far as this particular claim that has been conceded to Bengal is concerned. That is perfectly understandable but in the very long speech that Shri Kailash Bihari Lall made, I found a vein of sneer continuously running, so far as Bengal was concerned. Bengal is a great State, and as I stated, Bihar is a greater State because Bihar has a greater history. Therefore I desire that in respect of all States—not only these two States—however small they might be, however recent they might be, we should not talk in this strain. After all, we are all Indians and we have to develop a feeling of oneness in the sense that all the citizens in different parts of India are one, they are our brothers and sisters and therefore with due deference to my hon. friend I should like to submit in all humility that he should not entertain any such ideas so far as Bengal is concerned, much less speak out such ideas in the unfortunate manner in which he did. After all, whatever is stated in Parliament is broadcast throughout the world and we have to be extremely careful. We have to weigh every word before we utter it when we give expression to our grievances. My friend, Mr. Sinha, made an otherwise good speech but he also ultimately brought in certain matters, out of his anguish at the thought that he was losing some of his own portions of territory. I wish he had not brought in other things. It is quite human and perfectly understandable that when one has to lose to another State some of his own territory, the sense of possessiveness is likely to come in. All of us are human. But let us understand what the point at issue is and why the Commission has recommended the transfer of certain areas, especially Kishanganj, to West Bengal. We might or we might not appreciate their reasons, but let us not talk in terms of hopelessness or despair or out of a sense of frustration. There can be no question of frustration at all and there is no question of writing an epitaph. I wish such highly unholy and inauspicious expressions had not been used. We are hon. Members of Parliament. This is the Supreme body, the highest body in India and therefore whenever we speak we have always to maintain a very high level, a level of perfect dignity and let us not speak in terms which

are far from that level; let us not speak in terms which are not born out of self-restraint. I am anxious that so far as Bengal people are concerned, so far as Bihar people are concerned, we have to be extremely careful and as Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar pointed out Bengal was the first so far as modern renaissance was concerned. It was Bengal in the East, and I might add, Maharashtra in the West—they were the two great countries—which first gave us lessons in awakening against foreign thralldom. Then other States followed, Bihar also has followed. We have all been following but we must give to Bengal its due. In any case let us not use a language deprecatory to them because after all it is quite likely that Bengalis may have their own weaknesses, as we also have our own weaknesses. But let us be careful and let us always use expressions which are born out of self-restraint and not out of frustration. That is my humble appeal to all hon. Members.

Then another expression 'corridor' was used. I would like that such expressions should not be used at all. It is not a corridor that is being given to West Bengal. Hon. Members are aware that when the Muslim League activity was started and when it was at its height, they claimed, possibly under the 1940 resolution of Lahore, that between the two portions one in the east and the other in the west they should be given a corridor. They went to the extravagant length of claiming a corridor running right through U.P., Bihar and other areas. So the word 'corridor' has to be understood very clearly. It has a technical meaning as pointed out by my hon. friend Shri B. C. Ghose. So that is entirely different from what is being given to Bengal. Here there is nothing like a corridor. Both the portions are portions of West Bengal. Unfortunately on account of partition in 1947, West Bengal was put in a very miserable and unenviable position of having three districts in the north entirely unconnected with the other districts in the south. That position was there and therefore the States Reorganisation Commission was perfectly right and justified in giving them—not a corridor—a portion, a minimum portion of land, as they have pointed out, for the purpose of establishing geographical connection between the two because on the geographical connection ultimately depends political expansion, industrial expansion and a number of other circumstances that are absolutely essential for the welfare of

[Shri B N Datar.]

the State. In this particular Part A State the two portions had been isolated from each other and it was only for this purpose that a strip of land has been given, that a minimum strip of land has been given. It is perfectly open to us to say that this should not be given. But the object should not be misunderstood, nor should it be misrepresented as a corridor. I am quite confident that this aspect would be taken into account.

5 P.M.

Then a point was made out that the Government agreed to retain two more portions in Bihar instead of merely accepting or complying with what has been said in the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission. I have pointed out why Chandil thana and also Patamda police station have been retained in Bihar. So far as Patamda police station is concerned, there is some misunderstanding. I would point out to hon. Members that Patamda is just on the border of Singhbhum district and the Jamshedpur town. The Tata Iron works are in the Singhbhum district and this water course, this Dimna reservoir, is in this particular area. It was considered that inasmuch as Jamshedpur has a great importance—not only inter-State importance, it is one of the great industrial centres of India of which India is proud—and inasmuch as Jamshedpur town and the Tata Iron works were to continue in Bihar, that particular place in which there was this large reservoir ought also for the sake of administrative convenience—mind you not for any other purpose—to be taken away from the Purulia sub-district which is proposed to be handed over to West Bengal. Therefore, you will find, as I stated in my opening remarks, that the States Reorganisation Commission as also the Government of India took particular care to see that as against the transfer of certain lands or certain areas to West Bengal, it was necessary to see that Bihar was affected in the least degree. And, therefore, it was that in addition to the Chas division, which was not recommended for transfer by the States Reorganisation Commission, we further went into the matter and for reasons which I have already explained the two portions, Chandil thana and Patamda police station, were retained in Bihar, for the sake of causing the least hardship or inconvenience to the interests of Bihar. Therefore, I would submit that even

in this respect we are not acting under the directions or in the interests of either the Tata Iron works, as was suggested by some hon. friends. We are not acting under the influence of any capitalists. Let that be understood very clearly. We are acting in the interests of the poor people. If for example this reservoir was in Bengal and the town and the iron works were in Bihar, perhaps difficulties might arise. And, therefore, before these two portions were decided by the Government to be retained in Bihar, we took the informal consent of the great Chief Minister of West Bengal. Now, something was stated about the permission having been taken just by merely communicating our desire to him. After all let it be clearly understood that so far as West Bengal, Bihar and the Government of India are concerned, we are on the best of relations and if for example Dr. Roy agreed to what we proposed, then it has to be understood that so far as this agreement is concerned it is based on his consent, because it was a just proposal that the Government of India made. Let not the other parties exploit what Dr. Roy has stated in one of the Legislatures there. He merely pointed out historically what was done. That does not mean that the Government acted in a cavalier fashion, as unfortunately my friend, Shri Ghose has put it. We never acted in a cavalier fashion because we are responsible to you and you are our masters and, therefore, we have to act with the greatest circumspection. And, therefore, I would point out to this House...

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That is what the Chief Minister has stated.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: What the Chief Minister has stated is being interpreted by the hon. Member in an entirely different way. Now, I would submit that this does not imply that Government acted in an arbitrary way and Government merely took the *ex post facto* sanction.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That is what the Chief Minister has stated.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The hon. Member has not understood it properly and, therefore, I say that so far as Dr. Roy is concerned, we had his willing consent because he believed—I may put it at the worst—that what the Government of India were going to do was the best under the circumstances and Dr. B. C. Roy is not a leader who will give in very soon. And, therefore, it must be understood that Dr. B. C. Roy agreed with

all the implications of such an agreement. In any case he just took it for his own party purposes. (*Interruption*) I will finish in two minutes, Sir, And, therefore, I would submit.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Did the hon. Chief Minister of West Bengal say it for party purposes?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The relations between the Chief Minister of West Bengal and ourselves are absolutely cordial. There is no dispute about it. And I am pointing out that the Chief Minister agreed to it not because the Government of India expressed a decision, but because he must have believed that Government's decisions were under the circumstances perfectly and inherently correct.

Now, Sir, lastly I would request certain hon. Members who made a reference to Bombay and who stated that Bihar was a quiet State but Bihar might go the way of Bombay and others if, for example their demands were not conceded or if this particular Bill was carried through, to understand that what they have stated perhaps they would not have stated had they known the full implications of what they stated in a weak moment. So far as all such statements are concerned, we have to be very careful to see that our statements, even indirectly or remotely, do not lead to the incitement of a feeling of violence. We have to understand that. About Bombay I shall not go into the question. There were a number of circumstances why Government had to take a particular decision that it did. But let it not be supposed thereby that a particular decision was taken in a particular place because Government did not agree. In other words, there may be no attempts even indirectly at a feeling, I am more anxious that hon. Members do not feel, that they are losing these parts so far as Bihar is concerned because they did not carry on any agitation, much less a violent agitation. Let not such a feeling be with any hon. Member at all.

Now this is not a question of agitation. It is a question of accepting certain things which are legitimate. It is a question of taking a decision in the highest interests of the country, though it might be inconvenient here and there.

Then, Sir, something was stated here and in the other House also about the

Muslims in our country. And a threat was uttered that these are the Muslim people, and therefore on the border we should not have a discontented class of people. That argument also I would like to deprecate. In the first place, I might point out that I have full confidence in the loyalty of all these Muslims in India. We have nearly 4 crores of Muslims. Even if a particular decision has been taken, that decision is not anti-Muslim at all, because after all, what is being done is to transfer that area where the Muslims are in a certain proportion to another area where also there is a large number of Muslim population. And I do not accept the position that the Muslims in Bihar are entirely different from the Muslims in West Bengal. After all, they are Indians first, and even to the extent that they are Muslims, the Muslims in Bihar and West Bengal are the same.

Sir, I have covered almost all the points except one or two. It was stated by some hon. Members that the word 'Province' should be introduced in place of 'State'. That would be entirely a wrong notion, Sir, because we are a Federation. The Government of India or the Union Government is a Federation of various States, and we derive powers to a large extent from the States. (*Interruptions.*) And therefore let the hon. Members understand this position quite correctly that to a large extent the States have given certain powers to us, and the States are autonomous. Certain powers have been kept with us, but that does not detract from the autonomy of the States. And therefore, under these circumstances, if it is suggested for certain reasons that we should substitute the word 'Province' for the word 'State', that would be cutting at the root of provincial autonomy.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: May I know whether he is enunciating this political theory on behalf of the Government?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I am merely explaining the position. We have got the word 'State' now.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: That is the hon. Minister's own theory, not of the Government.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: All that I am doing is that I am explaining the constitutional position, Sir. Let the hon. Member understand it clearly.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, I want some clarification. Had we not 'Provinces' under the old Constitution, the 1935 Act?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I would request the hon. Member to read the proceedings. The word 'Provinces' was there, but the Provinces occupied more or less a subordinate position. I am just explaining my views. The then Law Member purposely removed this word. He suggested that the word 'States' should come in, and this word was put in on the analogy of.....

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Even in Canada, which is supposed to be a Federation, units are 'Provinces', and not 'States'.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I am explaining what the then Law Member did. Purposely and advisedly he stated that so far as the various federating units were concerned, it would be better if the word 'States' was used, and not the word 'Provinces'. Therefore I would point out to the hon. Members that it is better to have the word 'States' and not the word 'Provinces' because of certain implications. And according to me, Sir, one of the implications would be to reduce these States to the position of subordinate Provinces or subordinate units.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): In a Unitary State the word 'Province' has been used, and I think the word 'State' has been used appropriately here.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: My friend points out that in a Unitary State the word 'Province' has been used, and that is perhaps appropriate.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. N. DATAR: So, Sir, I have referred to all the points that were raised, and I now commend this motion for the acceptance of this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters con-

nected therewith, and resolves that the following Members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee :—

1. Shri K. P. Madhava Nair.
2. Kakasaheb Kalelkar.
3. Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.
4. Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt.
5. Prof. Humayun Kabir.
6. Shah Mohammad Umair.
7. Syed Mazhar Imam.
8. Shri R. P. N. Sinha.
9. Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar.
10. Shri P. N. Saprú.
11. Shri Abdur Rezzak Khan.
12. Shri Satyapriya Banerjee.
13. Shri Kishen Chand.
14. Kunwarani Vijaya Raje.
15. Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.
16. Shri Govind Ballabh Pant".

The motion was adopted.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES (AMENDMENT AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS, BILL, 1956

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment and Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, 1956, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 24th July, 1956."

I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at sixteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 1st August, 1956.