

[Shri Datar]

proposed to bring forward the following items of business next week:

Bills for consideration and passing

1. Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, as passed by the Rajya Sabha
2. Jammu & Kashmir (Extension of Laws) Bill.
3. Government Premises (Eviction) Amendment Bill, as reported by the Select Committee.
4. National Volunteer Force Bill.
5. State Financial Corporations (Amendment) Bill.
6. Newspaper (Price & Page) Bill, as passed by the Rajya Sabha.

Financial Business

Voting of Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1956-57 and Demands for Excess Grants for 1951-52.

It is proposed also to provide for a two-hour discussion on the situation in the Naga Hills during the course of the week.

I am also in a position to announce, Sir, that the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill will be brought up for consideration in this House on Monday, 3rd September.

BIHAR AND WEST BENGAL
(TRANSFER OF TERRITORIES)
BILL—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further clause by clause consideration of the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee.

Shri M. P. Mishra was in possession of the House. Hon. Members can speak on the amendments relating to clauses 3 and 4 and also the clauses and any new clauses in relation to them.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र (मुंगेर उत्तर पश्चिम):
अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल शाम मैं इस सभा के सामने यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि हमारे कम्युनिस्ट (साम्यवादी) भाइयों ने भाषा को एक घमं और देवता की जगह दे दी है और यही कारण है कि आज भाषा के नाम पर सारे देश में वे खूनखराबियां करवा रहे हैं और जितनी खूनखराबी व कल्ले-आम और गड़बड़ी सारे देश में पिछले एक साल से हुई है उस सब की जिम्मेदारी, मैं समझता हूँ, यहाँ की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पर है और उसके साथ साथ चलने वाली कुछ अंग में प्रजा समाजवादी पार्टी पर भी है। और यह जो कहा जाता है कि पुलिस ने गोली चलाई और ज्यादाती की तो वह तो पुलिस ने मजबूरी की हालत में ऐसा किया लेकिन जो नौजवान देश के मारे गये और जिनकी जानें जा रही हैं, इस सारी खूनखराबी की जवाबदेही यहाँ की इन दो पार्टियों पर है और विशेष कर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पर है। फायरिंग के बारे में भी मैं कह सकता हूँ कि उनकी जवाबदेही है, लेकिन मैं उस पर भी नहीं जाना चाहता। अभी मेरे एक महाराष्ट्र के दोस्त, जो कि इस सदन के सदस्य हैं और रास्ते में साथ आते थे, कह रहे थे कि परसों महाराष्ट्र के खानदेश में कांग्रेस के एक मंत्री एक सभा करने गये थे और लोगों को समझा रहे थे कि जो द्विभाषी राज्य बना है वह हमारे देश के हित में है। कम्युनिस्टों ने बगल में दूसरी सभा खड़ी कर दी और वहाँ से रोड़े चलने शुरू कर दिये। कांग्रेस कमेटी के मंत्री उन रोड़ों के बावजूद भी एक घंटे तक बोलते रहे, वे अपनी जान पर खेलते रहे। नतीजा यह हुआ कि सभा समाप्त कर जब वह घर जा रहे थे तो रास्ते में मर गये। उनकी लाश भी अस्पताल नहीं पहुँच सकी। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह कम्युनिस्ट जो दृष्य उपस्थित कर रहे हैं उसकी जवाबदेही का फैसला इतिहास करेगा। लेकिन उन को इस से क्या मतलब ?

जैसा कल मैं ने निवेदन किया था, उनको एक मामूली सी बात जानने में कि हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हो गया १५ अगस्त, १९४७ को, इस उजागर सत्य को समझने में भी ६ वर्ष लग गये, पहली दफा उन्होंने इस दफा १५ अगस्त को देश की आजादी के उत्सव में शिरकत की, उस में भाग लिया। उन को इस उजागर सत्य को समझने में भी ६ वर्ष लगते हैं।

अम उपमंत्री (श्री आबिद अली) :
जब बुलगानिन और कृष्चेव ने कहा यहाँ आ कर कि हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हो गया, तब उन्होंने इस बात को समझा।

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guha) : On a point of order. When the States Reorganisation Bill was being discussed, the Chair had given a ruling that no reference should be made to the firing or the looting or shooting incidents in Bombay and other places. May I know whether all these incidents can be discussed at the time of this Bill, and whether a separate ruling will be given in this case?

Some Hon. Members : It is a new incident.

Shri V. G. Deshpande : We have heard many things, that the people are doing this, or that the police are doing this.....

Shri M. P. Mishra : I was referring to an incident that took place only the day before yesterday in Khandesh, where a Congress leader was holding a meeting, and he was almost stoned to death by the members of the Communist Party, who held a rival meeting just adjacent to that meeting.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East) : Incorrect.

Shri V. G. Deshpande : While speaking on this Bill, can we talk about firing in Patna?.....

Mr. Speaker : So far as the Bombay firing was concerned, there was the desire for a judicial enquiry into the matter. There were allegations on one side, and counter-allegations on

the other side, and hon. Members were saying 'I have got evidence on this side', 'I have got evidence on that side' and so on. Enough had been said about those firings, and I thought that was to stress the need for an usual enquiry. However, this is not the place where a judicial enquiry could be asked for and had. There is another forum also, namely the local legislature, where the matter could have been brought up. So far as this matter is concerned, the point is whether these people can live together, and what difficulty is there standing in their way. There may be a casual reference to an incident that happened yesterday or the day before, without going into the details of it.

Shri Sadhan Gupta : This incident was not in that area.

Shri V. G. Deshpande : This was in the Bombay State.

Mr. Speaker : I thought there was another Khandesh in his own State.

Shri V. G. Deshpande : He is referring to Shri Pataskar's constituency.

Mr. Speaker : Hon. Members will kindly refrain from referring to incidents in other States. So far as the other States are concerned, they are in charge of good men to take care of them. There are other hon. Members who may take care of those States.

Shri M. P. Mishra : It was a fresh incident that I was referring to.

Mr. Speaker : True; it may be a fresh incident. But what happens in Khandesh in Bombay is not to be referred to here.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada) : On a point of order. Can a false statement be made about the Communist Party saying that they stoned a man almost to death, which, if it is true, must be under investigation? Can the hon. Member say that the Communist Party in Bihar almost to death? **बिहार का प्रश्न** almost to death **जहाँ तक बिहार का false** **जाय का प्रश्न उस में से चला**

उस के बाद दो सदस्य प्रायोग के

Shri M. P. Mishra: It is correct. I have received statements from Maharashtra friends.

Mr. Speaker: That statement also is on record. Both the statements, for and against, are on record.

Now, hon. Members will confine themselves to the question whether any portion of Bihar ought to be given to Bengal or not.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं कह रहा था कि यह देश स्वाधीन हो गया, इस उजागर सत्य को समझने में उनको ६ साल लगे, तो यह बात कि केवल भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्त नहीं बनने चाहियें भाषा के लिये भाइयों का गला नहीं कटवाना चाहिये, यह बात समझने में तो उन को अभी कई वर्ष लगे। उन लोगों को यह बात समझने में ३० वर्ष लगे कि जिस आदमी को वे देवता की तरह पर पूजते थे, वह संसार के इतिहास का सब से बड़ा त्रासक निकला। लेकिन एक चीज में हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई बहुत भाग्यवान हैं। उनको अपने दिमाग को तकलीफ नहीं देनी होती है, उनको सोचने के लिये कष्ट नहीं करना पड़ता है। उनके लिए हर काम दूसरे लोग करते हैं।

Shri Sadhan Gupta: On a point of order. Is the Communist Party's line, or whatever it is, under discussion here? Well, let us have a debate on it.

Shri M. P. Mishra: Those hon. Members will always attack the Congress, and when those who have been attacked....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. So far as any particular party is concerned, members may be referred to; any Member speaking to any other party can

Shri M. P. Mishra: Communist Party is wrong, of the House is concerned. The speaker on the above relevancy. It must clauses 3 and 4 are on hand, and any new clauses, Their views them.

are wrong. They are partisan. They have not looked into this matter. They never went there. They never ascertained the facts'. All this can be said for and against the Communist Party.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): As for that, we shall deny it. But the hon. Member said something else.

Mr. Speaker: A general attack on the Communist Party is not called for; of course, during the election time, it can be done.

Shri K. K. Basu: Let us have one day for it. We are prepared to listen to it.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will confine themselves to this issue, and they can say that the communists have got different views.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे कम्युनिस्ट दोस्त कहते हैं कि भाषा ही असल चीज है जिस पर प्रान्त का ही नहीं, गांव गांव का बटवारा होना चाहिये हमारे गृह मंत्री ने कल उनको उत्तर दिया कि अगर हर केवल बंगला भाषा के आधार पर ही खड़े होते हैं तो हमारे प्रान्त के जो हिस्से बंगाल को मिल रहे हैं उन में से एक इंच भी उस को नहीं मिल सकता

Shri K. K. Basu: It is a wrong statement.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : Just wait.

. एक इंच उन को नहीं मिलना चाहिये। कोई आधार नहीं है कि उन को किशनगंज के दो गांव भी मिलें पुरलिया को बात भी मैं कहना चाहता हूं एस० आर० कमिशन ने जो आधार बनाया है, उस के मुताबिक भी पुरलिया का एक भी गांव पश्चिमी बंगाल में भाषा के आधार पर नहीं जाना चाहिये। कल भी मैंने कहा था कि अगर भाषा की ही बात है तो

पश्चिमी बंगाल को दार्जीलिंग का भी हिस्सा अपने पास रखने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। वहाँ पहाड़िया लोग हैं। वहाँ पर आदिवासी, नेपाली, गोरखे लोग हैं और उनके बाद उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के लोग हैं। बंगाली वहाँ मुट्ठी भर हैं। लेकिन कोई कम्युनिस्ट नहीं कहेगा कि दार्जीलिंग को पश्चिमी बंगाल से बाहर जाना चाहिये दूसरे सूबे में जाना चाहिये या उसका एक अलग सूबा बनना चाहिये। तो यह बात कि अपना प्रदेश बढ़ाने के लिये अपने प्रदेश के अलावा दूसरे प्रदेश के अन्दर की जगहें भी चाहिये, एक गलत बात है। यह कहते हैं कि सन् १९५१ का सेन्सस जो है वह ठीक नहीं। लेकिन तब भी कहते हैं कि वहाँ के लोग बंगला भाषा बोलते हैं। कम्युनिस्ट कहते हैं कि बंगला भाषा बोलने वालों को अपनी भाषा के प्रदेश में जाना चाहिये और वहाँ के लोग जाना चाहते हैं। अगर यह बात सही है तो क्यों नहीं इन इलाकों के लोगों की राय ले ली जाती है? बंगाली प्लेबिसाइट का विरोध क्यों करते हैं? एक मामूली सी बात है, पुरुलिया एक सबडिवीजन है। किशनगंज भी एक छोटा सा हिस्सा है। भारत सरकार को सिर्फ १५ दिन लगेंगे वहाँ के लोगों की राय जानने में बालिग मताधिकार के आधार पर वहाँ की वोटर लिस्ट (मतदाता सूची) बनी हुई है। मैं कहता हूँ कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी (साम्यवादी दल) बंगाल के दोस्त और भारत सरकार भेरी इस छोटी सी मांग को मान लें। वहाँ के लोगों की राय ले ली जाये, और मैं कहता हूँ कि पुरुलिया के उस हिस्से से जहाँ ज्यादा से ज्यादा बंगाली बोलने वाले हैं, अगर ४० प्रतिशत लोग वोट दें कि हम बंगाल जाना चाहते हैं, तो हम जहारी हाथ उठा कर उन से कहेंगे कि आप चाइये। और किशनगंज भी अगर १० प्रतिशत लोग कहें कि हम बंगाल में जाना चाहते हैं तो हम उन से भी कहेंगे, हाथ जोड़ झंडा दिखा कर कहेंगे कि आप बड़े,

प्रेम से बंगाल चले जाइये। लेकिन यह बात भी उनको मंजूर नहीं। घबराहट है हमारे दोस्तों के अन्दर, क्योंकि वह असलियत को जानते हैं। वह सोचते हैं कि एस० आर० सी० न दे दिया है, सरकार ने भी अपनी मोहर लगा दी है, इसलिये ज्यादा अगड़ा न बढ़ाओ, जो मिले ले कर भाग चलो। लेकिन ले कर भाग चलने की बात तो चोरी की चीजों के सम्बन्ध में उठती है। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इन इलाकों में जनमत ले ले। एस० आर० सी० का उदाहरण दिया जाता है, सरकार भी बार बार कहती है, पंतजी कहते हैं कि हमने सारे फंसले एस० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) के फंसले के आधार पर किये हैं।

Shri M. K. Moitra (Calcutta north-west): Is "चोरी की चीज" parliamentary?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member did not say that any Member is a 'चोर'. That is all right.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : हमारी सरकार की तरफ से गृह मंत्री बार बार कहते हैं कि हम ने जो फंसला किया है राज्यपुनर्गठन आयोग के फंसले के आधार पर किया है। लेकिन यह बात भी सही नहीं है कि सरकार के सारे फंसले उस आयोग की सिफारिशों के आधार पर हुये हैं। आयोग के फंसले बहुत बदले हुये हैं। लेकिन मैं आयोग के बारे में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। आयोग एक क्वासी जूडिशल बाडी (अर्द्धस्थायी न्यायक निकाये) बनाई गई थी। इसी लिये उस में एक सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज रखे गये थे। लेकिन चूँकि उन जज महोदय का सम्बन्ध सूबा बिहार से था, इस लिये उन्होंने उस में कोई हिस्सा नहीं लिया जब बिहार का प्रश्न आया। इसलिये जहाँ तक बिहार का सवाल है, न्याय का अंश उस में से चला गया उस के बाद दौ सदस्य आयोग के

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

बचे। उन के लिये मेरे दिल में बड़ी इज्जत है। पंडित हृदय नाथ कुंजरू ने आयोग में बैठकर फंसला किया कि बम्बई का प्रान्त अलग रहेगा, बम्बई शहर एक अलग प्रान्त बनेगा अगर महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात एक साथ नहीं होते। लेकिन उन फंसलों पर जब सरकार ने कुछ निर्णय किया तो उस के बाद वहां खून की नदियां बहीं। उस के छः महीने बाद कुंजरू साहिब जो एस० आर० सी० के सदस्य थे, पूना पहुंचे और बयान दिया कि बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में जाना चाहिये। जनाबेवाला, अगर वे एक साल पहले अपने प्रपंचे दिमाग को सही रखते और उसी दिन वह फंसला कर देते कि बम्बई को महाराष्ट्र में दे दिया जाये तो यह खून-खराबी नहीं होती। हमारे आयोग के यही सदस्य हैं जिन का नाम है श्री कुंजरू। जो पिछले दिन राज्य सभा में दौड़े गये और कहने लगे कि किशनगंज और पुरलिया बंगाल को मिलना चाहिये। उनका यह भी कहना था कि हमें अपना फंसला बदलना चाहिये.....

Shri Sadhan Gupta: On a point of order...

Shri M. P. Mishra: I am not giving way.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: It is a point of order. He must give way. My point of order is whether the proceedings in the Rajya Sabha can be referred to here. What a Member said in the Rajya Sabha cannot be referred to here.

Mr. Speaker: What happened in the Rajya Sabha need not be quoted. He need not say 'Rajya Sabha'; he may say 'in the view of an hon. Member there'.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : एक दूसरे सदस्य हैं जो कि बहुत बड़े राजदूत रह चुके हैं। पहले उनका यह खयाल था कि हमारे देश में द्विभाषी प्रान्त बनने चाहिये और गुजरात

और महाराष्ट्र को मिला कर एक प्रान्त बनाया जाय। यही आयोग का फंसला था और यह फंसला उनकी राजामंदी से हुआ था। लेकिन जब अमृतसर कांग्रेस ने यह फंसला किया कि हम द्विभाषी प्रान्त बनाये जाने के हक में हैं तो उन्होंने यहां की एक रोटरी क्लब में जा कर भाषण किया और कहा कि भाषाओं के आधार पर प्रान्तों की रचना होनी चाहिये। ये थे इस कमिशन के सदस्य जो कि यह भी नहीं जानते थे कि उनका दिमाग कब किस तरफ जा रहा है, वे अपने दिमाग में ही साफ नहीं थे। इस लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस बात पर आप गौर करें और मेरे बंगाल के भाई भी गौर करें। जितनी भी यहां पर बहस हुई है, जितनी भी सिलेक्ट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) में बहस हुई है, जितनी भी बातें सरकार की तरफ से कही गई हैं और जितनी भी बातें बंगाली भाइयों की तरफ से कही गई हैं, उन सब से एक बात तो साफ हो गई है और वह यह कि बंगाल का कोई केस नहीं है, उनके पास कोई दलील नहीं है, उनकी मांग में कोई औचित्य नहीं है। जो वह कहते हैं वह अन्याय पर आधारित नहीं है, वह अन्याय करना चाहते हैं तब प्रश्न भावना का, सेन्टीमेंट का उठता है। और इस पर गौर करना चाहिये। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या बिहार के चार करोड़ भाइयों के हृदय में कोई भावनायें नहीं हैं, क्या उनमें भावुकता नहीं है और क्या उनमें सेंटिमेंट (भावना) की कोई बात नहीं है। हां, एक बात जरूर है और वह यह कि बिहार के लोग चुप रहते हैं, शांत रहते हैं। और सब से बड़ी बात है कि वे कांग्रेस के प्रति वफादार हैं। इस समय पन्त जी यहां नहीं हैं, उनकी जगह पर दूसरे मिनिस्टर साहब बैठे हुये हैं। मैं पूछता हूं कि क्या यही कीमत है जो हमें अपनी वफादारी की मिल रही है, क्या हमारी वफादारी का इनाम हमें यह मिल

रहा है कि बिना किसी न्याय के, बिना किसी इन्साफ के, बिना किसी औचित्य के बिहार के ये हिस्से बंगाल को सौंपे जा रहे हैं। वफादारी की कीमत तो कुछ और होती है। उसका बदला तो प्यार में दिया जाता है, सहानुभूति में दिया जाता है। और यहां हमें पत्थर मिल रहा है !

मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि किशनगंज के पास बंगाल के दो हिस्से हो गये हैं। बंगाल के उन दो हिस्सों को मिलाने के लिए उसे एक रास्ता चाहिये था जो कि उसे दिया जा रहा है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह इलाका जो उन्हें दिया जा रहा है पाकिस्तान में था। यह तो हिन्दुस्तान में ही था। वहां एक नेशनल हाईवे बना हुआ था और उससे बंगाली भाई आते जाते थे और कोई तकलीफ की बात नहीं थी। लेकिन सरकार ने कहा कि हम उन को रास्ता देंगे। इस वास्ते उसने यह फंसला किया कि बिहार की भूमि और भारत सरकार का राजपथ, दोनों हम बंगाल के मुपुदें किये दे रहे हैं। हम से यह वादा किया गया है कि हमारे लिये पुर्णलिया में एक हाईवे दिया जायेगा। उत्तर में बंगाल को सड़क दी जा रही है, दक्खिन में हमारी सड़क छीनी जा रही है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां जो एक दो औद्योगिक केन्द्र हैं, जमशेदपुर है और धनबाद है, उन दोनों को मिलाने के लिए हमारे पास कौन सा रास्ता रह जाता है। मानो हमारे लिए तो आज ही, अभी ही स्वेज कैनल बन्द हो गई है, और कल से ही हमें केप आफ गुड होप से हो कर जाना पड़ेगा। जो सड़क बिहार की थी उसे बंगाल को दिया जा रहा है और हमें यह आश्वासन दिया जा रहा है कि हम तुम्हारे लिए भी एक राजपथ बना देंगे। बंगाल को तो राजपथ मिल गया लेकिन हमारे लिये राजपथ बनाने का आश्वासन दिया जा रहा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन्साफ हो और एक ही इन्साफ की तराजू होनी चाहिये। किसी के लिये

एक तराजू और दूसरे के लिये दूसरी तराजू नहीं होनी चाहिये। हमारे बिहार की आबादी चार करोड़ की है। सब लोग जानते हैं कि बिहार में उतने जोर का आन्दोलन नहीं हुआ जितने जोर का कलकत्ता में हुआ है और जिस में वामपक्षियों का हाथ था। आप यह भी जानते हैं कि बिहार के लोग कांग्रेस के ज्यादा वफादार हैं, वे सन्न करना जानते हैं। लेकिन जो उनकी इस मनोदशा को जानते हैं वे यह भी जानते हैं कि जब कभी कोई चीज बरदाश्त से बाहर हो जाती है और हृदय को चोट पहुंचती है तो उसके गुस्से की भी कोई सीमा नहीं रहती है। जो घाव हमारे दिल पर लगाया जा रहा है, वह नहीं भरेगा और इसके अच्छे नतीजे नहीं निकल सकते।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बंगाल और बिहार दो पड़ोसी प्रान्त हैं और बहुत देर तक एक साथ रहते रहे हैं। इन दोनों को एक साथ जीना और एक ही साथ मरना है। जो कुछ भी हो, वह सद्भावनापूर्ण वातावरण में होना चाहिये। मैं बंगाली भाइयों से निवेदन करता हूँ कि उन्हें जो कुछ भी मिले उसे ले कर भागने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिये।

बरमन साहब ने कहा कि दूसरी लड़ाई दूसरी किशत के लिए छेड़ने की बात किसी ने नहीं कही। उन्होंने अपनी बात को सिद्ध करने के लिये बंगाल असैम्बली की प्रोसीडिग्स (कार्यवाही) के सफा १२१ का हवाला दिया है। लेकिन मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह भागें भी पढ़ें और सफा १२४ को देखें। वहां पर डा० राय ने, जिन के लिए मेरे दिल में बड़ी इज्जत है, और वह एक बड़े नेता भी हैं, जो कुछ कहा है उसे मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग बड़े होते हैं अगर वे अन्याय करने लगते हैं, तो अन्याय भी बड़ा करते हैं। जब वे पाप

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

करने लगते हैं तो पाप भी बहुत बड़ा करते हैं। डा० राय कहते हैं :

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

इसी चीज को हमारे एक मੈम्बर ने ज्वारंट कमिटी की जो रिपोर्ट है, उसमें अपने मिनट आफ डिसेंट में कोट किया है। यह मनोवृत्ति क्या बताती है? यह यही बताती है कि चाहे इसमें कोई श्रीचित्य हो या न हो, हमें इलाका चाहिये।

पन्त जी ने कल अपने भाषण में हम से यह प्रपील की श्रौर कहा कि एक दफा तो तुम अपना सारा प्रदेश बंगाल को देना चाहते थे, लेकिन अब तुम एक छोटा सा इलाका देने से क्यों इन्कार करते हो। इसे तुम्हें चाहिये कि खुशी से दे दो। मैं उनसे एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिसका मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह उत्तर दें। हमारा यह जो सारा शरीर है, वह उनकी सेवा के लिये हाजिर है। लेकिन अगर वह हम से कहें कि सारा शरीर तो नहीं एक हाथ को काट कर दे दो, तो क्या यह न्याय की बात होगी। अगर हाथ काट कर दे दिया जाये तो सारे का सारा शरीर ही ब्रेकार हो जायेगा। तो अगर अब भी वह हमें यह कहें कि अपने इलाके में से थोड़ा सा काट कर उन्हें दे दो और बगैर किसी न्यायोचित बात के दे दो, तो क्या आप इसे इन्साफ कहेंगे? हम अपने चार करोड़ बिहारी भाइयों की तरफ से इन्साफ की मांग करते हैं। आप इस चीज को न भूलें कि हमारे लोग बहुत ज्यादा गरीब हैं और बहुत ज्यादा पिछड़े हुए हैं। मैं कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कहना चाहता जो किसी को कड़वी लगे। १९११ तक तो हम बिहारवासी बंगाल के साथ में जीते आये। बंगाल के ही हम बनाये हुये हैं और बंगाल के ही हम बिगाड़े हुए हैं। अब जो इलाका

मानभूम का बंगाल को दिया जाने वाला है उसमें कितने बंगला बोलने वाले हैं, इसको मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता। वह तो एक डिभाषी इलाका है। वहां पर मुकर्जी, बैनरजी, चैटरजी इत्यादि की ज्यादा से ज्यादा १५,००० की आबादी होगी।

श्री क० कु० बसु : सिन्हा कितने हैं, यह भी तो बता दीजिये।

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : मैं, अग्रधर महोदय, यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहां पर लोगों के साथ इन्साफ होना चाहिये। सरकार के तराजू के पलड़े दोनों के लिये एक जैसे होने चाहिये और एक ही तरीके से सरकार को इन्साफ करना चाहिए। आप जब हमारी सड़क को काटकर बंगाल को दे रहे हैं तो हमारे पास जमशेदपुर से धनबाद जाने के लिये कौन सी सड़क रह जायेगी? धनबाद और जमशेदपुर ये दो औद्योगिक केन्द्र हमारी जान हैं। यहां से दो हजार लारियां रोज चलती हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप कम से कम इतना तो कर दीजिये कि बागमंडी, झालदा और जयपुर के थानों को आप बिहार में ही रहने दें ताकि हमारे पास भी कोई सड़क इन केन्द्रों को मिलाने वाली रह जाये। इन तीनों थानों में हिन्दी बोलने वाले ७० प्रतिशत और ८० प्रतिशत के बीच हैं।

कसाई नदी की यहां पर काफी चर्चा चली है और उस पर काफी बहस हो चुकी है। सबका जवाब दिया जा चुका है। मैं उसमें जाना नहीं चाहता। आज जिस तरह से कौरिडोर देने की बात सोची जा रही है, उसमें, मैं समझता हूँ, कोई अच्छाई नहीं निकलेगी। यहां पर कैचमेंट एरिया की बात भी की जाती है। अगर इसी बात को लिया जाये तो गंडक नदी का कैचमेंट उत्तर प्रदेश में पड़ता है और उसी आधार पर हमें उत्तर प्रदेश से पांच जिले मांगने चाहिये।

श्री क० कु० बसु : से लीजिये ।

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र : लेकिन हम मांगते नहीं हैं । लेकिन जिन तीन धानों को मैंने बिहार में ही रहने देने के लिए कहा है उनका तो कंचमेट एरिया से भी कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है । कस्माई नदी इन इलाकों को छूती भी नहीं है । यहां पर ज्यादा लोग हिन्दी बोलने वाले हैं । इसी सड़क से हमें आना जाना होता है और यही एक रास्ता मानो हमारे लिए खंज का रास्ता है । अगर इस हमारे पास रहने न दिया गया तो हमें केप आफ गुड होप हो कर जाना पड़ेगा । क्या सरकार इस बात को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं है ? क्या बिहार के चार करोड़ लोगों की आवाज इस लिए नहीं सुनी जायगी कि वे चुप रहते हैं और वे कांग्रेस के प्रति वफादार हैं ? और चूँकि कलकत्ता में लालटोपी वाले बहुत शोर-गुल करते हैं, झंड़े उड़ाते हैं, ट्राम्प को बरबाद करते हैं और रेलवे-लाइन्ज को उखाड़ते हैं, क्या इसलिये उन की आवाज सुनी जायगी ? मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बिहार के लोग बड़े दुखी हैं । उन के दिल में बहुत दर्द है । वे समझ रहे हैं कि उनका प्रपमान किया जा रहा है । अगर उन की उचित आवाज इस सभा में नहीं सुनी जायगी, तो कहां सुनी जायगी ? अगर उसको यह सरकार नहीं सुनेगी, तो फिर कौन सुनेगा ? हम केवल यह चाहते हैं कि पंडित कुंजरू को छोड़ कर आप किसी भी व्यक्ति को इस प्रश्न का निर्णय करने के लिए मुकरें कर दें । वह जो भी फैसला कर दे, वह हमको स्वीकार होगा । श्रीमान् देश की सब से बड़ी संस्था—लोक सभा—के अध्यक्ष, आप, यहां बैठे हुए हैं । आप हमारी बात को सुनें । चूँकि हमारे साथ न्याय है, इस लिये सारा सदन हमारे केस को समझ गया है । कृष्णस्वामी भाई को छोड़ कर बिहार के बाहर के सब माननीय सदस्यों के हृदयों में बिहार के प्रति सहानुभूति है,

क्योंकि वे जानते हैं कि हमारी बात न्याय पर आधारित है ।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I deeply regret the tone and temper of the speech of my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat. Bengal's claim is not based merely on idealism and sentiment or mere communistic proclivity. It is an entirely fantastic charge and is a complete misrepresentation (*Interruption*). If my hon. friend who belongs to the Congress had cared to look at the S. R. C. Report he would have found out that the minimum demand was put forward by the West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee. What did the West Bengal Congress Committee want? I am reading from paragraph 673 of the Report.

"The West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee on the other hand claims at present an area of about 13,950 sq. miles involving a population of about 6.7 millions."

There is no communist nor any member of the opposition parties in the Government of Dr. B. C. Roy. What claim did that Government put forward? The Government of West Bengal confined its claim to a smaller area of 11,840 sq. miles involving a population of 5.7 millions. What the S. R. C. did was not fair, nor even just. It gave us only a small fraction of the minimum demand of Bengal and it was purely based on justice, fairplay and equity.

Our quarrel is not with Bihar; our quarrel is not with the people of Bihar; our quarrel is not with the Government of Bihar. Our quarrel is deep-seated; our animus is against British Imperialism, which deliberately played a dishonest role. Our quarrel is with Curzon; our quarrel is with Curzon and Hardinge and against those who partitioned Bengal and who annulled the partition. You know the Bengalis lived in a region which was a compact linguistic area. Today the Congressmen may say that the linguistic principle is all bad. But the Indian National

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Congress in its conjoint wisdom stood by Bengal in those dark days of Imperial repression and bureaucratic torture when Bengal unfurled the banner of freedom and resented that artificial partition. That artificial partition was simply created to cripple the Bengalis, to disrupt our homogeneous and compact cultural unity, and an integrated race. That is why they did it. We rebelled against that.

Sir, in the great speech of Lord Morely delivered in the British House of Lords, he thundered and raising his voice he said, 'Let Surendra Nath Banerjee shout; let Bepin Chandra Pal shout; let Bal Gangadhar Tilak shout; let even the Punjab Lion, Lajapat Rai shout, but this partition is a settled fact; it shall never be unsettled. But due to the conjoint efforts of our great people, backed by the great patriots of different parts of India, we could annul that partition. But, at that time, in order to penalise us, in order again to disrupt us, they resorted to this crude device, this unjust device, this dishonest device. What is this dishonest device? It is the device of adding Bengali-speaking areas to other contiguous Provinces. You may laugh at Dr. H. N. Kunzru; but you cannot laugh at the facts of history. You can laugh at Sir Fazl Ali or at Dr. Panikkar; but, you cannot ignore the basic facts of recorded history. The fact of history is this. Deliberately, purposely, wickedly and against the protests of Bengal's leaders, against the protests of Bihar's leaders, against the protests of the Indian National Congress....

Shri M. P. Mishra: But you never protested till the British were here.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee:against the protests of all national leaders, the British Imperialists tried to cripple Bengal and they deliberately tried to convert united Bengal into a Muslim majority area. Therefore, deliberately and perversely, they deducted some Bengali-speaking areas and gave them to contiguous

provinces. At that time we protested, the Congress protested, the Bihar leaders protested. The moral duty of national leadership today is to undo that wrong, to redress that great injustice. Our animus is not against Bihar. It is entirely wrong and a complete misrepresentation to say that some communist mischiefmakers are doing all this.

My friend was talking about one State and another. I am just coming from a city with which is associated the sacred memory of Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Patel. That city is today suffering from great frustration and resentment. Do not convert Calcutta into Ahmedabad; do not for Heaven's sake convert Bengal into Gujarat and throw our people into misery and resentment and frustration. I am not making a narrow, technical or merely linguistic approach to this problem. But I am appealing to this House. You may have a giant's strength; you may be a sovereign Parliament. I talked to leading Congressmen in Ahmedabad; I talked to leading representatives of the Congress Press, to the editors of nationalist papers; I talked to industrialists, capitalists and so on. Every one of them there is deeply resenting this attitude that Parliament which has got a giant's strength should have behaved like a giant. You have got a giant's strength; if you like, you can deprive Bengal of everything. Will that be fair; will that be just and proper? What are you saying? You are saying that this Report is dishonest. What is this Report? The S. R. C. Report says that it is a predominantly Bengali-speaking area. What is wrong there?

Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South). It was based on wrong facts.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am definitely saying that it is not wrong. They have said, 'Even according to 1951 census, the Bengali-speaking majority in the rural area of Purulia will be about 55 per cent (as against 28 per cent. of the Hindi-speaking people).' Now, kindly remember the words, 'even according to the 1951 census.' Why are they saying this? What is

the good of trotting forward for the consumption of Members of Parliament certain distorted figures in 1956? The 1951 census was challenged as unfair, cooked up, manipulated, unreliable, not only by West Bengal but by Bihar also. You will see the definite verdict of the S. R. C. It is not fair to say that Dr. Kunzru has misbehaved. It is a recorded fact. What is that fact? The fact is found in paragraph 644.

"The mother-tongue data of the 1951 Census have been challenged by both Bengal and Bihar."

Therefore, what is the good of saying 'according to 1951 Census'? My friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, I am told—I was not here yesterday—was misled by this summary. It has been given in one of the dissenting minutes, on page xxxvi, that in Jhalda Hindi-speaking population is 79·2 per cent and Bengali-speaking population 13·1 per cent. It is entirely wrong. For Heaven's sake, I appeal to the Parliament to understand that these figures have been manipulated or re-assorted out of the figures which stand condemned—not by Dr. B. C. Roy, not by the West Bengal Congress Committee, not by the Hindu Maha Sabha, not by the Communist but by everybody, by the Bihar Government, by the Bengal Government, by the Bihar Congress and by the Bengal Congress. What is the good of wasting the time of Parliament and saying that according to 1951 Census—by some re-assortment of the data made in 1956—that 79·2 per cent of Jhalda is Hindi-speaking and only 13·1 per cent Bengali-speaking? Proceed on to the 1931 Census where there has been no challenge, no question of political manoeuvring, and no question of States reorganisation. According to the 1931 Census—I have got the figures here—in the Purulia Sub-Division, Bengali-speaking population was 10,46,653 and the Hindi-speaking population was 62,269. Therefore, the Bengali-speaking population was 81·15 per cent while the

Hindi-speaking population in Purulia Sub-Division was 4·83 per cent. What is wrong when Pandit Kunzru and Dr. Panikar said "Leave aside those disputed figures, leave aside the figures which have been challenged both by Bihar and Bengal, both by the Congress Committees of Bihar and of Bengal, both by Dr. Roy's Government and by Dr. Sinha's Government, go by earlier figures, which are 81·15 per cent and 4·83 per cent in 1931"? You may remember that last time when I had the privilege of addressing this House, I pointed out to you that there have been sensational and almost miraculous figures given in 1951 Census due to some manipulation and that we have been the victims of such manipulation in Bengal under Mr. Suhrawardy's government. You know what happens when power politics gets into census enumeration. In that sub-division, Purulia, in the intercensus period, the Hindi-speaking population has gone up by 707·99 per cent. The West Bengal Congress Committee and other bodies that appeared before the States Reorganisation Commission pointed out that it was something like a miracle. It is a biological impossibility. It cannot go up to 707 per cent in the intercensus period. Therefore, they rejected it, I mean the Commission rejected it and stated that even according to the 1951 Census, it has a dominant Bengali-speaking population. They have recently published a book entitled Census of India, 1951, Language Handbook—that has just come in—on the Manbhūm Sadar (Purulia), Manbhūm District. These figures which are now put forward—I will not say misleading—are creating some kind of confusion. Kindly see the Introductory Note of this Language Handbook. It says:

"After the 1951 Census Sorting Operations, the Census slips of the districts of the Chotanagpur Division were kept in boxes and gunny bags and stored district-wise in a building at Hazaribagh. The Census slips of the

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

remaining districts which fall under the Bhagalpur Division were stored in one of the empty barracks of the Bhagalpur Camp Jail. The transference of Census slips from other buildings to the place of storage by unskilled hands has resulted in the mixing up of the slips of different tracts in many cases..... Some slips had also been eaten up or destroyed by white ants and other insects. These difficulties were sought to be overcome by reference to the National Registers of Citizens which were prepared by the enumerators simultaneously....."

Therefore, they admit that between 1951 and 1955, when this re-sorting was done, many slips were lost and some kinds of National Registers of Citizens—I do not know what they are—were referred to. But even there, the Superintendent of the Census Operations has stated that "There are also a few cases in which a majority of the slips were missing and the N.R.C. (National Registers of Citizens) was also not available". It is an amazing document and I am making this challenge with all seriousness and with all solemnity that it is a thing which is cooked up, which cannot be relied upon and which should not be accepted by this Parliament. Parliament, will be stultifying itself if it bases its judgment on this document (*Interruptions*). I am not yielding. Take for instance page 21 of this Book. There is a place called Raisa and the figure shown against it is 152, that is, all the people are Mundaris. Here is a Member of Parliament Sri Chaitan Majhi, who comes from this village and he was himself an enumerator and he says it is absolutely wrong. He is a purely Bengali-speaking man, but in this 152.....

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Patna East): He speaks Hindi also. (*Interruptions*).

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You will have your turn to speak. In this

page 152, it says all of them are Mundaris. The hon. Member says it is entirely wrong. He never recorded them as such. I do not know how this re-sorting has been done. Would you kindly allow me one more minute?

Mr. Speaker: Probably the hon. Member concerned knows both the languages.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am telling you that he was himself the enumerator. He recorded these people as Bengali-speaking; that was the original enumeration. According to him the original Census figures were that these people were Bengali-speaking. Now there is some kind of re-sorting, and by that re-sorting it is put down "539. Raisa.... 152 (other languages)", as if that is the true picture.

I am showing you another village at page 41, Jitan, from which my hon. friend, Shri Bhajahari Mahata, M. P. comes—he comes from Manbhumi South cum Dhalbhum. The total population is 401, of which 305 are Hindi-speaking, zero Bengali-speaking, 88 Santali-speaking and so on. He is himself a Bengali and he says that this is an absurd thing. It is not a Hindi-speaking area, it is purely a Bengali-speaking area.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea cum Santal Purgana): The hon. Member speaks Kurnali also.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What he has said in his minute of dissent is that it is entirely wrong to say that all these 305 are Hindi-speaking people and that there is not one single Bengali-speaking man there. It is a predominantly Bengali-speaking village. It is entirely wrong to say that there is not one single Bengali-speaking man over there. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga Central): Under whose inspiration this re-sorting has been done? Is it from the Government of Bihar or the Central Government?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am not going into the motives, but I am only stating facts. I am pointing out that even the Introductory Note says.....

Shri M. P. Mishra: Why should Shri Chatterjee quarrel with this? Will he have a plebiscite for that area? (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I do not think plebiscite is going to be held here; I am not taking a plebiscite here in this House. Hon. Members will kindly have patience. I have allowed opportunity for Shri M. P. Mishra to speak, and he spoke so vehemently. Another hon. Member is referring to published documents. Hon. Members may agree or may not, but he must be allowed to go on. This is not the way in which hon. Members should shut out any discussion on this matter. I will call other hon. Members on the other side also. As a matter of fact, I started with them. I said that those whose property is being taken away, according to them, must be given the first opportunity to speak, and I allowed them to speak. The others must justify their stand.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What I would very respectfully point out, Sir, is that the table at page xxxvi of the Minutes of Dissent of a Bihar member is calculated to mislead the people; it says—

"The following table shows the linguistic composition of the 16 police stations of the Sadar Sub-Division of Manbhūm which are proposed to be transferred to West Bengal, as has been found after the report of the S.R.C. from the village-wise re-sorting of census slips of the census of 1951."

The very Introductory Note says that the re-sorting could not be accurate and could not be complete because it says that some slips have been eaten up or destroyed by white ants and other insects.....

Shri Bibhutī Mishra (Saran cum Champaran) rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Member go on. I will call you later on.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It says that these difficulties were sought to be overcome by reference to the National Registers of Citizens which were prepared by the enumerators simultaneously. Here is a Member of Parliament, Shri Chaitan Majhi, who is himself a representative of the citizens of his own village, and he says that in those cases he had himself prepared the figures and no such thing as mentioned here was recorded by him. How are you to check up and verify this? As a matter of fact, if you look at the startling thing here, Jhalda, which is at page 3, you will find that according to the 1951 sorting, the Hindi-speaking population is 29 per cent, Bengali-speaking population 60·8 per cent, and the present resorting in 1956 says 77·6 per cent Hindi and 13·8 per cent Bengali. By resorting it becomes the reverse. It is a peculiar re-sorting. There must be some wishful thinking!

Stick to 1931. I have given you the figures. And if you like, I can give you the figures which are set out in the West Bengal Congress Committee's memorandum, showing all the Bengali-speaking strength from 1891 to 1951. It shows that right through it was a predominantly Bengali-speaking area. And I told you that in the Census of 1931 where there is the latest record, where there were no power or pressure politics, it was clearly eighty-one odd per cent. Bengali-speaking area.

Therefore, reject this 1955 figures. If you reject this, and if you have got the other data, I will submit that this is a perfectly honest verdict of the S.R.C. Really, they have done us an injustice by a little confusion over Chas. They thought it was on one side of Damodar. But it is really on the other side, this Chas thana. They thought like that because of the contiguity to Dhanbad. Possibly they were misled by old maps and so on.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

If there was any principle, the whole of Purulia sub-division ought to come to us, if not the whole of the district of Manbhum. What is the good of pointing to these artificial figures prepared five years after the so-called Census and then saying "condemn this report"?

My friends are laughing as to this catchment area and all that. I do not think there is any question of laughter in this. What has the Commission said? The Commission has said that already the West Bengal Government has undertaken important schemes of both flood control and also irrigation projects and therefore Kasai river is very vital for Bengal. Also, after hearing the Bihar Government, it has said that it is not so very important for Bihar. And it passes through Jhalda. If you take away Jhalda, you really hit the development of that project, and that is what they are pointing out. They have pointed out that thing very carefully—I am referring to paragraph 661 of the S.R.C. Report—that "The transfer of Purulia can be justified on the ground that it will facilitate the implementation of a flood control-cum-irrigation project which has recently been taken up in West Bengal. The Kangsabati (Kasai) river, which rises in Purulia"—it really springs at the Jhalda end—"is of no real importance from the point of view of Bihar, but West Bengal has already utilised it to some extent in its lower reaches, and now proposes to build a dam on this river near the Bihar border." Therefore, both on linguistic and administrative grounds, and also for the implementation of this important project, it is so vital for the lives of millions of people in Midnapore.

I am appealing to my friends: don't create any passion and don't snatch away the little territory which has been given to us in the Report. It is far far below the basic minimum demand of all parties and all sections. There is no question of

party politics or anything of that kind in this demand. Don't drive the people again to frustration and to say "Parliament has again done us this great injustice".

We demand redress of the long suffered injustice done by the Britishers. Do not let people say that when they are in power, when the Congress Party is in power, they did not redeem their pledge, they did not redeem their moral pledge which they had given when they were in the opposition and when they condemn the British.

What is the good of referring to this man or that man? You know that the greatest authority is Greirson who is neither a Communist, nor any oppositionist, nor a Congressman. He has said.....

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: What about the others?

Shri Syammañdan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Nor even a communist.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: My friend the Vice-Chancellor of Patna University, likes the I.C.S. man from Manbhum. This is what Mr. Coupland, I.C.S., who was Deputy Commissioner of Manbhum has said, and it appeared in the Manbhum District Gazetteer:

"The prevailing language of the district is the western dialect of Bengali known as the Rarhi Boli, which is used by 72 per cent. of the inhabitants."

I hope the Vice-Chancellor will listen to this. Will you then say: he is wrong? And Greirson is the greatest authority. He has also categorically said that this is a Bengali-speaking area.

Therefore, don't think that we are simply creating difficulties for insulting or hurting anybody. We were insulted and hurt, not by you or

by your leaders, but by the Britishers and the bureaucrats. You came to our rescue, and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru moved that resolution. And on 4th January 1912 your leaders specified the areas.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I challenge that statement.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What is the good of saying "I challenge"? Let my friends challenge from the house-tops. It does not matter. Here it is in print, and it appeared in "The Bengalee" of the late Surendra Nath Banerjee. It was signed by five distinguished Bihar leaders, and they had actually said which are the portions which have been unlawfully, improperly and inequitably taken away from Bengal and given to Bihar. They definitely said that the whole of Manbhūm should go to Bengal, that Dhalbhūm sub-division.....

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: On a point of information. I would like to know whether Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said this.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am not saying that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said this. My friends have not got the patience to hear me.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We have had patience for years.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am asking them to listen to me. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru moved a resolution in the Indian National Congress when partition was being annulled, that injustice is being done and all Bengali-speaking areas should go to Bengal.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Agreed.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: On 4th January 1912, five distinguished Bihar leaders, including Lala Parameshwar Lal who seconded the resolution moved by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, specified the particular areas which should be allocated to Bengal and which should not be given to Bihar or kept with Bihar. And the whole thing has been quoted in Mr. Moitra's Minute of Dissent. If you kindly look at it.....

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member say that those Biharis were liberal and these Biharis are not?

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Gajendra Prasad Sinha (Palamau cum Hazaribagh cum Ranchi): We agree provided any part of Manbhūm is Bengali-speaking.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What I am saying is there is the plighted word of Bihar, and I am appealing to the descendants of those worthy leaders, of Bihar to redeem their ancestors' pledge. I am glad that Mr. Jaipal Singh is here. They distinctly said:

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am listening to you.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: "As for Chota Nagpur, the whole district of Manbhūm and the Dhalbhūm pargana of Singhbhūm district are Bengali-speaking and they should go to Bengal, the rest of the division, which is Hindi-speaking remaining in Bihar."

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: He is just quoting what Mr. Moitra has said about that.

Mr. Speaker: I am not able to control the hon. young Member. If he wants to speak and he has got some documents or some other portions of the same document with which he can refute it, I will certainly give him an opportunity. Let him bear his soul in patience.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Let the document be put if that is true. It is not there. It is not in the document, what he is quoting.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. I will call him after Mr. Chatterjee resumes his seat. Let him say it is not correct.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am sorry, it has gone home! That is why he is so hesitant.....

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: You should be happy that it has gone home.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: As for Chota Nagpur....

Mr. Speaker: I want the House to inform me how much time we shall spend on these clauses 3 and 4 and the amendments thereto. Today we started at about 12 o'clock (An Hon. Member: A few minutes after twelve). We have spent about half an hour yesterday. Therefore, long before 3-30 we must be able to finish this matter and go to the other matters.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I suggest...

Mr. Speaker: One hour will remain for the next day, for Third Reading. We must conclude all the amendments today, and the clauses.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): Cannot we finish the whole thing today? It has been discussed and argued, I think, and all points of view have been thrashed out. Perhaps hon. Members would like to finish it today and start with the new subject when we meet again on Monday, whichever be the subject.

Shri K. K. Basu: Why grudge even a few hours?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not grudge. If hours can satisfy, I have no objection. But I thought hours do not give anything.

1 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: General discussion is not very different from the discussion on the clauses. As the hon. Minister said, we can finish this today. I will allow him about 15 or 20 minutes for his reply. Only clauses 3 and 4 matter; the other clauses are ancillary and auxiliary. Now it is 1 o'clock we can finish clauses 3 and 4 by 2 o'clock.

Shri K. K. Basu: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The matter has been argued all along. The House has heard the case of Bengal sufficiently.

Shri K. K. Basu: It has not.

Mr. Speaker: We will finish these two clauses not later than 2-30 P.M. Hon. Members will be brief.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: For the information of this hon. House, I should like to point out that the copy of this newspaper "Bengalee" in which the five Bihari leaders' statement was issued is still available in the National Library. The National Library is in Calcutta and I shall invite any Member who is sceptical that we are giving out a story to come there and see it with their own eyes. I will read from the minute of dissent of Mr. Moitra the extract from the Bihar leaders' statement:

"In accordance with the resolution of the last congress, (the 1911 Congress), the sound principle would be, as enunciated there, that all the Bengali-speaking tracts should be brought under the Government of Bengal and all the Hindi-speaking tracts under the Lieut. Governor of Bihar. According to this arrangement, the portions of Purnea and Maldah to the east of the river Mahananda—which is the ethnic and linguistic boundary between Bengal and Bihar—should go to Bengal and others to Bihar."

That is Sir, what we are asking. Do not treat us like an Oliver Twist; do not treat Bengal like a charity boy. Do not say that the claim is fantastic, non-sensical and not founded upon any reason. Great statesman which Bihar had produced have categorically said that Mahananda is the boundary between Bihar and Bengal. We have been given not even that; we are given short of that. But you are chaffing at that. It is not worthy of my Bihari friends to ridicule Bengal over that.

With regard to this Corridor question, I beg of you to remember that it is an entirely perverse misrepresentation to call it a 'corridor'. Who has demanded a 'corridor'? Are Bengalis so senseless or so unpatriotic, not

knowing even the A, B, C of the Constitution of India that we demand a corridor? Nothing of the kind; we do not demand a corridor. Dr. B. C. Roy's Government, the West Bengal Congress and all the political parties have said that in order to have real integration of the State, there must be physical contiguity established and not because we wanted a corridor.

Kindly look at the map. The whole position is because Pakistan is there.

Shri M. P. Mishra: Concede the same to Pakistan.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I will read Rajaji's speech. Kindly remember Rajaji's words, words of one of the greatest statesmen India has produced in modern times:

"Here is a province which is divided into two unconnected parts. Here is a southern part of West Bengal Province, and here is Darjeeling in the north and in between there is no connection, and let us have some connection. That was the proposition. It is not a corridor problem as was eloquently and graphically put, bringing before us all the pictures of the corridor problems of Germany and of Poland. It is a totally different thing. They want an administrative improvement in the matter of communications. It is really a question of communications and of bringing about a state of things whereby our general defence position and administrative position may be improved. This is the real and legitimate aspect in which we should understand this resolution. And from that point of view, I must on behalf of Government be ready to tell the House that the Government will have to consider this and must consider it very seriously and do all that is in their power. Let there be no mistake. It is not a Bengal problem. Nor is it a Darjeeling problem. It is an Indian problem."

1-05 P.M.

[**PANDIT THAKURDAS BHARGAVA** in the Chair]

So, it is not a corridor problem, but an Indian problem. It is a problem of India's defence and security. If you look at the map, you will find that after you go up to the Bengal limit, there is a gap of about 170 miles. So, it is not a corridor that we want. Our goods—jute and textile goods etc. are being smuggled into Pakistan. Unless and until the Bengal police and the Bengal authorities can cordon that border successfully, infiltration will be going on there. So, in order to prevent this daily and hourly smuggling into Pakistan of our goods, there must be this integration, integration not for a corridor, but for India's security. It is an amazing argument that I, as a Bengali, cannot go through Bihar for the purpose of going to another part of India. Unless you give some territory for the purpose of physical integration, geographical contiguity and administrative convenience, how can we prevent infiltration? That is our demand. There were some charges and counter-charges, but the S. R. Commission itself has said that this is absolutely vital for India's security and for strengthening the hands of the West Bengal Government to prevent this smuggling of goods into Pakistan. Therefore we demanded this. Kindly remember Rajaji's words. I am making a last appeal: Do not say, "because you have got a corridor in the north, we must have a corridor in the south." I ask, for what purpose do you want a corridor in the south? In one minute of dissent, it has been said that they do not want the transport of vital coal from Dhanbad to Jamshedpur to be disrupted. Is coal taken in bullock carts or on the heads of men? Millions and millions of tons of coal are required for the blast furnaces of the Tatas. You have Chandel and other ways; and, coal is carried by wagons and trains. You have the biggest coal fields one in Jharia, another in Bokaro and a third in Karanpura. From

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Bokaro-Karanpura they can get at least 2 million tons of coal. The world's biggest coal fields are in Karanpura. So, you have the biggest coal fields and you can carry coal by train without touching one inch of Bengali land. What is the difficulty that you are envisaging, I cannot understand. You are demanding integration, as though to check some smuggling there. Is there any Pakistan or smuggling there? For Heaven's sake, I ask my hon. friends from Bihar to appreciate that the two positions are not in *pari materia* the two positions are entirely different and there is no difficulty at all. Has anybody experienced any difficulty in getting coal even from the coal fields in Bengal, even from Asansol or even from the Calcutta side? What is the difficulty? There are coal fields in Central India from where you can get coal. I will read out what has been stated in page (xii) in the minute of dissent of a Bihar M.P.

"What holds good for Bengal should hold good for Bihar". But, we do not ask for any corridor; there is no question of repeating this oft-quoted maxim. Is there any smuggling or infiltration into Pakistan there? Is there any defence problem there? Is there any security problem there? Then, it is said:

"The transference of Manbhum Sadar will create similar problems for Bihar. The road and rail link between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur, Muri and Ranchi (the vital artery of communications between the industrial areas of Bihar) will be disrupted."

How will the rail link be disrupted? It is under the Railway Minister. Supposing that little chunk of territory goes to Bengal, how will the railway link be affected?

"For quick delivery, the transport of vital raw materials and fuel between the mines and the consuming factories in Bihar will have to pass through Bengal."

They have all along been passing through that area and there will be no difficulty in future also. As I have said, they have the largest coal fields of Jharia, Bokaro, Ramgarh and Karanpura and there is absolutely no difficulty in the transport of coal.

I ask this House to remember what has been said by Rajaji and accept that. And really if there is any question of justice we ought to have been given the whole of Manbhum. This adjusting and re-adjusting of census figures has created some kind of confusion. I do not know why the Chief Minister of Bengal has become so generous. Perhaps there was some pressure from New Delhi. I do not know why he behaved like this on this occasion. Perhaps there was some pressure from somewhere—pressure of big capital or some big men sitting here. That is why he surrendered.

But don't threaten us after you have taken away Kishanganj. The feeling in Bengal is, I may tell you in all earnestness, as if an atom bomb has fallen and if you again take away part of Purulia there will be another atom bomb thrown at us and it will be like Hiroshima and Nagasaki and so I appeal to you not to plunge us in that misery without justification, in that frustration which will not be good for anybody.

Mr. Chairman: Let me make an announcement. The following further amendments to the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill have been indicated by Members to be moved, subject to their being otherwise admissible:—

Clause 3—Nos. 61, 31 and 32.

Clause 3A—No. 34.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I beg to move: Page 2, line 26—

after "sub-section (2)" insert:

"by an authority appointed in this behalf by the Central Government".

Sbri R. Mahata (Manbhum South cum Dhalbhum): I beg to move:

(i) Pages 2 and 3—

omit lines 35 to 40 and 1 to 5 respectively.

(ii) Page 3, line 9—

for "Purulia" substitute "Manbhum"

(iii) Page 3—

after line 14, insert:

"3A. The demarcation of boundaries as mentioned in sub-section (5) of the Section 3 shall be made in the following manner:—

(a) A thorough re-examination shall be made of the linguistic position of such territories as are specified in the sub-section (5) of the Section 3 and of all other pertinent questions relating to them, and for this purpose a suitable body of twelve persons shall be set up by the Government of India, with personnel, official and non-official in equal proportions from amongst men renowned for their integrity and capacity, which shall undertake the work of such re-examination and which shall, for this purpose, study carefully all the material including facts and figures concerned that were submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission, and would demarcate the linguistic boundaries of Bihar and West Bengal with regard to the territories specified in sub-section (5) of section 3;

(b) The Government of India shall set up one or more fact-finding committee or committees with impartial and able men, official and non-official in equal proportions, which shall help the said body in their re-examination work contemplated in clause (a), by assisting them in ascertaining the linguistic position of these territories, going personally to such parts of these territories as would require their personal

visits; and these fact-finding committees shall, thereby, examine all the contentions and controversies about and find out the truth in regard to, the linguistic position of various sections therein, the position of subsidiary languages of the bilingual people, the position and nature of the local dialects thereof, including that of tribal people therein, taking such help from renowned linguists of the country as would be required for ascertaining the truth.

(c) Such transfer of any portion of these territories shall not come into conflict with any practical administrative convenience in those territories and with the security of India as a whole, the question of which will ultimately be decided by the Government of India, after ascertaining the views of the body to be set up under the clause (a).

(d) Prior to the visits contemplated above the fact-finding committee or committees shall invite all those who submitted memoranda to the States Reorganisation Commission to join, watch and help the work of fact-finding as referred to in a clause (b).

(e) In the demarcation of the linguistic boundaries as would be made by the aforesaid body as mentioned in the clause (a), clear simple majority of the persons speaking any of the languages specified in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution would be the criterion and in regard to the persons speaking of any dialect, it will be considered as to what language it is akin to and in what language their educational, cultural and social life are being conducted or should be conducted for their speedy progress and their convenience.

(f) The Government of India shall make suitable provisions for

[Shri B. Mahata]

the expenses that would be incurred by the aforesaid body as well as by the fact-finding Committees mentioned in the clauses (a) and (b) for conducting their work as specified in the above mentioned clauses of this section; and shall also make arrangements for providing such official staff as would be required by that body and the fact-finding Committees;

(g) The Government of India shall clearly state the reasons justifying their such of their decisions, as would be made in accordance with the above-mentioned clauses of this section, with regard to any of the territories specified in sub-section (5) of the section 3 and as would not comply with the provisions made in the sub-section (5) of the Section 3 and clauses under Section 3A.

(h) That the Government of India shall take necessary measures to examine all charges, along with reasons and facts therefor, made in the memoranda submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission and to the Government of India by the people of Bihar and West Bengal, that their demands and cases have not been dealt with by the Commission impartially, properly and on sound principles as well as on the very principles that the Commission themselves laid down; and after the examination of all these charges, through proper enquiries, made in accordance with proper procedure, the Government of India shall give their clear verdict over these matters within six months from the appointed day."

Mr. Chairman: These amendments are before the House.

Shri Syamandan Sabaya: Sir, at one time when I was a zamindar and had occasion to know about lawyers and litigation I heard a story. The story was that an eminent lawyer was addressing the High Court and in sup-

port of his case he has stated that "what better justice could be administered when the jurors in this case are two eminent educationists? No more impartial, no more learned and no more capable jurors would be available and, therefore, the High Court should not interfere with the judgment at all in consultation and in concurrence with the jurors' view". The very following day the lawyer had to appear again. Unfortunately or fortunately for him, in the other case also there were these educationists, who were the jurors. But in that case he had to appeal to the High Court against the decision of the jurors and he said: "Sir, our educationists are very good as a whole. But what do they know of litigation, about criminal cases, about Indian Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code? Their opinions on such matters are not worth the paper on which it is written." The judge asked: "Well, yesterday you said that they are the best and able jurors. What has happened in the 24 hours to make you change your opinion now? He said: "Sir, I do not represent the educationists in this court; I represent my client." I need not go further.

Now, listening to the very able argument of my hon. friend, Mr. Chatterjee, this morning, I had some kind of feeling like that which reminded me of the story of the lawyer. In the first place he has made out a case that if you don't hand over this portion of Purnea to Bengal, the smuggling will go on, defence problems will be affected and infiltration will continue. Of course, these are not home matters; they are international matters with Pakistan on one side and Hindustan on the other. So, there is some justification for Bengal to claim this portion. But why on earth do you claim a similar thing in Purulia and Southern Manbhum? I thought he said it is a simple matter; he would appreciate it than we do in Bihar. If the Purulia area is

claimed because of the international situation, defence, smuggling and infiltration, in the Manbhum area he gives a bit of his advice—and rightly so, because he is an able lawyer and ex-judge of a High Court and we will hear him with all regard—that although this area falls in Bihar, “We must have the catchment area for the river”. Then he says: why are you talking about the corridor? Who has asked for the corridor? We do not want any corridor. But when this question comes, he says: After all, it will be the Indian Union and this land will be in Bengal. May I humbly enquire from him, respectfully enquire from him: why is he afraid if this portion remains in Bihar? What will happen to this catchment area? Will the Bihar Government put up a heavy bund, get a portion of the Himalayas and settle it there so that nothing can be done in the catchment area? I was just meeting the argument. He has not made out any special case so far as Manbhum is concerned and so far as other areas of Manbhum district is concerned.

Individually, not as belonging to Bihar, but as a Member of this House, I have always felt sad at the manner in which the debate on this question has gone on. Therefore, now I do not like to refer to that at all. I look at the whole problem from one angle. Get what is your need, but please don't argue; at one time I asked for 15,000 sq. miles; I brought it down to 11,000 sq. miles. Then I brought it down to 8,000 sq. miles. Even that did not stay and the S.R.C. gave us 3,8000 sq. miles. Now willy-nilly pressure, capitalism, communism and all that sort of thing has reduced it to 3,200 sq. miles and, therefore, nothing more should be reduced. That, I submit, will not be an argument worthy of the situation nor even worthy of the great State of Bengal. There is no doubt in my mind that the lead which Bengal has given to this country is a monumental one to be recorded in the history with golden letters; no one can deny that. We who live in that part of

India have always considered Calcutta as our Mecca. Therefore, I submit that this matter should be looked at from the point of need. It is not a question of taking a part of a State and giving it to another. Nothing of the kind. It is the simple question of : what is most convenient, what is most desirable and what is the immediate need of a particular area?

Now, my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee assailed the figures of census and has referred to previous census reports of 1931 and 1884 and things like that. This problem could be, in my opinion, easily conceived and even more easily settled. The difference in number arises not from the counting of heads of those who are Bengalis or Biharis but the difficulty really is that in this part of the State, the people inhabiting that area generally speak Kurmali language. I have no doubt that my hon. friend Mr. Brajahari Mahata will admit that the language which he speaks in his household or the other people speak in the village is Kurmali. There has been difference of opinion as to whether Kurmali is allied to Hindi or it is allied to Bengali. Several views have been expressed and my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee has quoted Dr. Grearson. But Dr. Grearson himself later—I shall place that record before you on the Table of the House and Mr. Chatterjee could verify it—, after making that statement, has stated that on closer verification of the matter he thought that Kurmali was more skin to Hindi than to Bengali.

Those things apart, the real question is that in that area the Kurmali-speaking people are in a prepondering majority. We do not dispute whether it is Hindi or Bengali and it could not be said with any certainty that it is Bengali and not Hindi or that it is Hindi and not Bengali. We, on this side, claim that it is Hindi. Shri Brajahari Mahata himself will admit that in his family, while he

[Shri Syamnandan Sahayan]

talks with his brother, daughter, son or wife, he normally talks in Kurmali language. In fact, it does not need any great argument. If Kurmali language is spoken here and someone speaks Hindi and somebody else speaks Bengali. . . .

Shri K. K. Basu: You do not know . . . (Interruption).

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Mr. Basu, you are a very clever man. You have all your property in Bihar. Because, you live in Bengal, therefore you talk like that.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. No mutual talk like that is permitted. It will spoil the atmosphere of the debate.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: That is the thing which makes the difference. It is the larger population of Kurmali-speaking people there which alters this record. Apparently, when the records are produced, everyone feels, how could this Bengali-speaking population be reduced from so much to so much? It is not a question of being reduced. It is a question of how the Kurmali language has been considered by the census report.

The other point which my friend Shri Chatterjee took was with regard to the resolution passed at the Congress and also with regard to the statements issued by our leaders from Bihar—respected leaders; even now their names are a matter of pride and great significance to my State. But let us see what they actually said.

It is said here:

“Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru who moved this resolution no doubt mentioned that he had been assured by his Bengali friends that Manbhum was a Bengali-speaking area, but he qualified his statement by adding:”

Sir, I am quoting the language which he himself uttered.

“I should be very slow in giving my personal opinion in any matter relating to the readjustment of a Province with the geography of which I was not perfectly and personally familiar.”

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru was thus not speaking from his personal knowledge. His Bengali friends had given him the impression that Manbhum really constituted a Bengali-speaking majority. Similarly, Dr. Sinha, after that statement which was published—of course, that was published in Bengali which I have not seen, but I agree that Shri Chatterjee is satisfied that it is a genuine document and I will not dispute the *bona fide* of that—a little time ago—I do not know which year he mentioned—himself under his signature submitted a memorandum to the President of the Constituent Assembly, and later on to the Government of India, in which he very clearly, very specifically, without equivocation stated normally what the position with regard to Manbhum, Talbhum and Santhal Parganas is. I have got a copy of that with me, which I shall lay* before the House so that it may not be construed as a document which was wanting in genuineness.

It will thus be seen why at one time a statement might have been made. As I said, if Shri Chatterjee is satisfied, then certainly I will not dispute it. Being a colleague of mine and knowing him as I do, I am sure he will not say a thing about which he himself was not satisfied. After all, on many occasions, as I said in a speech previously here, Dr. Roy, Sir Nalini Ranjan Sirkar and various other persons made statements and later on, after reviewing the situation, they altered the position with regard to linguistic matter. Both Dr. Roy and Sir Nalini Ranjan Sirkar have made unequivocal statements that to demand the creation of a province on

*On examination the document was not found admissible by the Speaker and it was returned to the Member.

linguistic grounds is not a nationalistic proposition; it is against nationalism. I have got that record also which I can place before the House. These are different aspects which are moved in a different way.

As I said in the beginning, when I started making my submission, the first thing to consider is as to what is your need and not what you demanded or what you have got. If it is found that the need of Bihar is also in this area, I have no doubt that my Bengali friends would look at it in that perspective and not merely in the perspective that they had a fruit which was so big and now it has been cut down to a very small size. That is not, in my opinion, the correct way of appreciating the difficult situation in which both Bihar and Bengal are placed.

In this connection, Sir, I have nothing more to add. But I have two amendments in my name. I do not know what procedure you follow. If this is the only occasion for me to speak, then I should like to say a word or two about my amendments also. If I will get another opportunity to place my views with regard to my amendments, then I will not speak on them now.

Mr. Chairman: If the amendments relate to clause 3, then this is the proper occasion for him to refer to his amendments.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: My amendment No. 45 to clause 3 reads:

Page 2—

for lines 30 to 32, substitute:

“(b) Sadar sub-division of Manbhum district, excluding Chas thana, Chandil thana, Patamda police station of Barabhum thana, Jhalda thana, Baghmundi thana, Arsa police station of Purulia thana, and those portions of Purulia mofassil and Balrampur police stations in Purulia thana which

lie to the West of Dhanbad-Jamshedpur highway.”

Now, Sir, it should be appreciated that Dhanbad and Jamshedpur are the two important industrial belts useful not only for the State of Bengal, but, as a matter of fact, of vital importance to the whole country. If you see the map which I have before me, Sir—I am sure you will have gone through it before—you will find that Dhanbad is on the north, Jamshedpur on the south and the whole area in between is being transferred to Bengal. Sir, I need not try to take your time in impressing upon you, this House and the Government, particularly, that even from administrative point of view these are two very important industrial belts. Big industries are there. Whether it would be desirable from any consideration, particularly administrative, that there should be a kind of a piece of area under the administrative control of another State, is a matter which, in my opinion, deserves very careful consideration. If some arrangement, I submit, could be made with regard to this area, I personally feel that there will be a great satisfaction. I would submit to my friends from Bengal that if anything, even less than what the real demand is, could be made peacefully, with pleasure, under the policy of give and take on either side, it would be much better.

In this connection I may mention that although the moment any question of merger is raised by any Member in this House some friends from Bengal do not naturally like it—I have not had the benefit of studying astrology, but sometimes even from looking at the past and considering the future carefully one sometimes does make prophecies—I feel almost certain that, if not now, in a few years' time there will be a merger of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. About Assam I do not know.

I will give my reasons for it. It is not that I am indulging in, what you call, day-dream or reverie. We now find in this Indian Union, Uttar Pra-

desh, Madhya Pradesh, then a big maritime State, Gujerat, Maharashtra, Kutch, Bombay, Vidarbha, Saurashtra and so on. Whatever may be said, Bengal has led the country for a long time and I have no doubt it will . . .

Shri K. K. Basu: She will still lead, not to darkness but to light.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Let us hope through you.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Red lights!

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: What I am saying is, Bengal, which has led the country rightly in the past, will not naturally be prepared to occupy a position which would not be with all these States. There may be difficulties. They may view things with apprehension. But I have no doubt that in time they will consider that a bigger State to the east will be a better proposition, a much better proposition for Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, rather than lead an isolationist life which, in this world, even countries like America do not advocate.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Let us have a bet on it.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I am much too old to take it. But you can. You are a young man.

Now, Sir, as I said, there is no doubt that at one time they will feel it. It is not a question of somebody imposing it upon them. They will no doubt feel the difficulty of remaining in the position in which, in spite of these transfers of territories, these States will be placed in.

In this connection, as I said, it is the question of an area. Of course, the hon. Home Minister has already assured us that there will be a national highway and all that. But I will beg of him and the House to consider whether it would be desirable that two of these big industrial belts, important not only for the province but the whole nation, should have an area interspersed in between which will be under another administrative control.

My second amendment is, in my opinion comparatively simple. It is—

Page 3—

after line 5, add:

"Provided further that the demarcation referred to in sub-clause (2) being 200 yards to the West of the highway in Purnea district connecting Dhalkola, Kishanganj and Chopra with Silliguri in Darjeeling district and 200 yards to the south or south-east of the highway in Purnea district connecting Dhalkola and Karandighi with Raiganj in West Dinajpur district shall be so fixed as not to divide any existing village or town or bazar into two parts; and that the area of this 200 yards will be reduced to the extent required to avoid division of populated area."

I do not think I should really be required to take a good deal of your time in elaborating this matter. In the latter case the Bill as it has been reported on by the Joint Committee states that generally an area 200 yards to the west of the highway will be given to West Bengal. There is a special provision that so far as the Kishanganj municipality is concerned there will be a diversion. My only submission and my humble submission is that if we stick to this 200 yards all through, it may mean many villages being cut; even towns and bazaars being cut into two, and perhaps, it may be that if we stick rigidly to it one house may be cut into two. So, I would appeal that this consideration should weigh with all friends here, our friends from Bengal, other Members of Parliament, and particularly the Home Minister. I think this is an aspect which deserves very sympathetic consideration. Apart from the reasoning behind it, I have no doubt we have to respect the sentiments of people living there for such a long time, people who have got houses. . . .

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): The word "generally" is there.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I admit that is the idea underlying it. But I want to make a little more specific. I hope the hon. the Home Minister if he finds there is substance in what I am saying, will accept my amendment; or he can even deal with it in ways other than I have proposed in my amendment. But I have every reason to believe that Government will take a sympathetic view of things. Nobody gains anything by cutting up villages and houses. I want to bring this matter before the House with a view to making it quite clear that this contingency is likely to arise and it will be desirable even now to give an assurance to the people inhabiting those areas that there was no such thing in the mind of Parliament or of Government.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Will you omit the last part of your amendment "and that the area of this 200 yards will be reduced to the extent required to avoid division of populated area"? That is hardly fair.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I am willing to omit it. My amendment may be accepted deleting those words, if it meets with the wishes of the Government and will remove their difficulties. There is no desire on my part to be dogmatic. It is all with a view to giving satisfaction to the people there that so far as Government and Parliament are concerned they have no desire to create any division or disruption. That is all I have to say in this connection. With regard to my other amendments I shall move them when the occasion comes.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): Mr. Chairman, Sir, up to this time I have not spoken a word on States reorganisation. Today I have been provoked to say something on it. Sir, my hon. friends from Bihar have put things in such a way that Bengal is the culprit before Parliament, that we are land-grabbers. If Bengal is at fault for land-grabbing may I not claim that Bihar also is at fault for not giving what is being settled by the lugnest

authority? In fact, both are at fault. Either neither is at fault, or both are at fault.

Sir, my hon. friend Mr. Sahaya began with a story. Let me also begin with a story. Our illustrious poet Rabindranath Tagore wrote a poem
दो बीघा जमीन ।
from Bihar all know it. What is that story? A man had two *bighas* of land and for turning it into an orchard a *zamindar* somehow managed to acquire it. The poor man was helpless. He went to other lands. After ten or twelve years when he had practically become a beggar he returned to his native village and wanted to see those two *bighas* of land. There was an orchard there and he found that the mango sapplings that he had planted had borne fruits. It was summer and the man found that they were ripe fruits. He went there to take rest and suddenly two ripe mangoes fell on the ground.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Or, in his mouth.

Shri S. C. Samanta: The man was picking them. The person who was on the watch arrested him and brought him before the *zamindar*. The *zamindar* rebuked him as a thief, to which the man replied:

तुमि महाराज साष् होले आज,
अमि बाज चोर बटे ।

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Please translate

Shri S. C. Samanta: "Oh *zamindar*, now you are a *sadhu*. I from whom you snatched away the land am a thief and you are a *sadhu*."

Sir, the British Government wanted to separate Bihar from Bengal. My friends from Bihar have admitted that certain portions of Bengal were given to Bihar. That is an admitted fact. If Bengal now says that that portion should come back, is it grabbing? (Interruption) I have very often heard

[Shri S. C. Samanta]

it said that Bengal is a land grabber and that Bengal is parochial. Is this the way that Members of Parliament should deal with this question? We expected much. We did not speak from the Congress Benches to keep up the prestige of the House, to keep up the prestige of the Government. When the States Reorganisation Commission was set up, not one Member from Bihar protested against the constitution of the Commission. How can you settle? There should be some Commission; there should be some Judge. That Commission was set up by the Government. They did not protest against it.

What do we now see? They are in a body speaking against the Commission. They are in a body speaking against the decisions of the Commission. They are speaking against the decisions of the Joint Committee. What did they do in the Joint Committee? Did they vote against these clauses? I respectfully ask the hon. Home Minister whether the Members from Bihar have voted against these clauses. The clauses were accepted by mutual arrangement.

Shri M. P. Mishra: All of them have submitted minutes of dissent.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Once having accepted it, is it fair for the Congress members to dissent? Is it proper? Why did we come to an agreement? We should not have come to an agreement. We must have voted.

Shri M. P. Mishra: There was no voting.

Shri S. C. Samanta: What did we see in the Joint Committee in the last meeting? Of the 48 Members, six were all along conspicuously absent. I am referring to the report of the Joint Committee. That day 34 were present. Fourteen were from Bihar. If they did not want these clauses to be there and thought that not an inch of land should be given to West Bengal, West Bengal would not have

become poorer. They should have that courage. Why should they come to a compromise and then again come before Parliament and accuse that Bengalis are land grabbers?

Shri M. P. Mishra: The leadership stands in the way.

Shri S. C. Samanta: No leadership stands in the way. This party cannot stand if the leaders are thwarted and dishonoured in this way. I must say there should be some limit. It is for this reason that I am provoked to say something.

West Bengal would not be disappointed if we do not get a single bigha of land from Bihar. West Bengal can go on. West Bengal will not be rich and Bihar will not be poor if something goes or something does not go. We are the inhabitants of India. We belong to different provinces for the sake of administrations. For the sake of administration we have divided ourselves. For the sake of administration, the Government appointed a Commission. We are said to be grabbing something. There may be grabbing everywhere. They may claim everything. Who is going to give? There should be some Judge. The Judge has given a verdict. My hon. friends say, you are grabbers of land, you are grabbing so much of land. Where does the question of so much land come in? For the sake of administration, for the sake of defence, for the sake of other things, a body which was appointed by us has settled the question. That should be accepted or not accepted. Why should Bengal be charged for the decision that has been given by the Commission? You speak against the Commission. The Commission has given such a decision. Why draw West Bengal here? It is the Commission which has given the decision that this much of land should go. You must speak against the Commission. What do we see here? The Bengalis, Communists and others are the targets: not the Commission, not the Cabinet, not the

Government. Where do we stand? It is for this reason that I am provoked to submit before this hon. House—I respect the Members—and before you, if they had heard from us or read all the points that are involved in these intricacies, they would not have spoken in the way they spoke yesterday. Are we land grabbers? Do we want this portion or that? The Government has brought forward the Bill. You go to the Government. The Government may ask the West Bengal Government or the Bengali Members to accede to this. So far as I know, we have acceded. We have acceded Chandil thana and Patamda police station before the Cabinet. We have acceded to the request of the Home Minister to abide by the decision of the Joint Committee. The hon. Lady Member Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha has said that the Bengalis are not at all ready to come to any compromise. Where does the question of compromise arise?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: What did I say?

Shri S. C. Samanta: She wants that the Bengali Members should go to her and propose a compromise.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Never.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Nobody will go to her, or any other Member. It is for the Government to propose a compromise. Bengalis will consider and Bengal has accepted.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, मैं आपकी मार्फत एक बात माननीय सदस्य से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि विधान बाबू श्री श्री बाबू दोनों मुख्य मंत्री बंगाल के और बिहार के मर्जर के प्रपोजल पर राजी हो गये और हमारी समुत्तर कांग्रेस ने उस को प्राथीर्वाद दिया और उस मर्जर के प्रस्ताव का केबिनेट के सदस्यों ने भी समर्थन किया तब उससे आज वे पीछे क्यों हटते हैं ?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. This is not the occasion for making a speech. If the hon. Member wants to make a speech, he may perhaps get an

opportunity. By way of interruption, it is not right to make a speech.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I will not take more of the time of the House. I will request all Members of Parliament to look into the matter and settle in broad day light. We cannot do whatever we like. Parliament is above all. Everything is before us. I request hon. Members to go into the matter, see the process and not to accuse Bengalis as land grabbers and parochial as has been said by some Members coming from Bihar.

At the end, being a Congress worker of long standing, I say these are disputes which can be settled in an environment of love. That has not been done. Why? Who is responsible for it? It is the right of every Member of this House to do that. Here the feeling of every one is so much estranged. How far are we going down? We are really the sons of India. We have to build India. We go on just like villagers living side by side quarrelling for two bighas of land, going to the Supreme Court and thereafter also quarrelling. That should not be done. This is my request. With these words, I request the House to accept the Bill as it is.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Jaipal Singh.

Some Hon. Members rose.

Shri K. K. Basu: We are not getting a chance.

Mr. Chairman: I am proceeding by the clock. By 2-30. . .

Shri K. K. Basu: We have given amendments. People who have not moved get the chance.

Mr. Chairman: I do not understand how the complaint arises. I am calling those who have given amendments. They must be given time. (Interruptions). Order, order. If all the hon. Members who gave notice of amendments rise up, the Chair cannot be accused.

Shri K. K. Basu: My complaint is on this ground, that we are the first to move amendments, other persons who have not moved amendments are given chance, if you please look up the list.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. This will be quite wrong if Members who have not moved any amendment are not given any chance at any time. After all, the whole thing is before the House, and those Members who have given notice of amendments cannot necessarily be given time. This practice, the hon. Member knows has been prevalent in this House for a long time. It is very difficult to give a chance to all hon. Members who have moved amendments.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I have already made it very, very clear and quite specific that I cannot be a party to the decisions that have been taken by Government in regard to this particular Bill.

I have tabled three amendments. One seeks to draw the attention of Parliament to pursue the problem of a Poorva Pradesh, a strong frontier province. The question of the defence of the realm has been invoked right and left. I hope Shri Chatterjee will support this amendment and vote for it.

The second one, amendment 38, is what you might call a compromise whereby both get something, that is to say North Bengal will go back to Bihar and South Bengal, the Bengal table-land, the Chota Nagpur plateau, will go back to Bengal. That also is a problem this Parliament and the country might consider.

The third, amendment 39, is my protest against this most mischievous and dangerous idea that has been brought in, that of a corridor. Now the word "corridor" is being denounced on the floor of Parliament, but at the time the States Reorganisation Commission visited these areas, this

was the popular word. Now we are being told that the idea of a corridor was never in the picture. Whether you call it a corridor or whatever you call it, as I stressed yesterday, be logical, be consistent in your arguments. I deeply regret that Government have failed to be either logical or consistent or to have, from the tribal point of view, human reason. I regret I cannot give my support to this. I would have gone quite a long way to assist Government out of this difficulty. My friends from Bengal must realise what part they have played in the area I come from. The hon. Member who just preceded me felt very disturbed because somebody called Bengalis landgrabbers. I would like to invite him to come round to my area.

Shri S. C. Samanta: There Bihar also enjoys with you.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May be so.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Everybody enjoys.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I would invite my friend to come round with me to Chota Nagpur and see who has done the land-grabbing. See for yourself. It requires no argument. See with your own eyes. Convince yourself why six rebellions besides risings in the last decade of the last century and during the first decade of this century took place.

Let us not talk about that. Here is an appeal made by the ruling party today that for administrative reasons, that is the main thing, Bengal should have this or that territory. I humbly submit that even on that score I am not convinced that the Manbhum area should go to Bengal. It has failed to convince me. The moment they can convince me I will be their staunchest supporter, but they have been muddled-headed in their reasoning.

I am not disputing the northern sector question, but when my friends

here argued about this contiguity, lines of communications, administrative requirements, as I pointed out yesterday I ask: what happens to our lines of communications from Jamtara to Danbhad? It is not a question whether we are all citizens of India. That is not the problem. If that were the case, they should not raise the problem themselves, but they are raising it. I suggest that Government should think again. I know by their commitments they are in such a mess that they do not know how to extricate themselves. It is very, very obvious.

My hon. friend asked a question: what did you do in the Joint Committee? May I just tell him what happened on the last day? This is something which I did not want to disclose on the floor of Parliament.

Shri Barman: On a point of order. Are the proceedings of the Joint Committee open in this House for discussion?

Shri M. P. Mishra: Why did you not raise the point while the friend by your side raised it?

Mr. Chairman: This point that it was not raised when Shri Samanta was speaking is irrelevant, but it is quite clear and it is the rule usually observed that proceedings of the Select Committee are not to be disclose in this House or any where else.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Anyway, it is very, very patent and I hope my hon. friends from Bengal have counted the number of dissenters. From that they can infer exactly what we feel about it. Let them draw their own conclusions, but the fact is this. We wanted to be reasonable. We wanted to come to the help of our friend. We have been to him again and again, even up to the very last minute. We are prepared to help him in his great difficulty. We have been even to see the Leader of the House so that the solution may be arrived at in a way where no bad feelings are created or intensified. That is the problem. I may say that,

as far as I am concerned any attempt by any Government, blue or red or yellow, at any time at the disintegration of the tribal tract will be resisted. This is exactly what you are doing, and this is not the first time that you have done it. You did it at the time when you merged or integrated the Chota Nagpur States. What happened? The massacre of Raj Kharsawan. Satyagraha in Mayurbhunj. It happened all over the place. I say that I am willing to co-operate certainly, but I would like my friends from Bengal to realise that the people in Bihar, the people in the tribal area also have their feelings.

Lastly, I am sorry my friend Shri Chatterjee is not here.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am here.

Shri Jaipal Singh: He was talking very much about the census figures. He says from 1951 go back to 1931. He forgets that in the 25 years there has been a shift in the population. Why does he not go back to 1901? Why does not go back to 1911? Because, obviously it will not suit him. As I said earlier on, let us drop this language basis, particularly when it comes to the tribal areas, because the Adivasis are multi-lingual. We have the example that he himself instanced. A Mundari or Santali or whatever you call him can be enumerated as anything. He is absolutely at the mercy of the enumerator. I was in 1941 in Calcutta when the census operations took place. I know exactly what happened to me. I was asked: "What language do you speak?" I had to tell him that I did speak Hindi, I spoke English, I spoke my own mother tongue, I spoke Bengali also. He put me down as a Bengali. So, I increased the Bengali-speaking population in Bengal by one in 1941. The same process has been in operation all over the place. If my friend Shri Chatterjee comes and lives with me in Ranchi. I will classify himself as a Hindi-speaking person. Let us

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

not invoke the wrong arguments. As the hon. Minister has said, here is an administrative requirement, a certain psychological development in the State of Bengal. Something has to be done. We in Bihar, I want to assure you, would certainly have liked to have assisted him, but not the way that Government have set about it.

2 P.M.

Shrimati Sushama Sen (Bhagalpur South): Coming from Bengal as I do, having been born and bred in Bengal, and then having stayed in Bihar for nearly forty years—and all my work lies in that area—I find it is indeed very painful for me to hear the charges which are levelled against Bihar or Bengal.

But, yesterday, when I heard the Home Minister saying that the Jalpaiguri area has to be linked up with Darjeeling in order that there may be security on the Indo-Pakistan border, I realised that apart from linguistic considerations, there were administrative difficulties also so far as Bihar was concerned, especially in regard to this area which links up Dhanbad with Ranchi, Dhanbad with Jamshedpur, and Ranchi with Jamshedpur.

So, all that we want is that the areas mentioned in amendment No. 11, which I support, namely the areas comprised in the police stations of Jaipur, Jhalda, Bagmundi, Balrampur and that part of Purulia police station lying to the west of the road between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur, should go to Bihar. I say that it is only fair that these areas should be given to Bihar. So, I support this amendment. I hope the Minister of Home Affairs will see that this link which is necessary, from Ranchi to Jamshedpur, and from Dhanbad to Jamshedpur, is given to Bihar.

I feel that this request should receive sympathetic consideration from the Home Minister, because we do

not want the other portion which goes to West Bengal. On the other side, the whole of Purulia may go to West Bengal, and I do not think we should quarrel over this.

I think the best solution would have been the merger which was contemplated. If it comes about in the near future, I would be the first person to support it, and Bengal, Bihar and Orissa should form a Poorvapradesh. With these words, I support the amendment No. 11.

Mr. Chairman: Now, Shri K. K. Basu. The hon. Member should be brief and try to conclude quickly.

Shri K. K. Basu: How many minutes can I have?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member can take five to seven minutes.

At 2-20, I have called the Home Minister to reply to the discussion.

Shri K. K. Basu: Bengal has been at the bar of criticism. So, it does require some time to reply to the criticisms.

Mr. Chairman: My difficulty is that the time cannot be extended. It is not a rubber ball. If Shri N. C. Chatterjee takes forty minutes, and Shri Syamnandan Sahaya takes about twenty minutes, then, the time is shortened. After all, the time cannot be extended by the Chair at its sweet will and pleasure.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: But about fifteen minutes of my speech were taken up by interruptions.

Shri K. K. Basu: We are discussing now the most vital problem in respect of the Bill which seeks to readjust the boundaries of Bihar and Bengal.

Much has been said about the emotional expressions of Bengalis. Even the hon. Member who spoke previous to Shrimati Sushama Sen, the great leader who called himself the leader of the tribal people, Shri

Jaipal Singh, wanted us to go to Chota Nagpur and find out who the landgrabbers are.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Please do.

Shri K. K. Basu: We have been there, and we have seen who the land-grabbers are. If my hon. friend wants that the land should really be given back to those to whom it is due, then, I say that we shall join my hon. friend. But he only says that the Bengalis are land-grabbers. It may be that some Bengalis, who have some tracts of land adjoining the Bengal territory, or some Bengali-speaking persons of this particular division, might have gone there and settled there.

But why does my hon. friend not raise his voice against the mine-owners who are neither Bengalis nor Biharis? Either they are Britishers, or they are persons belonging to the States other than Bihar and Bengal. So, I really shudder to understand the spirit in which this Bill is being discussed.

The Bengalis and Biharis have lived as friends for many generations. I myself have many friends among the Biharis, and I am really proud of it. But our approach in regard to this matter is purely a rational one, the main consideration being the linguistic one. I do not want to go over the history of this matter, because the Government of the day want to disown what had been their main guiding philosophy at the time of the struggle for the liberation of the country, namely that language is the most vital factor to be borne in mind in the matter of the reorganisation of provinces.

Now, let us consider what special benefits will be derived by the administration. We today are in a backward condition. We have to spend a huge sum of money for providing primary education. In spite of the definite article in the chapter on Directive Principles of State Policy in

the Constitution, we have not yet been able to introduce free primary education in most parts of the country. Then problem assumes a worse form in a small State, and in States which are more or less deficit when such concession, have to be provided in different languages.

Now, these two States are more or less deficit. If they have to provide educational and other facilities, then they will have to spend huge sums of money. Further, if the demand of a substantial linguistic minority has to be complied with under article 347, we would require enormous sums of money. In fact, we want that in course of time, even in the High Courts, the regional language should be used as the court language. Even today, if you go to the Patna High Court or any other High Court, you will find that the regional language is not being used. If you go to the Calcutta High Court on the original side, you will find that the judges are Bengalis, the litigants are Bengalis, and the counsels are also Bengalis.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: The attorneys are also Bengalis.

Shri K. K. Basu: The witnesses also are Bengalis. Their evidence is given in Bengali. But it is translated into English, which is the court language, and which, in course of time, is to be replaced by the regional language. Why should there be this huge waste of money?

We feel that the administration throughout the State, right up to the highest level, should be carried on in the language of the region. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the problems of the linguistic minorities should be reduced to the minimum. We are not oblivious of the fact that there will still be certain industrial areas, and certain cosmopolitan areas where, there may be linguistic minorities, coming not only from the adjacent areas, but even

[Shri K. K. Basu]

from places far away in the country.

My hon. friend talked of Jamshedpur. May I ask him how many Biharis and how many Bengalis are in the ruling position there? Who are the mine-owners there? Who are the persons having the controlling voice even in the administration of the Tata company? Are they Bengalis or Biharis? It is the Parsis who are controlling the Tatas. It is the Parsis who are controlling the place. They have come and dominated over this area. There are also some persons from the south or the north who are there.

But the problem of the cosmopolitan areas will remain. Our effort should be to minimise the problem of the linguistic minorities. Therefore, we feel that all the areas speaking the same language as that of the adjoining State should be tagged on to that State. We want that this principle should be applied, down to the village, because the village is the smallest administrative unit, so far as we have found it.

Unfortunately, a lot has been said about the problem of linguism. Now, what is linguism? If a village which is contiguous to a particular State can be tagged on to it, because of its linguistic affinity to the adjoining State, it is certainly right.

Even according to the States Reorganisation Commission's report, which speaks on the basis of the census figures of 1951 and earlier, in the Dhalbhum sub-division of Singhbhum district, in areas like Dhanbad, the sub-division of Manbhum, or the Santal Parganas, there is a substantial number of Bengalis. Even if I concede, for a moment, the census figures on which my Bihar friends place reliance are right, I can say that there is a substantial number of Bengalis in these areas.

So, if a particular area has to be divided, with the village as the unit for purposes of division, then it is necessary even from the point of view of the better administration of these areas, for which my hon. friends opposite clamour, so much, that the villages where Bengali is spoken, and which are contiguous to the State of Bengal should be added to Bengal.

Then, we are told that the problems of economic viability, administrative convenience etc. are there. I say that in that case, Bengal has even got a bigger claim than Bihar. If you take into consideration the question of administrative convenience of India, you should see that the States are so reorganised that areas which are comprised in a particular State are more or less of a uniform standard. In that event, a large portion should go to West Bengal. But I do not base my claim on that; my Party's stand is strong and clear on this point. Possibly the Government of West Bengal or the West Bengal Congress might have made a claim on that basis from Bihar; I do not know. They might have said that those territories might be given to West Bengal, and Bihar might be compensated, if they want, by taking some territory from Madhya Pradesh or U.P. and adding to it.

I therefore say that this argument of administrative or economic viability should not be raked up. The theory of economic viability in connection with this issue is a dangerous formula. Every State is in deficit. Bihar has a deficit of Rs. 14 crores on revenue account and West Bengal has a deficit of Rs. 27 crores. So if you want to strengthen West Bengal economically, it is all the more necessary that the industrial hinterland with its raw materials should come back to the manufacturing industries of Calcutta. But we do not indulge in this sort of dangerous argument. We stick to the

scientific basis of language. We say, take the village as the unit and redraw the map of a particular State.

The problem of link has been raised and discussed. But we feel that from the security angle—I do not know whether the Home Minister agreed with this or not—it is very necessary that north and south Bengal should be closely linked together, because we have on the border Pakistan. We have a feeling that the Home Minister has accepted this. Even the SRC says that in Kishanganj the language spoken is more akin to Bengali. So the point that the Home Minister made that they are not Bengali-speaking is not correct.

There is another reason why there should be this close link between the north and the south of West Bengal. There is a lot of smuggling going on on the Indo-Pakistan border. Goods are smuggled out. Every time that goods are smuggled from the Calcutta market and sent to Pakistan, we find shortage and the prices soar very high.

But if you compare this with the link that my friends from Bihar are demanding from Dhandbad to Jamshedpur, I say it is a fantastic demand. In that event, in the north you must give us the railway track which forms another portion of the Kishanganj area. But we do not want that. Where is the question of distance if you want to go from one part to another, whether you travel 150 miles or 225 miles?

Shri M. P. Mishra: We can better deal with Pakistan than you.

Shri K. K. Basu: That is the reaction of my friends from Bihar.

So far as the problem of the national highway is concerned, there should not be unnecessary restriction put upon any side.

My friends have referred to other problems. Reference was made to

the people of Darjeeling. In that case My hon. friend, Shri Jaipal Singh, will have his Jharkhand State. But I say here you must understand the problem in its content. Certainly, our Party has said that the people of that area should have administrative reforms. We have demanded again and again that they should have an autonomous administration. We have demanded that the Sixth Schedule should be amended. We have said they should have a larger share in the administration of their own affairs.

But I only say: do not bring in the problem of economic viability in connection with the issue of redistribution, because then other problems will arise, as the deficit of West Bengal on revenue account is to the tune of Rs. 27 crores.

Therefore, I appeal to my Bihar friends, let us, for the time being, accepted what is there. We only want the Bengali-speaking areas.

Shri M. P. Mishra. You will never be satisfied.

Shri K. K. Basu: Let us accept it for the time being, in that spirit. Then as regards further disputes, let there be a Boundary Commission appointed. If the Boundary Commission says that any area which has been transferred to Bengal in the Purulia area is Hindi-speaking, we are agreeable to transfer that back to Bihar. I think every Bengali is patriotic enough to accept that. But I feel that there has been a feeling that Bengalis are land-grabbers. It has been posed in this House. Bengal does not demand anything which is not right. There is a campaign to prevent Bengal from getting what is due to her. There was a campaign of merger and it fell through. If Bengal is dubbed as land-grabber, certainly Bengal will take up the challenge and will give the answer. We have given the answer to British imperialists and we will give the answer to the ruling gods of Delhi, if they do

[Shri K. K. Basu]

not want to accept and concede the just demand of Bengalis.

I do not want to say anything more as my time is up. But I repeat: let us accept this for the time being. Appoint a Boundary Commission later on which may go into the problem of boundary adjustment on the linguistic basis. If as a result of the findings of that Commission, it is found that any area transferred from Bihar to West Bengal is Hindi-speaking, we will transfer it back to Bengal; at the same time, we should also get all the Bengali-speaking areas of Bihar.

सभापति महोदय : श्री भागवत झा
आजाद ।

बाबू राम नारायण सिंह (हजारी बाग-
पश्चिम) : सभापति महोदय, मैंने भी
अमेंडमेंट मूव करना है ।

सभापति महोदय : मेरे पास इस
वक्त कम से कम दस आदमियों की चिट्ठस
पढ़ी हुई हैं और वक्त मेरे पास सिर्फ
सात आठ मिनट है । सब अमेंडमेंट्स मूव
हो चुके हैं । इतने थोड़े अरसे में सिर्फ एक
आनरेबल मेम्बर बहस कर सकते हैं ।

बाबू राम नारायण सिंह : मैं सिर्फ
एक दो मिनट चाहूंगा ।

सभापति महोदय : अगर सब के सब
दस पंद्रह आनरेबल मेम्बर एक एक मिनट
चाहेंगे, तो बीस वाइस मिनट लग जायेंगे ।
इसलिये मुझे अफसोस है कि मैं इस वक्त
आप को वक्त नहीं दे सकता ।

श्री टेक चन्द्र (अम्बाला-शिमला) :
जनावेवाला, मैं एक कानूनी नुक़्ता पेश करना
चाहता हूँ । अगर आप इजाजत देंगे,
तो मैं मशकूर हूँगा ।

सभापति महोदय : श्री भागवत
झा आजाद ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I also
sailed in the same boat in which
my hon. friend. Dada Samanta was
sailing. I too purposely did not
speak up till now, not even once on
the S.R. Bill. But I am now provoked
as my Dada was to speak, and I have
chosen to take a few minutes.

I need not go into details. Why do
we want to press the amendment
moved by Shri Syamnandan Sahaya
and Shri Jaipal Singh which wants a
link from Jamshepur to Dhanbad
and to Ranchi? I need not point out
to Shri N. C. Chatterjee, who was
absent from the House yesterday, that
the hon. Minister was replying yester-
day to Shri H.N. Mukerjee's hyper-
boles and superlatives which were
devoid of logic and rationality. They
should have read that reply of the
Home Minister and then should have
argued the point on the basis of
language.

I need not go into details because
I know that the man who is awaken-
ed is not sleeping. I cannot show my
friends any logic. I can only say this.
We are told that Shri Dip Narayan
Sinha and some Bihar leaders have
spoken about this. We are told that
we are insulting those departed souls
in refusing to accept the demands of
our friends from West Bengal. I say,
in all humility, that it is those gentle-
men who are insulting the soul of
those departed leaders. I would only
quote one or two lines from the Reso-
lution itself. I challenge Shri N. C.
Chatterjee to place on the Table of
the House even now those documents
which contain the statement wherein
Shri Dip Narayan Sinha or Shri
Parameshwar Lal said that the areas
of Manbhum and other portions
should go to West Bengal.

Shri M. K. Moitra: I will do so

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I will say
'No'; I will do that on their behalf.

They will put the Resolution moved
in the Congress. It says:

"This Congress desires to place
on record its sense of profound

gratitude to His Majesty the King Emperor for the creation of a separate province of Bihar and Orissa under a Lieutenant Governor in Council and prays that in readjusting the provincial boundaries, the Government will be pleased to place all the Bengali-speaking districts under one and the same administration".

We have no objection to this. Let my friends and the Government accept this challenge of the Bihar Government and the Bihar people. If there is one area which is Bengali-speaking in Bihar, let it be transferred to West Bengal. We have said that from the very beginning. Therefore, they should not harp on things which do not exist at all. If in that area, there is 40 per cent. Bengali-speaking population, we are prepared to give it to West Bengal. Let there be 5 per cent. Bengali-speaking people in Kishanganj; we are prepared to concede that to West Bengal. They should speak on the basis of compactness of area, which we have granted. So far as language is concerned, it does not matter.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya has quoted what Shri Sapru said. I can still quote, though I have no time, what Shri Parameshwar Lal said about that. So let them not misguide this House by saying what was never said at all. That is why I ask: if they had said it, let them place it on the Table.

Then so far as the catchment area is concerned, I need not go into details. My hon. friend, Shri Mishra, has dealt with it. The argument of catchment area cannot be accepted as the basis. I certainly appreciate what the Home Minister said that there is no basis of language, no ground of catchment area but there are certain sentiments and there are certain feelings which we want to respect. Out of respect to them we conceded, we agreed that let North Bengal and South Bengal be joined

and we gave Kishanganj. But let not compactness mean 100 yards or 200 yards and thereby the transfer of the dissatisfied people of Kishanganj to West Bengal. We never said that we do not want to give an inch. We feel that there is no case for it. But because we have respect for the sisterly State, we have love for the sisterly State, we said let something be given for the sake of their convenience. Something given does not mean transfer of territories and they are not at all Bengali-speaking territories.

A very big thing has been tried to be impressed upon us by Shri Mahata. Grierson has been quoted. I say to my friends, 'Why not you see the solid facts of 1956?' Why do you refuse to believe in the progeny of man? Do you believe in natural calamities and other things? Then, believe what has happened in this area. I would say to Shri Basu that he is a Marxist believing in demonism and the Marxist theory. Don't you want to be dogmatic about the fact that man is a man? You know if there is a couple, a man and wife, what happens. You know all these things happen. Therefore you need not say that what Grierson said was right.

साथी छोड़ पुरानी बात ।

नई कहानी, नई रवानी,

नया नया इतिहास,

युग पलटा ले रहा आज,

भ्रम छोड़ों कल की बात ।

साथी छोड़ पुरानी बात ।

You can have a Marxist mind. You always say what things were a quarter of a century before. These things were not existing. If they had been there I would have readily agreed to that. Therefore, I would say that when the ground does not exist and there is only the question of sentiment and feeling on which the Home Minister has appealed to us, we responded to that appeal. I would also humbly pray to him that let him also persuade our friends from Bengal to

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

appreciate our feelings also, the compactness of area, the convenience for passing from Dhanbad to Jamshedpur. They have got a territory given to them; they wanted a big chunk; they have been given a small chunk. For the sake of keeping good feelings we gave that. Let him do his best to see that for the thousands and thousands of people residing in that area, let them agree to our having a small thing, about 2½ Thanas which will give compactness to that region in Bihar, which will link Dhanbad to Jamshedpur.

Though the Bill is there I will say that I am waiting for those days when Bihar, Bengal and Orissa can be one, whereby all these sentiments of Bengali and Bihari will go. If you permit me I can speak in Bengali though I am not a Bengali.

I will say two lines about Santhal Parganas. My friends from Santhal Parganas have spoken so much about it. I am sure my Santhali friends have given the Bengali friends sufficient reply. I will just point out to my friends from Bengal:

मयुराक्षी विहवल दीही कोई न रहे कंगाल,
लो बिहार का संदेश मैं लायी हूँ बंगाल ।
तुम दोनों मिल पूर्व देश के बंदो पथ पर,
बड़ा हर्ष है, बड़ा गर्व है, नयी योजना
नया वर्ष है ।

I am longing for that day when, if not my generation, at least my younger generation will succeed.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, I have to call the hon. Minister.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have luckily not much to say on this occasion. Hon. Members sitting on the opposite benches are more in agreement with me than some of my own dear colleagues who hold a different view with regard to the proposals which are embodied in this Bill. Still, I feel that they have not strengthened their case or mine by the arguments that they have advanced.

I do not think that these proposals can be sustained on the linguistic ground. The States Reorganisation Commission as also the Dar Commission had laid down that no area should be transferred to any other State unless 70 per cent. of the people living in that area proposed to be transferred spoke a language which is in harmony with the language of the other State. Everybody will admit that that test is not satisfied here.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Need not be.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think there can be no two opinions.

Shri K. K. Basu: Break up the district; it will do.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not know; but I think my statement is not disputed.

But if we take that as correct, my own point is this. Do not lay stress on a weak point. When we have a strong point, why not make full use of it and why put yourself in difficult straits by emphasising what is vulnerable?

Shri Sadhan Gupta: There is no difficulty except of your creation.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Bigotry is not sometimes congenial to the spirit of reason. But still it is better to adopt a rational attitude than bigoted or, what might be called in milder terms, orthodox ones. My friends seem to be wedded to linguism. I think, instead of Marxism and Leninism, now, linguism has become the principal creed. Well, they are free to make their own choice. (*Interruption*). But, so far as I am concerned, I accept that language is one of the potent factors to be recognised. But, there are other factors which may prove even more important and worthy of attention and supremacy than language itself. Here, if we are to apply the linguistic principle, it will not be easy to justify the transfer at least of the portion of Purnea that is being now, by all, admitted as being worthy of being transferred to Bengal.

If we look at the other part of the proposal contained in the Bill concerning Purulia, it will have to be admitted that the linguistic position is not quite clear whether Kurmali is part of Bengali or whether it can well be regarded as Hindi. I think it is at least a debatable point. So, we cannot afford to be dogmatic on a matter which does not admit of a very clear and unequivocal answer.

The main reason why the transfer of a part of Purulia sub-division is being suggested is the need of promoting the development of Bengal and this area itself. The Ajay and Kasai rivers pass through this area and there are big schemes and projects. You want to finish them and to see them well maintained and well managed so that both Bengal and Bihar might benefit thereby. That is the main reason. Those arguments which, in a way, led us to propose the transfer of this area to Bengal became unanswerable when the question of Chandil and Patamda came, because they were equally essential for the maintenance of the works in which Bihar was vitally interested. So we have struck to the framework of the S.R.C. Report. We have substantially accepted it and, as I said yesterday, the S.R.C. had the opportunity of examining these matters of detail. Where large issues are concerned, this House may be with them where questions of principle arise, but where adjustment of border areas is the main question, we can place—and I think rightly too—considerable reliance on the S.R.C. I was really delighted and it was heartening to hear from Shri Chatterjee today all the encomiums that he showered on this Report and the tributes that he paid to its authors because in the speeches that he had delivered previously, he seemed to differ, not only on minor points, but on minor as well as major points, from the authors of this Report. Well, better late than never. Wisdom dawns at the last moment if not when one is born. So, I am glad that he has come round to the view that the proposals of the S.R.C. were sound, well-conceived and based on

unassailable arguments. I think that he will concede that it applies also to the proposal of the bilingual State of Bombay. I hope he has been converted to that view. Now he has no grievance so far as that particular proposal is concerned. I only wish he had not gone to Ahmedabad because some people infer from such onslaughts on his part that in spite of his advanced age, he is ever ready to fish in troubled waters.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: This is an unfair charge. I went there at the request of my Gujarati friends, and I shall tell my hon. friend that they are really suffering from great frustration because their wishes were not consulted. I have no particular grievance over Gujarat, but I am voicing their almost unanimous feeling that they are suffering from this acute sense of frustration that their views were not ascertained, that their aspirations were not consulted at the crucial moment.

Shri M. P. Mishra: Why do you not agree also to consult the wishes of the people at Manbhum?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Shri Chatterjee went to Ahmedabad at a time when it was in a disturbed state and he found there a sense of frustration. I think that was more an excitement than an occasion for cool and calm consideration during the days he was there, and his own contribution tended somewhat that way.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Entirely wrong. I did my best to appeal to them not to tarnish the fair name of the city with which the memories of Mahatma Gandhi were associated—the apostle of non-violence, sounded and gave his great call from there.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I accept it.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I ought to tell the hon. Home Minister that the mischief was started by the undesirable and unprovoked police firing, and if that had not taken place, nothing would have happened there. He ought to know that.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not think that Shri Chatterjee will blame me if

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

I were to say that perhaps the trouble would not have worsened if he had not gone there. Sometimes words carry less weight than action. So, his asking them to follow the lead of Mahatma Gandhi was somewhat belied by his presence at that spot.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Am I not a Member of Parliament? Do I represent only the district of Hooghly? Have I no right, as being the President of the Hindu Mahasabha, to go there at the request of my friends..

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am glad that.....

Mr. Chairman: The fundamental right of going anywhere in India is not the point at dispute. That fundamental right is there for all hon. Members to go anywhere in India.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am glad that Shri Chatterjee has come back and is in our midst now, and I am really happy to see him because there was trouble and the trouble was at its worst during the time he was there. Now that place is returning to normal and I hope the conditions there would continue to improve but all this is beside the point.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I wish the Home Minister had gone there.

Pandit G. B. Pant: As he was there, I thought my presence was not called for.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Your police presence was there.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Let us go back to the Bill itself.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Is the Home Minister afraid of his collecting evidence of the misdeeds done by this Government? Then he may say so.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Shri Chatterjee can very well take care of himself and Shri Sadhan Gupta need not be very much worried on his account.

So far as this Bill goes, I have not much more to say. There has been some question of the communications between Ranchi and Dhanbad, or

Ranchi and Jamshedpur not being quite satisfactory. As I said before, we might have looked into it. The fact that this area is being transferred to Bengal from Manbhum will not stand in the way of a road or a highway being provided connecting Ranchi with Jamshedpur. I think about that here need not be any great concern or anxiety.

As to these amendments, I have just to remind the House of one or two amendments that I have proposed, where we speak of demarcation. I have suggested that the words "by an authority appointed in this behalf by the Central Government" might be introduced so that the demarcation may be made in a proper way. We hope to appoint a senior Revenue Officer along with an engineer or a surveyor to look into the matter and to demarcate the boundary.

I am also prepared to accept the amendment that had been moved here—

"Provided further that the demarcation referred to in sub-clause (2) being 200 yards to the West of the highway (I would introduce the word "generally", that is, 200 yards generally to the West of the highway) in Purnea district connecting Dhalkola, Kishanganj and Chopra with Silliguri in Darjeeling district and 200 yards to the south or south-east of the highway in Purnea district connecting Dhalkola and Karandighi with Raiganj in West Dinajpur district shall be so fixed as not to divide any existing village or town or bazar into two parts...."

This is amendment No. 46. I think all will agree that so far as possible no village should be split up.

The latter part had said that in case a village were to extend beyond 200 yards, then the village be kept within Bihar. I think that will fit in all right. It may be 150 yards or it may be 250 yards either way. In

order to maintain the integrity of the village, the authorities who will be appointed to demarcate the boundaries should make all efforts to preserve the integrity of every unit.

Shri K. K. Basu: In that event, to maintain the integrity of every unit in certain portions it will be necessary to increase it to 250 yards. Will that be done?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Yes. That is why I have omitted the latter part, because the latter part had said that if it went beyond 200 yards then the boundary may not be extended. Now it may be 250 yards or it may be 150 yards, either way.

Shri K. K. Basu: My difficulty is, the particular provision says 200 yards to the south or south-east.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Now I am saying: "200 yards generally".

Shri K. K. Basu: Do you think that the word "generally" will have that flexibility?

Pandit G. B. Pant: That is in the Bill.

Shri K. K. Basu: We fully agree that the unit should not be split up.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Sir, I have not much to say. I would only appeal to hon. Members to accept this clause in the Bill, which had been discussed long enough. Sentiments have been given sufficient play and we know that there are strong feelings held, but let us, for the sake of the great name that Bihar and Bengal both possess and the contributions that they had made towards the realisation of our great ideal of independence, not of Bihar or of Bengal but of India, agree to accept this proposal in the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Now, before I begin to put the amendments to the vote of the House, I may just bring to the notice of the House that in so far as amendment No. 46 is concerned, it has

been suggested that instead of the phraseology given therein it would be better if we adopt the following:

Page 3—

for line 1 substitute:

"Provided that the boundary line shall be so demarcated as not to cut across any village or town;

Provided further that from the point where the first-mentioned highway."

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think it is the same thing.

Mr. Chairman: Is Shri Syamnandan Sahaya agreeable to this?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I think it meets the point. I accept it.

Mr. Chairman: Now I shall put amendment No. 46, as amended, to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 3—

for line 1 substitute:

"Provided that the boundary line shall be so demarcated as not to cut across any village or town;

Provided further that from the point where the first-mentioned highway."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Now I will put amendment No. 61 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 2, line 26—

after "sub-section (2)" insert:

"by an authority appointed in this behalf by the Central Government."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Does any hon. Member want his amendment to be put separately to the vote of the House?

Shri K. K. Basu: My amendment
No. 2 may be put.

Chandil Thana and Patamda police
station of Barabhum Thana."

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Page 2, lines 30 to 32—

omit "excluding Chas thana,

The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes 16;
Noes 122.

AYES

Division No. 5]

Basu, Shri K.K.
Buchhikotaiiah, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
Chatterjee Shri N.C.

Chowdary, Shri C.R.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Dasaratha Deb, Shri
Gupta, Shri Sadhan
Krishnaswami, Dr.
Mahata, Shri B.

12-53. P.M.

Majhi, Shri Chaitan
Moitra, Shri M.K.
Mukherjee, Shri H.N.
Rao, Dr. Rama
Rao, Shri P. Subba
Zaidi, Col.

NOES

Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Shri H.L.
Agarwal, Shri M.L.
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri
Bansilal, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri P.L.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C.
Birbal Singh, Shri
Bogawat, Shri
Borkar, Shrimati Anusayabai
Bose, Shri P.C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chandak, Shri
Charak, Th. Lakshman Singh
Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan
Chaudhary, Shri G.L.
Dabhi, Shri
Das, Dr. M.M.
Das, Shri B.K.
Das, Shri K.K.
Das, Shri N.T.
Das, Shri Shree Narayan
Deogam, Shri
Dhusiya, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dube, Shri U.S.
Dubeey, Shri R.G.
Dutt, Shri A.K.
Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
Bacharan, Shri I.
Gandhi, Shri Feroze
Ghose, Shri S.M.
Guhain, Shri
Gopi Ram, Shri
Guha, Shri A.C.

Hemda, Shri Benjamin
Hasda, Shri Subodh
Hazarika, Shri J.N.
Hembrom, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Hyder Husein, Ch.
Ibrahim, Shri
Iyyunni, Shri C.R.
Jain, Shri N.S.
Jaipal Singh, Shri
Jajware, Shri
Jangde, Shri
Jena, Shri Niranjan
Jhunjhunwala, Shri
Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya
Jwala Prasad, Shri
Kajrolkar, Shri
Kale, Shrimati A.
Katham, Shri
Kayal, Shri P.N.
Kazmi, Shri
Khongmen, Shrimati
Kirolikar, Shri
Krishna Chandra, Shri
Kureel, Shri B.N.
Kureel, Shri P.L.
Lingam, Shri N.M.
Mandal, Dr. P.
Mavalankar, Shrimati Sushila
Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
Mishra, Pandit S.C.
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri M.P.
Mishra, Shri R.D.
Narasimhan, Shri C.R.
Naskar, Shri P.S.
Mawal Prabhakar Shri
Nehru, Shrimati Shivravati
Pande, Shri B.D.
Pannalal, Shri
Pataaskar, Shri

Raghubir Sahai, Shri
Raghubir Singh, Ch.
Raghubath Singh, Shri
Ramaswamy, Shri P.
Ramaswamy, Shri S.V.
Rane, Shri
Rup Narain, Shri
Sahaya, Shri Syammandan
Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
Saigal, Sardar A.S.
Samanta, Shri S.C.
Sanganna, Shri
Sen, Shri P.G.
Sen, Shrimati Suahana
Sewal, Shri A.R.
Sharma, Pandit K.C.
Sharma, Shri D.C.
Sharma, Shri K. R.
Sharma, Shri R. C.
Shivannajappa, Shri
Siddananajappa, Shri
Singh, Shri D.N.
Singh, Shri H.P.
Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar
Sinha, Dr. S.N.
Sinha, Shri Anirudha
Sinha, Shri B.P.
Sinha, Shri G.P.
Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Sinha, Thakur Jugal Kioore
Sinhaan Singh, Shri
Sunder Lal, Shri
Suresh Chandra, Dr.
Tek Chand, Shri
Thimmaiah, Shri
Tiwari, Shri R.S.
Tiwary, Pandit D.N.
Uikey, Shri
Varma, Shri B.B.
Varma, Shri B.R.
Vishwanath Prasad, Shri

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: In regard to the other amendments, 29 is same as 2 and 41 same as 2 and 29. Therefore, they are barred. I shall put the other amendments to the vote of the House.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I want my amendment No. 37 to be put separately.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: On a point of order, the amendment is out of order, because it surreptitiously tries to impose a Purva Pradesh which is outside the scope of this Bill.

Shri Jaipal Singh: It is very much in order, in the light of what we decided a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker: This Bill seeks to add some area from Bihar to Bengal. He only says in his large-heartedness, add the rest also.

All right. Let it become a new State or let it be an old State. I cannot rule it as out of order. Substantially there may be a merger or addition of particular portion.

The question is:

Pages 2 and 3—

for clause 3, substitute:

"3. As from the appointed day, there shall be added to the State of West Bengal the territories which on the 1st day of March, 1956 were comprised in the State of Bihar and the territories of the States of West Bengal and Bihar shall thereupon become the State of Purva Pradesh."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put all the other amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 2—

for lines 30 to 32, substitute:

"(b) Purulia sub-division of Manbhum district;

(c) such other areas as may be demarcated for inclusion in West Bengal by the Boundary Commission to be set up under section 4A."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 2, line 32—

add at the end:

"and the area comprised in the police stations of Jaipur, Jhalda, Bagmundi, Balrampur and that part of Purulia police station lying to the west of the road between Dhanbad and Jamshedpur."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 2—

(i) omit lines 30 to 32; and

(ii) Page 3, lines 7 to 10, omit:

'and the territory specified in clause (b) of that sub-section shall form a separate district to be known as Purulia district within Burdwan division of the State of West Bengal.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 2, lines 36 and 38—

for "200 yards" substitute "20 yards"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

(a) Page 2—

(i) omit lines 24 to 29;

(ii) omit lines 35 to 40; and

(b) Page 3—

(i) omit lines 1 to 5; and

(ii) lines 6 and 7, omit:

"The territory specified in clause (a) and of sub-section (1) shall be included in, and from part of, Darjeeling district, and"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 2—

for lines 24 to 29, substitute:

"(a) that portion of Purnea district which lies to the east of

[Mr. Speaker]
the Mahananda river and the
Mechi river; and"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

- (i) Pages 2 and 3—
omit lines 35 to 40 and 1 to 5 res-
pectively.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, line 9—

for "Purulia" substitute "Man-
bhumi"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 3—

after line 14, add:

"(5) The following territories of the State of Bihar shall also be a part of West Bengal on expiry of six months from the appointed day, excepting those portions thereof which shall be found to be inhabited, in a single majority, by people speaking any other language as specified in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution, than Bengali, determined by a body set up by the Government with powers to demarcate the boundaries between Bihar and West Bengal, in the manner specified in section 3A within six months from the appointed day—

- (i) the whole of Dhanbad sub-
division;
- (ii) the whole of Dhalbhum
sub-division;
- (iii) from Santhal Pargana dis-
trict—
- (a) Jamtara sub-division;
- (b) Pakur sub-division;
- (c) Rajmahal sub-division ex-
cluding Sahibgung Thana;

(d) South Dumka of Dumka
sub-division; and such other
areas as are Bengali-speak-
ing in the sub-division;

(e) Koro taluk in Deoghar sub-
division and such other ar-
eas which are Bengali-speak-
ing in the sub-division; and

(iv) such other Bengali-speaking
areas of Purnea, as have not been
included in section 3."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Pages 2 and 3—

for clause 3, substitute:

"3. As from the appointed day, there shall be added to the State of West Bengal the territories which on the 1st day of March 1956 were comprised in the Chhota Nagpur Division, the district of the Santhal Parganas, Banka sub-division in the district of Bhagalpur and Jamui sub-division in the district of Monghyr and the said territories shall thereupon cease to form part of the State of Bihar; and, there shall be added to the State of Bihar the territories which on the 1st day of March 1956 were comprised in districts of Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri, Cooch Behar, West Dinajpur and Malda and the said territories shall thereupon cease to form part of the State of West Bengal."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Pages 2 and 3—

for clause 3, substitute:

"3. As from the appointed day, there shall be added to the State of Bihar the territories which on the 1st day of March 1956 were comprised in the districts of Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri and Cooch Behar and the said territories

shall thereupon cease to form part of the State of West Bengal."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:
Page 2—

for lines 24 to 29 substitute:

"(a) that portion of Kishanganj sub-division of Purnea district which lies to the east of the Mechi and the Mahananda river and that portion of Gopalpur thana of Purnea district and of Barsoi police station of that district which lies to east of the Mahananda."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 2—

after line 32, add:

"(c) the whole of Dhanbad sub-district;

(d) the whole of Dhalbhum sub-division;

(e) the whole of Jamtara and Pakur sub-divisions of Santhal Parganas district and also the Bengal speaking areas of Dumka, Rajmahal, Madhupur and Deoghar of that district."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Pages 2 and 3—

omit lines 35 to 40 and lines 1 to 5 respectively.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 2—

for lines 30 to 32, substitute:

"(b) Sadar sub-division of Manbhum district, excluding Chas thana, Chandil thana, Patamda police station of Barabhum thana, Jhalda thana, Baghmundi thana, Arsa police station of Purulia thana, and those portions

of Purulia mufassil and Balrampur police stations in Purulia thana which lie to the West of Dhanbad-Jamshedpur highway."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 3A.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 3A—I am putting amendment No. 34 which seeks to add a new clause.

The question is:

Page 3—

after line 14, insert:

"3A. The demarcation of boundaries as mentioned in sub-section (5) of the section 3 shall be made in the following manner:—

(a) A thorough re-examination shall be made of the linguistic position of such territories as are specified in the sub-section (5) of the Section 3 and of all other pertinent questions relating to them, and for this purpose a suitable body of twelve persons shall be set up by the Government of India, with personnel, official and non-official in equal proportions from amongst men renowned for their integrity and capacity, which shall undertake the work of such re-examination and which shall, for this purpose, study carefully all the material including facts and figures concerned that were submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission, and would demarcate the linguistic boundaries of Bihar and West Bengal with regard to the territories specified sub-section (5) of section 3;

(b) The Government of India shall set up one or more fact-finding committee or committees with impartial and able men, official and non-official in equal

[Mr. Speaker]

proportions, which shall help the said body in their re-examination work contemplated in clause (a) by assisting them in ascertaining the linguistic position of these territories, going personally to such parts of these territories as would require their personal visits; and these fact-finding committees shall, thereby, examine all the contentions and controversies about, and find out the truth in regard to, the linguistic position of various sections therein, the position of subsidiary languages of the bilingual people, the position and nature of the local dialects thereof, including that of tribal people therein, taking such help from renowned linguists of the country as would be required for ascertaining the truth.

(c) Such transfer of any portion of these territories shall not come into conflict with any practical administrative convenience in those territories and with the security of India as a whole, the question of which will ultimately be decided by the Government of India, after ascertaining the views of the body to be set up under the clause (a).

(d) Prior to the visits contemplated above the fact-finding committee or committees shall invite all those who submitted memoranda to the States Reorganisation Commission to join, watch and help the work of fact-finding as referred to in clause (b).

(e) In the demarcation of the linguistic boundaries as would be made by the aforesaid body as mentioned in the clause (a), clear simple majority of the persons speaking any of the languages specified in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution would be the criterion and in regard to the persons speaking of any dialect, it will be considered as to what language it is akin to and

in what language their educational, cultural and social life is being conducted or should be conducted for their speedy progress and their convenience.

(f) The Government of India shall make suitable provisions for the expenses that would be incurred by the aforesaid body as well as by the fact-finding Committees mentioned in the clauses (a) and (b) for conducting their work as specified in the above mentioned clauses of this section; and shall also make arrangements for providing such official staff as would be required by that body and the fact-finding Committees;

(g) The Government of India shall clearly state the reasons justifying such of their decisions, as would be made in accordance with the above-mentioned clauses of this section, with regard to any of the territories specified in sub-section (5) of the section 3 and as would not comply with the provisions made in the sub-section (5) of the Section 3 and clauses under Section 3A.

(h) That the Government of India shall take necessary measures to examine all charges, along with reasons and facts therefor, made in the memoranda submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission and to the Government of India by the people of Bihar and West Bengal, that their demands and cases have not been dealt with by the Commission impartially, properly and on sound principles as well as on the very principles that the Commission themselves laid down; and after the examination of all these charges, through proper enquiries, made in accordance with proper procedure, the Government of India shall give their clear verdict over these matters within six months from the appointed day."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now amendments Nos. 12 and 13 to clause 4.

The question is:

Page 3, line 23—

after "of that Province" insert:

"and the districts of Maldah, Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling now forming part of West Bengal"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, line 34—

add at the end:

"but shall not include the territories comprised in the districts of Maldah, Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: New clause 4A. Amendments Nos. 3 and 14.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 3 after line 39, insert:

"4A. (1) *Boundary Commission*.—A Boundary Commission shall be appointed consisting of a judge of the Supreme Court to be nominated by the Chief Justice, a linguist and an expert on Tribal problems to demarcate the contiguous Bengali speaking areas in Dhanbad sub-division of Manbhum district, Dhalbhum sub-division of Singhbhum district, Santal Parganas and also other such areas of Purnea district taking village as a unit and trying to keep a particular tribe under one administrative unit or system as far as possible.

(2) Immediately on such demarcation, the areas so formed shall form part of the State of West Bengal and shall cease to form part of the State of Bihar."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: 'Aye'.

Mr. Speaker: Those against will please say 'No'.

Several Hon. Members: 'No'.

Mr. Speaker: I think the 'Noes' have it. The motion is negatived.

Some Hon. Members: 'Ayes' have it.

Mr. Speaker. I shall put it again. The question is:

Page 3 after line 39, insert:

"4A. (1) *Boundary Commission*.—A Boundary Commission shall be appointed consisting of a judge of the Supreme Court to be nominated by the Chief Justice, a linguist, and an expert on Tribal problems to demarcate the contiguous Bengali speaking areas in Dhanbad sub-division of Manbhum district, Dhalbhum sub-division of Singhbhum district, Santal Parganas and also other such areas of Purnea district taking village as a unit and trying to keep a particular tribe under one administrative unit or system as far as possible.

(2) Immediately on such demarcation the areas so formed shall form part of the State of West Bengal and shall cease to form part of the State of Bihar."

Now, those in favour will please rise in their seats.

Shri K. K. Basu: Bell.

Mr. Speaker: Not necessary. I need not go on ringing the bell. Those in favour? Fifteen.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Let their names be recorded.

Mr. Speaker: Let us see.

Now, those against will please rise in their seats.

I see a large number. The motion is negatived.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: The names should be recorded.

Mr. Speaker: It is not usual to record names in such matters. Hon. Members will pass on their names. Let me not spend time. The amendment is lost.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

Page 3—

after line 39, insert:

4A. (1) Boundary Commission.—A Boundary Commission shall be appointed consisting of a judge of the Supreme Court to be nominated by the Chief Justice, a linguist, and an expert on Tribal problems to demarcate the contiguous Bengali speaking areas in Dhanbad sub-division of Manbhum district, Dhalbhum sub-division of Singhbhum district, Santal Parganas and also other such areas of Purnea district taking village as a unit and trying to keep a particular tribe under one administrative unit or system as far as possible.

(2) Immediately on such demarcation the areas so formed shall form part of the State of West Bengal and shall cease to form part of the State of Bihar."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 5. No amendment.

An Hon. Member: There is amendment No. 33.

Mr. Speaker: That is for clause 3. The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6—(Bye-elections to fill vacancies in the Council of States)

Shri K. K. Basu: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 8—

for "after the appointed day" substitute:

"after the next general election"

My amendment seeks to alter the provision which says:

"As soon as may be after the appointed day, bye-elections shall be held to fill the vacancies existing on that day in the seats allotted to Bihar and West Bengal."

3-08 P.M.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Under the provisions of the Bill, twelve seats are to be transferred to West Bengal. The representatives of these areas should go to West Bengal. But, under the provisions, out of 12 members of the present Assembly of the State of Bihar, only eight, I am told, are being transferred to the Bengal Assembly. Out of the new twelve members who should form part of the new legislature of West Bengal, only eight are being added and four seats remain vacant. There can be no bye-elections till the next general elections. My amendment seeks to provide that these bye-elections should be postponed till after the next general elections which are coming in six or seven months. The new legislature of West Bengal will fall short of four members. There cannot be, naturally, any bye-elections, because these four new members should be in Bihar till the next general elections. My submission is that these bye-elections should be postponed till after the general elections when the entire membership of the transferred areas will form part of the West Bengal legislature. This is the short amendment and I think, with all reasonableness which the Minister thinks he has got, he will accept this amendment.

Pandit G. B. Pant: There seems to be some little misunderstanding. This

clause only relates to the vacancies in the Council of States. So far as vacancies in the Council of States are concerned, I do not see why they should wait for the general elections.

Shri K. K. Basu: These vacancies are as a result of the additional members allotted because of the transfer of territories. There has been a new adjustment and new members have been added. We are not having all the members. Four will continue in Bihar. In view of this, the whole thing should be postponed till after the general elections which are coming in February, not even six months.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think, so far as the Council of States is concerned, it is a perennial body and it has no particular connection with the general elections. So, the clause should stand.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 4, line 8—

for "after the appointed day"
substitute:

"after the next general election"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

*Clause 6 was added to the Bill.
Clauses 7 to 12 were added to the Bill.*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Members who voted in favour of amendment No. 3 to add new clause 4-A have intimated their names. They are as follows:

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Shri Hiren Mukerjee; Shri Sarangadhar Das; Shrimati Renu Chakravartty; Shri M. K. Moitra; Shri Bajahari Mahata; Shri Chaitan Majhi; Shri Tushar Chatterjea; Dr. Rama Rao; Shri Dasaratha Deb; Shri S. B. Kotaiah; Shri K. K. Basu; Shri P. Subba Rao; Shri C. R. Chowdary and Shri Sadhan Gupta.

Clause 13— (Allocation of seats in the House of the People etc.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause 13.

Shri K. K. Basu: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 31—

for "252" substitute "254"

I think this time the hon. Minister will accept the amendment because under the present delimitation arrangement, in Bihar for every six seats in the State legislature there is one parliamentary seat. Therefore, as a result of the transfer of a particular area from Bihar to Bengal, two parliamentary seats have been reduced and 12 seats from the Bihar State legislature. The number of seats allotted to Bihar namely 12, has been tacked on to West Bengal, but in West Bengal today for every seven Assembly seats there is a parliamentary seat. It is on the basis of 105,000 that an Assembly seat is allotted to West Bengal whereas in Bihar it is on the basis of 115,000 or 120,000. So, if we accept the provisions of the Bill, what will happen is that in respect of these two parliamentary seats six Assembly seats will constitute one parliamentary seat, whereas for the rest of the State of West Bengal seven Assembly seats will constitute one parliamentary seat. The twelve seats they have reduced in Bihar they have just added to West Bengal, but I feel in view of the overall situation in West Bengal, the number of seats should not be 12 but 14. Therefore, instead of 252—we have got 240 and they are now adding 12 more—it should be 254. I think the Minister will appreciate this point of view. Otherwise, the whole basis will be completely different.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved.

Page 5, line 31—

for "252" substitute "254".

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think there is some slight error because this 252 is just seven times 36; 254 will not be

Bill

[Pandit G. B. Pant.]

in any way related to 36. This is the correct figure—one for seven so far as West Bengal is concerned and one for six so far as Bihar is concerned.

Shri K. K. Basu: In West Bengal today there are 240 seats, 238 elected and two nominated. You are only adding 12. I want you should add 14.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That would not be a multiple of seven. That is what the Minister has said.

Shri K. K. Basu: I think the Minister has understood my point.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have understood.

Shri K. K. Basu: The position is this. In the present West Bengal Assembly we have got 240 seats, 238 elected and two nominated.

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): The nominated does not count.

Shri K. K. Basu: Therefore what I say is if this means that this 252 does not include the nominated seats, I have no objection. If it does include nominated seats, you cannot have multiple of seven.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It applies to only elected seats.

Shri K. K. Basu: Then, it is all right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then I need not put it. Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 13 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 14 and 15 were added to the Bill.

Clause 16—

(Delimitation of Constituencies)

Shri K. K. Basu: I beg to move:

(i) Page 6—

(i) lines 2 and 3,

for "appoint an authority" substitute:

"constitute the Delimitation Commission in the manner herein-under prescribed"; and

(ii) for lines 15 and 16, substitute:

"(2) Such Delimitation Commission shall be composed of two members one of whom shall be a person who is or has been a Judge of the Supreme Court or of a High Court and the other the Chief Election Commissioner, *ex officio*. The Central Government shall nominate the member other than the Chief Election Commissioner as the Chairman.

(3) To assist such Commission seven associate members shall be nominated by the Central Government of whom three shall be the members of the House of the People and the other four of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly. In so nominating the Central Government shall take into consideration the composition of the Houses in the same manner as was provided under the former Act known as Delimitation Commission Act, 1952 provided however that the associate members appointed under the former Act shall be so nominated if they are willing and shall satisfy the requirement of this Act as to their representation.

(4) Such associate member shall have no right to vote or to sign any decision of the Commission.

(5) Any vacancy in the office of the Chairman, member or associate member shall be filled in by the Central Government as soon as practicable.

(6) Save as otherwise provided herein the Commission shall have all the power and function of the Commission as provided in the former Act.

(7) Authenticated copies of all orders amending, cancelling and substituting the Delimitation Order made under the former Act shall be sent to the Central Government and to each of the State Governments and thereupon that order shall supersede all orders made by the former Commission and have the full force of the law and shall not be called in question in any court.

(8) Such orders shall be laid before the House of the People and the State Legislatures by the Central and the State Government respectively as soon as may be after they are received.

(9) All elections to the House of the People or the State Legislature shall be held according to that order after the appointed day in supersession of and notwithstanding any provision by any other law."

(ii) Page 6, lines 2 and 3—

for "an authority" substitute:

"the Delimitation Commission appointed under the provisions of the State Reorganisation Act as the authority"

(iii) Page 6, line 16—

add at the end:

"under the provisions of the States Reorganisation Act."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are now before the House.

Shri K. K. Basu: This is very simple. In respect of all other States which are being formed or re-formed or re-adjusted the new delimitation is to be made by the Delimitation Commission as provided for by clause 44 of the States Reorganisation Bill but unfortunately I do not know why in the 438 LSD.

case of West Bengal there is no provision for a Delimitation Commission. The present clause in the Bill merely states that the Central Government shall by notified order appoint an authority. We want that in the case of West Bengal also there should be a Delimitation Commission on the same principle as found in the other Bill. Though it may be that we may not have much reshuffling so far as the number of seats is concerned, still certainly there is going to be reshuffling because we do get two parliamentary seats in respect of the 10 lakhs and 3 lakhs of people who are coming to us in the two areas. Therefore I urge that in West Bengal delimitation should be on the same par as in other States. I do not know why the Minister has left this power entirely to the Central Government or the executive machinery, because they are really apprehensive that they may have to have a different experience and that is why they want to have a special provision for West Bengal. I would like the provision regarding delimitation as provided in clause 44 of the States Reorganisation should be adopted here, and more or less on the same lines I have moved my amendment 59. I think the Minister should accept it.

Pandit G. B. Pant: In substance I agree with Shri Basu. We will appoint a Delimitation Commission and West Bengal will be treated in the same manner as other States. There was some technical difficulty—provision has been made in the S. R. Bill for the appointment of a Delimitation Commission and that Bill has not yet been passed. Therefore, we had to use the word "authority" there, but at the proper time we will issue a notification and the authority will be the same Delimitation Commission as in other States.

Shri K. K. Basu: Can I take it as an assurance from the Minister?

Pandit G. B. Pant: It is for you to take it or not to take it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendments?

Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendments, were by leave,
withdrawn.

Amendment made: Page 6:

for lines 10 to 14, substitute:

"(b) to revise to such extent as may be necessary or expedient, having regard to the said provisions, the orders of the Delimitation Commission made under section 8 of the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952, with respect to Bihar and West Bengal."

—[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 16, as amended, stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 16, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 22.—(Land and goods)

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I beg to move:

Page 8—

omit lines 13 to 21.

The portions which I desire to omit will be:

"(2) Any unissued stores of any class in Bihar shall be divided between West Bengal and Bihar in proportion to the total indents for stores of that class made in the period of three years ending with the 31st day of March, 1956, for the transferred territories and for the rest of Bihar:

Provided that nothing in this sub-section shall apply to stores held for specific purposes such as use or utilisation in particular institutions, workshops or

undertakings or on particular works under construction."

My reason for moving this amendment and taking the valuable time of the House is that the portion actually to be transferred is very small, and therefore, to trace all the unissued stores throughout the State, to take stock of them, to take the total indents made in the previous years into account, etc., in my opinion, is a cumbersome procedure which is not commensurate with the time and energy this is likely to take; further, the gains to Bengal or the loss to Bihar that will result from this will not be commensurate with the actual time and energy and even expenditure incurred on these operations.

I know that this provision has been inserted with a view to bringing it into line with the provision in the States Reorganisation Bill which we have adopted already. But the conditions there were definitely different, and therefore, such a provision, was in my opinion, necessary in that Bill. But here, it will not be necessary to follow what has been laid down in the States Reorganisation Bill.

That is why I submit that these sentences may be omitted. The provision in clause 22 (1) lays down clearly that whatever stores are in the transferred territories shall be transferred to Bengal, and to that, we have no objection.

Sub-clause (1) of clause 22 reads as follows:

"Subject to the other provisions of this Part, all land and all stores, articles and other goods in the transferred territories belonging to the State of Bihar shall, as from the appointed day, pass to the State of West Bengal."

So, if we retain this provision, all the stores lying unused or unutilised in the transferred territories shall go to Bengal. I am only objecting

to a census or a regular estimate or a regular accounting or a regular count being done of all the unissued stores throughout the State, for the purposes of this transfer. My view is that this will not be necessary, because this will not be commensurate with the trouble that it involves.

Therefore, I would suggest that, perhaps, Government might think of dropping this portion of clause 22.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

Page 8—

omit lines 13 to 21.

Pandit G. B. Pant: The hon. Member himself has pointed out that this clause has been taken bodily from the States Reorganisation Bill. If the necessity of introducing a separate Bill for the transfer of these territories from Bihar to Bengal had not arisen, these proposals too would have formed part of the original States Reorganisation Bill, and whatever difficulties may have to be faced would have had to be faced then also.

Besides, the proposal contained here follows a general principle. In the circumstances, it will be difficult for us to depart from the policy that we have adopted. In the case of the bigger Bill too, even to the small areas, such as the four talukas in the south of Travancore-Cochin, which are transferred to Madras, this principle is applied. Similarly, Abu is transferred from one State to another. There too, this principle was made applicable. I do not see how we can depart from the policy which we have generally adopted and followed.

Shri Syamnadan Sahaya: I thought that it was only proper to have brought this to the notice of the Home Minister and of the House. I do not press the amendment. In the other Bill, this provision was included, and I think, it was an important check. So, I do not press this amendment.

Pandit G. B. Pant: The better course would be for the Bengal and Bihar representatives to sit together and to decide that they would not follow this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member got leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Pandit G. B. Pant: The hon. Member may persuade Dr. Roy and Mr. Sinha not to go in for these things.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Shall I move the amendment relating to negotiable instruments?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the clause to vote.

Pandit G. B. Pant: You can settle these things privately. Let not the scheme of the Bill be disturbed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That clause 22 stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 22 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 23 to 25 were added to the Bill.

Clause 26.—(Credits in certain funds)

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I beg to move:

Page 9—

after line 11, add:

“Provided that, for the purposes of such division, the amount of deposits made under the Provident Funds Act, 1922, by persons serving in connection with the affairs of Bihar and deposits made by the local authorities in the public account of Bihar shall be deducted from the amount of

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

the investment in the cash balance investments account."

The language of the amendment is clear enough. I do not think it needs any great stress to be laid on it. While the procedure adopted in the other States will be applicable to this State also in regard to the division of the general assets of the State, yet I feel that the amount kept in the general account by way of provident funds and the deposits of local authorities should be deducted, and only the balance should be distributed. That is my suggestion, in short.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendment is before the House.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Again, this provision also has been bodily taken from the States Reorganisation Bill. The accounts all over the country are maintained in the same form. So, I think no hardship will accrue, if we follow....

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Actually, I do not know whether in other States, the same accounting procedure is followed.

Pandit G. B. Pant: The accounting procedure is the same all over the country. It is laid down by the Comptroller and Auditor-General for all the States. We have the same pattern all over the country.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: In that case, I do not press my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not merely a question of not pressing it, but of asking for the leave of the House to withdraw it.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I ask for the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are no amendments to clause 27. So, I shall put clauses 26 and 27 to vote together.

The question is:

"That clauses 26 and 27 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 26 and 27 were added to the Bill.

Clause 28—(Public debt)

Amendment made:

Page 10, line 1—

after 'sinking fund' insert 'or depreciation fund'.

—[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 28, as amended stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 28, as amended, was added to the Bill.

New Clause 28A

Pandit G. B. Pant: I beg to move:

Page 10—

after line 9, insert:

"28A. Refund of taxes collected in excess.—The liability of Bihar to refund any tax or duty on property situate in the transferred territories, including land revenue, collected in excess shall be the liability of West Bengal and the liability of Bihar to refund any other tax or duty collected in excess in any case where the place of assessment of that tax or duty is in the transferred territories shall also be the liability of West Bengal."

Shri K. K. Basu: I beg to move:

That in the amendment proposed by Pandit G. B. Pant, printed as No. 25 in the List No. 5 of amendments—

add the proviso to new clause 28A:

“Provided that the Central Government shall reimburse the West Bengal Government for the amount she might have to pay thereunder”.

I was trying to find out whether there was a similar provision in the S.R. Bill, but so far, I could not find any such provision. I fully agree that it is very difficult for the Bihar Government to repay. It must be done by West Bengal because there will be administrative problems. I have no objection to that. But why unnecessarily saddle the West Bengal Government which is already running a deficit and asking for more and more money from the Central Government? Therefore, my proviso says that if such payment has to be made by the West Bengal Government, the Central Government must reimburse that Government to that extent. West Bengal is not at fault for this payment because it is because of certain administrative difficulties that this has to be made. We cannot go back to Bihar and ask them to pay once this area has been transferred to West Bengal.

Therefore, I would like the Minister to consider this point:

Pandit G. B. Pant: If Shri Basu will refer to clause 83 of the S.R. Bill, he will find a corresponding provision. But so far as this particular clause goes, no hardship is caused to West Bengal because it will be getting its share out of the cash balances and other funds held by Bihar. So when it gets the share of the assets, it has also to meet the liability. I do not think there is anything inequitable in this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is past 3-30 now. We have to take up non-official business. Shall we dispose of this clause in the next few minutes and then take up non-official business?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I would suggest that you extend the discussion for a few minutes so that we not only finish this clause and other clauses but also the third reading of the Bill. I won't take any time; I won't speak for more than half a minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If that is the desire, we shall continue with this.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am not quite sure whether we are suspending the other business of the day.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will finish with this Bill and then have full time for non-official business. The House will sit longer to finish that business.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the amendment proposed by Pandit G. B. Pant printed as No. 25 in List No. 5 of amendments—add the proviso to new clause 28A:

“Provided that the Central Government shall reimburse the West Bengal Government for the amount she might have to pay thereunder”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 10,—

after line 9, insert:

“28A. Refund of taxes collected in excess.—The liability of Bihar to refund any tax or duty on property situate in the transferred territories, including land revenue, collected in excess shall be the liability of West Bengal

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

and the liability of Bihar to refund any other tax or duty collected in excess in any case where the place of assessment of that tax or duty is in the transferred territories shall also be the liability of West Bengal."

The motion was adopted.

New Clause 28A was added to the Bill.

Clauses 29 to 39 were added to the Bill.

Clause 40.—(Provisions relating to Services)

Shri Syamandan Sahaya: I beg to move:

Pages 13 and 14—

for clauses 40 and 41, substitute:

"40. (1) Every person who immediately before the appointed day is holding or discharging the duties of any post or office in connection with the affairs of Bihar in any area within the transferred territories shall, subject to the provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3), be withdrawn by Bihar on the appointed day at an hour fixed by the Central Government.

(2) Every person who, immediately before the appointed day, is serving in connection with the affairs of Bihar, and is resident of any area within the transferred territories, shall be given an opportunity by Bihar to opt, in writing, for service in connection with the affairs of West Bengal.

(3) Any person who has opted under sub-section (2) to serve in connection with the affairs of West Bengal shall be permanently allotted by the Central Government to serve in connection with the affairs of that State with effect from such date as it may deem fit; and he shall cease to serve in connection with the affairs of Bihar and shall be made available for serving in West Bengal with effect from such date as may be

agreed upon between the State Governments, or in default of such agreement, as may be determined by Central Government.

(4) The conditions of service applicable immediately before the appointed day in the case of any person withdrawn by Bihar under sub-section (1), or permanently allotted to West Bengal under sub-section (3) shall not be varied to his disadvantage except with the previous approval of the Central Government."

My amendment really seeks to substitute a clause for both clauses 40 and 41. Relating to services, there are two clauses in the Bill. But the amendment which I moved is slightly different. The idea of my amendment is that if anybody, who is at present serving in the transferred territories or who comes from the transferred territories, that is, who is a resident of the transferred territories, wishes, he should have the opportunity to opt as he wants to remain in Bihar in service or to go to West Bengal. He should have that choice, and that should be considered, if possible, subject to certain considerations of administrative importance. That should be given due weight.

As it is, the provisions laid down in clauses 40 and 41 of the Bill are to the effect that on a certain date, those people are to be transferred on orders issued by the Central Government and later on the position will be decided naturally by the constituted authority, which in this case will be West Bengal. I thought that in the interest of service, it would perhaps be desirable if those who desired to remain there were allowed to remain there, and those who desired to go to West Bengal, were allowed the option to do so. It is with a view to introduce this option that this amendment has been moved. There is no difference, so far as the intention and also the language are concerned, between what is contained in the Bill and what is suggested by me in the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendment is before the House.

Pandit G. B. Pant: There is no rigidity about it. If the employees in Bihar want to stay in Bihar and the Bihar Government is prepared to retain them in its service, nobody will like to compel them to go to West Bengal. The Central Government has the final say in all these matters, and it does not intend to compel any one to either stick to a place or to go out of that place to another one. But I do not like this principle of option at all, because in our own country we will have men serving in one State, though they may have their home in another. In fact, we are introducing certain provisions in order to provide new facilities for serving in States other than those in which people have been born and have been living, so that the integrity and unity of the country may be maintained and also preserved and promoted in actual practice.

But so far as these clauses are concerned, I do not think any difficulty is likely to arise. They may have their home in another.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: In view of the clarification given by the hon. Minister, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Ms. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 40 to 51 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 40 to 51 were added to the Bill.

New Clause 52.

Shri Chaitan Majhi (Manbhum South-cum Dhalbhum—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I beg to move:

Page 16—

after line 22, add:

"Part IX

Safeguards to the linguistic and other minorities

"52. (1) The Central Government shall appoint a provisional

Minorities Safeguard Board for Bihar and West Bengal with 11 members therefor, and out of the eleven members one shall be nominated by the Central Government and two from each other respective State Governments and two members of Parliament from each of the States, one being from the minority party and the other from the opposition and two more from each of the States, drawn from the general public.

(2) The Chairman of the Board shall be elected from amongst and by the members and the Central Government nominee shall be its permanent Secretary.

(3) The Board shall look into and hold suitable enquiries for charges of discriminatory as well as oppressive treatment of the linguistic and other minorities of the States concerned from the part of the State Governments or any body or groups in the States of Bihar and West Bengal acting with powers,

(a) as provided for them through proper legislations by the State Governments and the Central Government in consultation with each other and amongst them;

(b) as given to them by provisions as referred to above in clause (a) of this sub-section, to have the right to hold enquiries into matters relating to the States concerned and to visit places in those States in pursuance of their duties as mentioned in the terms of reference made for the purpose;

(c) to look into all disabilities, legal or otherwise, created in the realm of the educational, cultural, social, economic, religious and political life of the minorities concerned in order to find ways and means to overcome them and to get them redressed by drawing the attention of all concerned; and

[Shri Chaitan Majhi]

(d) to hold conferences attended by the representatives of the said minorities and of such organisations that are working for the protection of the rights of the minorities, in order to formulate suggestions and to find ways and means that would enable the minorities to enjoy maximum privileges and their civic rights that would practically be possible in the existing conditions of their life and the state of affairs in the States concerned.

(4) The Board will apprise the Parliament and the Central Government and the States Governments concerned of all their findings and their remedies.

(5) The Board will continue as long as there is no all-India arrangement evolved to serve this purpose for which this provision of Board is being set up."

*By my amendment I am demanding the creation of a Minority Safeguard Board in a manner prescribed in the amendment. The Board will look into the questions of safety and rights and the well-being and progress of the linguistic and other minorities in the States concerned. The necessity of this Board will be fully realised when we will take into consideration the state of affairs going on for the last eight years in the life of the linguistic minorities in the State of Bihar. The Zonal Council, visualised in the States Reorganisation Bill is inappropriate to achieve what is aimed at by this amendment.

It is well known in India today that the linguistic minorities have been and are being oppressed and suppressed by the Government of Bihar in the Bengali-speaking areas in the State. Hundreds of schools were deprived of their right to enjoy

the Government recognition and to impart education in Bengali. Illegal and unconstitutional ways and means were devised to rob the people here of their right to assemble together and to enjoy the freedom of speech and to performing age-long festivals of their own. For that reason, the black law of Security Act was promulgated, and hundreds of people have been arrested in clear contravention of the spirit and the text of the Constitution. An unending reign of terror, and suppression and oppression of all kind have been and are being perpetrated by the Government of Bihar and their agents in the life of the linguistic minorities in the States. The officials and the hirelings under the guidance and aegis of the Government of Bihar have looted the properties of the Bengali-speaking people, made severe attack on their persons with deadly weapons, set fire to their institution because it was being conducted through Bengali medium, and have been inflicting various kinds of humiliation and disabilities on the linguistic minorities in those parts. The Government of Bihar is trying to make our life miserable by creating dissensions amongst the communities,—amongst Adibashis and non-Adibashis, Harijans and Non-Harijans, amongst Kurmis and Non-Kurmis, pursuing their divide and rule policy with regard to the linguistic and other minorities.

This is the condition of life in the places where the minorities live. So it is our demand that, so far it is practicable, the Bengali-speaking territories should be transferred to West Bengal on linguistic principle when there is a way out on principle; and there should be an effective and strong Board to safeguard the rights and the lives and properties of the linguistic and other minorities.

Though we are facing a serious objective condition in our lives, requiring a way out, yet we want that

things should be governed on principle. And we adhere strictly to the linguistic principle, and we do justly so. We demanded that the whole of Manbhum and Dhalbhum and all the Bengali-speaking parts of Santhal Pargana and Purnea should go to West Bengal. However much the agents of the Government of Bihar may say in refuting the truth, the bare truth is that all these areas are Bengali-speaking.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 36 of the hon. Member relates to the safeguards to the linguistic and other minorities. That point has already been raised in this House and it has been ruled by the hon. Speaker that these safeguards would find a better place when we are discussing the Constitution (Ninth) Amendment Bill. So, I rule this out of order. This is not the place where it can be moved.

Schedule

Pandit G. B. Pant: I beg to move:

Page 16—

lines 35 and 36—

for "the second half of the financial year 1956-57" substitute:

"the period commencing on the appointed day and ending on the 31st day of March, 1957".

As we have substituted 1st November for 1st October, this is a consequential amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 16—

lines 35 and 36—

for "the second half of the financial year 1956-57" substitute:

"the period commencing on the appointed day and ending on the 31st day of March, 1957".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Schedule, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

The Schedule, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 1—(Short Title)

Shri K. K. Basu: Sir, I move:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6—

for "(Transfer of Territories)" substitute:

"(Reorganisation and Readjustment of States Boundaries)".

My amendment is also sentimental and emotional. It is to use instead of the words (Transfer of Territories) the words (Reorganisation and Readjustment of States Boundaries). By the use of these words, as in the case of the other main Bill, I think, we can get this Bill passed in a spirit much more friendly than what has been expressed for the last two days during discussion.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I wonder if it would be proper to make a change in the title of the Bill after we have carried on all this discussion, considered it in the Joint Committee and published it as such. I do not think it will be proper.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6—

for "(Transfer of Territories)" substitute:

"(Reorganisation and Readjustment of States Boundaries)".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and Title were added to the Bill.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

Shri M. K. Moitra: Sir.....

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Cannot we take up this third reading on Monday?

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I humbly suggest that we have this third reading on Monday?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I put it to the House and the House agreed that we will finish it today.

Shri M. K. Moitra: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Bill is now before the House and it is going to be passed. But I am sorry to say that the Bill will not be able to create the satisfaction that ought to have been created. It would not be able to end the controversy that has been there in the country for the last 50 years because no principle has been followed in the Bill.

We know that we wanted that the Bill should be based on the principle of language, contiguity of areas and wishes of the people. In fact, there has been an anxiety to base the Bill on language because if language be not made the basis of the Bill, why was there so much anxiety on the part of our friends from Bihar to part with the areas, to transfer the areas to Bengal? The question of language was acting behind their minds; it was also behind the mind of the Hon. Home Minister. The other day, the Hon. Home Minister said that Shri Deshmukh had confused thinking because he had changed his place. Now, I should say that the hon. the Home Minister and his friends are having confused thinking.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I never used those words.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri M. K. Moitra: With regard to this Bill because.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister says that he never used that expression.

An Hon. Member: In any case it is correct at least as far as he is concerned.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It may be correct as far as I am concerned but I did not use it in regard to Shri Deshmukh.

Shri M. K. Moitra: He has changed his place now. Some years ago it was language on the basis of which he wanted the reorganisation of the States and now he says that language will have no place. But we are where we were before and, therefore, on our part there has been no confused thinking. (*Interruption*).

Sir, there has been the question of lebensraum. Bengal has been accused of having a desire for land grabbing. But I say, who should be accused of this? Is it the Bengalis or is the boot on the other leg? In 1948 when Kharswan and Seraikella were added to Bihar, they took it and they refused to part with it even though it should not be with Bihar. So, the boot is on the other leg and if any charge of land grabbing is to be made on the floor of the House, it should be against Bihar.

I am sorry to say that the hon. **Shri M. P. Mishra** said that it was very difficult to deal with the Bengalis. And, yet, I found him anxious for a merger of Bihar with Bengal. We could not understand it. If he cannot deal with people like the Bengalis, why should there be an anxiety in him to have merger with Bengal?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I may bring it to the notice of the hon. Member that we are at the third reading stage. He knows the restrictions so far as this stage is concerned.

Shri M. K. Moitra: I am concluding. The thing is the Bill will be passed but the Bill will never satisfy the people and the controversy that has been there in the country for the last 50 years will continue. It will not bring together the two peoples though it should have brought these two peoples together so that a strong and united India could be built. In going to solve a problem the authorities have created new problems. If anybody is responsible for that the responsibility lies on the Congress High Command.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya East): I rise to support this Bill, but at the same time I would like to place my views on the dangers that confront this country on the borders of Bengal. Bengal has been vivisected. West Bengal is tottering on one leg. I plead for the merger of the adjoining provinces with Bengal-Bihar, Assam and Orissa. I plead for merger not because I believe either in a unilingual or in a bilingual or in a multi-lingual State, but because I believe that that is the only solution of all the problems that confront us. I stand for the establishment of a unitary State. But knowing fully well the limitations under which we have to work at the present moment, the only solution now is merger. Bengal is tottering on one leg; it has been vivisected; half of Bengal has gone over to Pakistan. Now West Bengal fall either on our side or on the side of Dacca or Peking. West Bengal is being subjected to gravitational pulls from two different directions—from Peking and from Dacca. The gravitational pull from Peking is becoming stronger and stronger day by day. East Bengal has gone out of the Indian Union. West Bengal will also go out if it is not integrated with the adjoining provinces.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: It will remain in India.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: West Bengal is far away from Delhi. The

farther you go from the centre of gravitation, the lesser becomes its pull.

The fauna and flora of Bengal is akin to that of South East Asia. Darjeeling was a part of China for a long time. Why do I say that there is danger in West Bengal? It is because of these reasons. Traces of Mangolian blood are found in our veins. The unrest in the Nagaland ought to be an eye-opener. Let us be on our guard. The gravitational pull of Dacca is also a factor to be reckoned with. Sarat Babu stood for an independent Bengal. The gravitational pull of China will become irresistible if both parts of Bengal are integrated into a sovereign independent republic. I am not thinking in terms of military defence, for defence is the responsibility of the Government of India. The area of a province is not a factor of any military significance. The old conflict between the Congress and the Muslim League will arise again if the two parts are united within the framework of the Indian Union. There would have been no Pakistan if Bihar had not been separated from Bengal. The old conflict between the Congress and the Muslim League will not arise if before East Bengal comes back into India, West Bengal is integrated with the adjoining provinces.

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East): I oppose the whole Bill tooth and nail, as it has ignored the basic factor that the people of the areas concerned should be taken into consultation. Our Home Minister can by no means make any good out of this Bill. This Bill has solved no problems. I saw just now what the hon. Member from Bengal, who spoke before me, felt about this Bill and I reiterate it. Everybody will understand that perhaps the Home Minister may think it is a make-shift arrangement for some years and somehow we have bypassed the problem. But this problem will arise again because without taking the census or a plebiscite, the Home Minister has left all the three parties like this. I repeat

[Pandit S. C. Mishra]

once more that for some time there may be no quarrel, but immediately after that, Shri Chatterjee and people like him will always be going fifty years back and they will be saying that this part ought to have come to Bengal, that part ought to have gone to Bihar and this part ought to have gone to Orissa. I made it plain on the very first day and I repeat it again in front of the Home Minister that it is a great sin to keep in Bihar any thana, any taluka or any district which by a majority is Bengali-speaking or wish to go to Bengal or to Orissa. Our Home Minister thinks that we take something from here and give it to Bihar so that Bihar may be satisfied—Kharswan and Seraikella have not been taken away from Bihar and Bihar should be grateful for it. This is exactly the monkey's justice and nothing more. By saying that, the Home Minister tries to placate one State here and placate another State there, but no State is going to be placated and shall be placated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The monkey did dispense justice and no attempt was made to placate anybody.

Shri Syammandan Sahaya: Dispensed justice in order to placate itself.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: When one tray went down, for the time being the balance was tried to be made up. Here I think for some time the Bihar people will be taken into a conference in a room and said this and that; at another time the Bengal people will taken into another room and said this thing and that thing and so on.

Two fundamental injustices have been done. Here the Home Minister thinks that all the factors that are to be calculated are either he himself, that is the Home Minister, the Chief Minister of Bihar and the Chief Minister of Bengal. For this venerable *malik* of Delhi, people do not exist at all, if today a contingency arises. Well, you may have land, but

why drag one set of people from here and another set of people from there? In Purnea District, if an option is given, I think 80 per cent. of the population will wish to come out of that area and vacate the whole area for Bengal. That would have been an improvement and lakhs of refugees might have been settled there. Our benign Government will say nothing about it and will give no consideration. They will give consideration to anything about the Chief Minister, anything about the Home Minister, but nothing about the people who inhabit the areas.

I am very weak, this being the fifteenth day of my fast and so I cannot speak very much.

If we look back on the story of Phillip Bonaparte—Louis Bonaparte, we find that he said "my brother perished because he was vacillating". Our great lords of Delhi also feel that if they vacillate, if they go away a bit even from their determination, perhaps they shall be losing in the coming elections. Anyway, once more I say that the basic principle has been ignored and the people of those areas have been ridden rough shod. Neither has this question been settled. Had the plebiscite been taken in all these States, there would have been no quarrel. The thing that pains me most is that a problem which could have been very easily settled without any party having a chance to grumble has not been tackled in that way, because our rulers do not take the people into confidence.

4 P.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the House desires that this discussion should be concluded. I now call upon the hon. Minister.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Sir, I was surprised when certain speeches were made by the Members sitting in opposite benches. I do not think that the last speaker belongs to any political party.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Certainly, the Socialist Party of India.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Yes, I was mistaken and I stand disillusioned. So I have found the key to his speech and I do not propose to reply to it.

So far as other Members are concerned, I am, on the whole, thankful to the House for having adopted the Bill almost unanimously. There are some cynics always even in the brightest of society and one finds relief in the thought that their forebodings seldom come true. Only they see red everywhere, they themselves being immersed in red.

As to the merits of this Bill, I remind the House that it is not the Government which is directly responsible for the proposals contained in the Bill. The proposals emanated from the States Reorganisation Commission. That Commission has been applauded by many of the Members sitting opposite. They have given a due measure of praise to the Commission. We have accepted the proposals of the Commission and the Commission expressed the hope, which they have stated in their own unequivocal language, and which I would like to quote before I conclude. They say:

"The redrawing of these boundaries has been one of the most difficult problems with which this Commission has been faced. We have tried to arrive at decisions which are in our opinion fair and equitable. We have been anxious to ensure, if possible, that the sterile and unfortunate controversies which have taken a great deal of the time and energy of the leaders of Bengal and Bihar should be brought to an end as early as possible."

This Bill has been designed in order to put an end to these controversies. I hope it will fulfil that purpose. But, if any misguided people still persist in continuing these sterile controversies, they will find their labours

and energies ultimately lost in darkness, in dust, without yielding an iota of any result.

The chapter of any territorial controversies between Bihar and Bengal is closed. It is not going to be reopened. There may be union of Bengal and Bihar.....

An Hon. Member: No, no.

Pandit G. B. Pant: but there will be no further transfer of territory from one to the other except with mutual consent. So, whatever people may still be designing, whatever be their plots, I for one believe that they will never succeed. Goodwill will grow. There will be more of mutual amity, fellowship, friendship and comradeship between the citizen of Bihar and Bengal and they both will join hands in making an earnest endeavour for the welfare and progress, not only of their own respective States of Bihar and Bengal, but of the whole of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-EIGHTH REPORT

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Dist.—Central): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th August, 1956."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fifty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th August, 1956."

The motion was adopted.