

44

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE
ON THE
DEMAND FOR PUNJABI SUBA
REPORT

25
Digi

Committee Br.



26
E 30
26

124
12
C. B. No. 188

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE
ON THE

DEMAND FOR PUNJABI SUBA

REPORT

(Presented on the 18th March, 1966)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March 1966/Phalguna 1887 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 1.25

CONTENTS

	PAGE (iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	
REPORT	
I.—Introduction	1
II.—Evolution of the Demand for Punjabi Suba	4
III.—Working of the Regional Formula in Punjab	8
IV.—Demand for Haryana State	15
V.—Merger of Hill Areas of Punjab in Himachal Pradesh	19
VI.—Conclusions & Recommendations	23
NOTES BY MEMBERS	
1. Dr. M. S. Aney	29
2. Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedy	32
3. Shri Bansi Lal	37
4. H.H. Maharaja Karni Singhji of Bikaner	38
5. Sardar Surjit Singh Majithia	39
6. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee	40
7. Chodhury Brahm Perkash and Kumari Shanta Visisht	45
8. Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel	50
APPENDICES	
I. Statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda) in Lok Sabha on the 23rd September, 1965	55
II. List of bodies, organisations, associations and individuals who gave evidence before the Committee	56
III. List of bodies/individuals who were invited by the Committee to give oral evidence before them but did not appear before the Committee or declined to do so	62
IV. An outline of the Scheme for Regional Committees in the Punjab State	63
V. The Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957 (as amended upto date)	66
VI. Sachar Formula	79
VII. Pepsu Language Formula	82
VIII. Study of Statistical data region-wise in Punjab	83
IX. State Income Estimates of the Punjab at current Prices, 1961-62	88
X. Distribution of Population and Density of Population in Punjab	89
XI. 'Rough' Map of Punjab showing Hindi and Punjabi Regions.	

CONTENTS

Page
(vii)

FOREWORD

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON THE DEMAND FOR PUNJABI SUBA

Composition of the Committee

Sardar Hukam Singh—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Dr. M. S. Aney
3. Shri Mani Ram Bagri
4. Chodhury Brahm Perakash
5. Shri Surendranath Dwivedy
6. Sardar Dhanna Singh Gulshan
7. Shri Hem Raj
8. H. H. Maharaja Karni Singhji of Bikaner
9. Shri Lahri Singh
10. Sardar Surjit Singh Majithia
11. Shri K. D. Malaviya
12. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
13. Shri Krishna Chandra Pant
14. Shri Sadhu Ram
15. Shri Amar Nath Vidyalandkar

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri Bansi Lal
17. Shri Uttam Singh Dugal
18. Shri Jogendra Singh
19. Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel
20. Shri Sadiq Ali
21. Kumari Shanta Vasisht
22. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shukdher—*Secretary.*

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON THE DEMAND FOR PUNJABI SUBA

REPORT

I

Introduction

e/ On the 6th September, 1965, the Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Gulzarilal Nanda) made a statement¹ in Lok Sabha in which he referred to the several steps which had been taken in recent years to arrive at an amicable arrangement for meeting the needs of the Punjabi and Hindi-speaking regions of the Punjab State and said that "the whole question (of formation of a Punjabi-speaking State) can be examined afresh with an open mind". He had added that "Government would be prepared to have further talks on the subject. We may hope that a co-operative solution would be discovered based on goodwill and a reasoned approach". A similar statement was made in the Rajya Sabha on the same date by the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi)².

2. Subsequently, on the 23rd September, 1965, the Minister of Home Affairs, (Shri Gulzarilal Nanda) recalling his earlier statement of the 6th September, 1965, announced³ in Lok Sabha Government's decision "to set up a Committee of the Cabinet to pursue this matter further" and added "I would request you (the Speaker, Lok Sabha) and the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, to set up for the same purpose a Parliamentary Committee of Members of both Houses of Parliament presided over by you". Concluding his statement, he expressed his confidence that "the efforts of this Cabinet Committee and of the Parliamentary Committee will lead to a satisfactory settlement of the question" (See Appendix I). A similar statement was made by the Minister of Home Affairs in Rajya Sabha also on the same date⁴.

3. The names of the members nominated to the Committee by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, and the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, respectively, were published in the Lok Sabha Bulletin—Part II, and the Rajya Sabha Bulletin—Part II, dated the 28th September, 1965.

4. Simultaneously with the announcement of the appointment of the members of the Committee, a Press Communiqué was issued on

¹L.S. Debs. dated 6.9.1965, cc. 3954—62.

²RS Debs. dated 6.9.1965, cc. 2847—54.

³L.S. Debs. dated 23.9.1965, cc. 7191—7202.

⁴R.S. Debs. dated 23.9.1965, cc. 5271—75.

the 28th September, 1965 inviting public bodies, organisations, associations or individuals desirous of submitting written memoranda on the question of formation of a Punjabi-speaking State for the consideration of the Committee to submit their memoranda to the Committee by the 20th October, 1965. Through the same Press Communique, the public were also informed that those who were desirous of giving oral evidence before the Committee could, besides sending their written memoranda, make requests to that effect to the Committee. The time for submission of written memoranda to the Committee was subsequently extended upto the 5th November, 1965 and this was notified for public information through a Press Communique issued on the 9th October, 1965.

5. The Committee met for the first time on the 9th October, 1965. At this meeting the following three Members of the Cabinet Committee were also present:

- (1) Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Minister of Information and Broadcasting;
- (2) Shri Y. B. Chavan, Minister of Defence; and
- (3) Shri Mahavir Tyagi, Minister of Rehabilitation.

At this meeting, the Committee decided to issue an appeal through a Press Communique to the Leaders of all political parties, sections of the Press and other organs of public to avoid issuing any controversial statements or counter-statements on the subject of the demand for a Punjabi Suba and urged that, considering the needs of present times and to maintain national solidarity, it was essential that utmost cordiality and amity should prevail among all people in the country. The Committee added that all suggestions and view-points on the subject might be made to them through written memoranda/representations, etc.

6. The Committee received 7,184 written memoranda/representations on the question before them.

7. The Committee held in all 28 sittings.

8. At their first and second sittings held on the 9th October and 26th November, 1965, the Committee considered their programme of work.

9. At their third to fifth sittings held on the 22nd to 24th December, 1965, the Committee held a general discussion on the various implications of the problems arising from the demand for the formation of a Punjabi Suba. The Committee felt that in formulating their

recommendations, they would keep all relevant factors in view, such as, historical and political background, linguistic and cultural homogeneity, geographical contiguity, economic viability, administrative convenience and security considerations.

10. The Committee commenced the hearing of the oral evidence at their sittings fixed on the 10th January, 1966 onwards. But owing to the sad and sudden demise of the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Committee had to adjourn till the 27th January, 1966.

On a suggestion being made, at the sitting on the 10th January, 1966, the Committee decided that Members of the Cabinet Committee might be requested to attend either jointly or individually, as might suit their convenience, the sittings of the Committee, when they heard the parties/organisations, who had submitted Memoranda to the Parliamentary Committee. A request to all the three Ministers was accordingly sent. With the impending Cabinet changes following the death of Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Cabinet Committee, however, ceased to exist, and, therefore, the Ministers did not attend the sittings of the Committee.

11. At their sixth⁵ and eighth to nineteenth sittings held on the 10th and 27th to 29th January, and 1st to 5th, 7th, 8th, 21st and 22nd February, 1966, respectively, the Committee heard oral evidence given before them by the representatives of 25 bodies, organisations, associations and individuals, including the Chief Minister and certain other Ministers of the Government of Punjab and the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh. (See Appendix II). Ten bodies/individuals, who were invited by the Committee to give oral evidence before them, either did not appear before the Committee or declined to do so. A list of such organisations etc. is at Appendix III.

12. The Committee held their final deliberations at their twenty-first to twenty-seventh sittings held on the 1st to 4th and 8th to 10th March, 1966.

13. The Committee adopted their report on the 15th March, 1966.

⁵The seventh sitting of the Committee held on the 11th January, 1966 adjourned immediately after passing a condolence resolution on the passing away of the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri.

II

Evolution of the Demand for Punjabi Suba

14. The question of re-distribution of provinces was first mooted by the Indian Statutory Commission (1930). Speaking of the factors which should govern such re-distribution, the Commission *inter alia* stated⁶ "if those who speak the same language form a compact and self-contained area, so situated and endowed as to be able to support its existence as a separate province, there is no doubt that the use of a common speech is a strong and natural basis for provincial individuality****" The question of re-distribution of provinces was also examined by the Nehru Committee of the All Parties Conference in 1928 which lent its support to the principle of Linguistic Provinces in the following words⁷:—

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

The Indian National Congress, in its Resolutions of October—November 1937 relating to the redistribution of Provinces on linguistic basis and on the minority rights, reiterated its faith in the "redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis" and affirmed that "the culture, language and script of the minorities and of the different linguistic areas shall be protected".

15. After the Transfer of Power in 1947, the question of re-distribution of provinces and formation of unilingual States came under active consideration of the All-India Congress Committee. By a Government of India Order, dated June 19, 1948, the Linguistic Provinces Commission (known as the 'Dar Commission') was appointed to report on the question of formation of the provinces of Andhra, Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra. As has been re-

⁶Report of the Indian Statutory Commission (1930), Vol. II, p. 24.

⁷All Parties Conference (1928), Report of the Committee, p. 62.

ferred to in the latter part of the Report, this Commission enunciated two important principles for carving out new States; *viz.*, 'administrative convenience' and 'homogeneity of language'.

16. Soon after the Dar Commission had submitted its Report, the Indian National Congress appointed at its Jaipur Session in December, 1948, a Committee to consider the question of linguistic provinces and to review the position in the light of the Report of the Dar Commission and the new problems that had arisen since Independence. The Committee, known as the J.V.P. Committee, which consisted of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, also recognised that "if public sentiment is insistent and overwhelming", on the creation of linguistic provinces, "we, as democrats, have to submit to it, but subject to certain limitations in regard to the good of India as a whole and certain conditions which we have specified". That Committee also sounded a note of caution that "Public sentiment must clearly realise the consequences of any further division so that it may fully appreciate what will flow from their demand".

17. On the 22nd December, 1953, the Government decided to set up a Commission to examine "objectively and dispassionately" the question of the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union "so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit as well as the nation as a whole, is promoted". This Commission was called the "States Reorganisation Commission". Chapter XI of Part III of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, 1955 deals with the problems of Punjab in relation to its re-distribution on a unilingual basis. The States Reorganisation Commission, while rejecting the demand for a Punjabi-speaking State, *inter alia* ⁸stated in their Report that "the case for a Punjabi-speaking State falls firstly, because it lacks the general support of the people inhabiting the area, and secondly, because it will not eliminate any of the causes of friction from which the demand for a separate Punjabi-speaking State emanates".

18. In this connection, the Committee note that in para 13 of the Press Communique issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, on the 16th January, 1956 announcing their decisions on some of the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission, it was stated that "the Commission's recommendations

⁸Report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee of the Indian National Congress, p. 15.

⁹Report of the States Reorganisation Commission (1955), p. 146, para 540.

about the formation of (i) a Punjab State comprising the territories of the existing States of the Punjab, PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh, * * * * * are still under consideration". An enquiry was made from the Ministry of Home Affairs to ascertain whether any Press Communique in this behalf was issued by them subsequent to the above Communique announcing their decisions relating to the Punjab and Himachal Pradesh. In reply, the Ministry of Home Affairs stated¹⁰ that "the Government of India did not issue any Press Communique or Resolution in the matter after 16th January, 1956 setting forth their decisions relating to the Punjab and Himachal Pradesh. The decision of the Government was, however, embodied in an explanatory note on the draft States Reorganisation Bill and the proposals for amendment of the Constitution".

19. As regards the breaking up of the then Bombay State, the Ministry of Home Affairs stated as below in their Press communique referred to *ibid*:—

"9. The Government of India have carefully considered the Commission's recommendation regarding the formation of Bombay and Vidarbha States. The proposal appears to be fair and reasonable. But in view of the strong opposition from the Marathi-speaking areas to the creation of the proposed bilingual State and in view also of the special position of the City of Bombay and public opinion in this area generally, the Government of India have arrived at the conclusion that two States, namely,

- (i) A Gujarat State comprising the Gujarati speaking areas with its capital within the State; and
- (ii) A Maharashtra State comprising the Marathi-speaking areas including the areas of the proposed Vidarbha State, with its capital within the State;

and one centrally-administered area, namely, Bombay, comprising

- (i) Greater Bombay, and
- (ii) the areas of the villages of Kopari, Mulund, Nahur and Turmbh in the Thana taluka and the Borivli taluka except the villages of Bhayandar, Dengri, Ghod Bunder, Kashi, Maroshi, Mire, Rai Murdh and Uttan;

should be constituted in place of the States of Bombay and Vidarbha as proposed by the Commission. The Government of India hope that it will be possible to make suitable

¹⁰Ministry of Home Affairs U.O. No. F. 38/3/66-SR, dated 14-2-1966.

arrangements on an agreed basis to meet the wishes of the people of Vidarbha.

10. The question of devising a suitable form of administration for Bombay and associating the people of this area with its governance is under examination."

20. The Bombay State has since been divided into Maharashtra and Gujarat leaving Punjab as the only bilingual State. Further, with the formation of Nagaland State, with a population of only about five lakhs, the demand for a Punjabi-speaking State has received a new impetus.

21. The memoranda and representations received by the Committee and evidence given before them have indicated beyond any doubt that, whatever might have been the position then, an overwhelming majority of the people in the State now supports its reorganisation on linguistic basis. One of the arguments advanced before the Committee against the formation of Punjabi Suba on the ground of language was more or less a repetition of the argument urged before the States Reorganisation Commission that the demand was basically a communal one. The bulk of the evidence given before the Committee, however, refutes this argument.

22. The representatives of Haryana have opposed the formation of one unilingual State with Punjabi language and they have unanimously expressed their strong resentment against Punjabi in Gurmukhi Script being imposed on them even as a second language as envisaged in the Regional Formula. The spokesmen of the Haryana Arya Samajists categorically stated before the Committee that the Hindi-speaking people from Jullundur Division who opposed the demand for a Punjabi-speaking State did not represent the views of the people of Haryana on this issue.

23. As has emerged from the evidence given before the Committee—both oral and written—, the active opposition to the creation of a Punjabi-speaking State now proceeds from a section of the population in the Punjabi region. How large the section is, is a matter of judgment. There is also a difference in the degree of opposition. A part of this section opposes a separate Suba with vigour and determination but another sizeable section while not welcoming it would submit to the inevitable. It may also be added that in the evidence adduced before the Committee, there was no dispute with regard to the boundaries of the existing Hindi and Punjabi Regions of the Punjab as defined in the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957.

III

Working of the Regional Formula in Punjab

24. After the case for a Punjabi-speaking State was rejected by the States Reorganisation Commission, a Regional Formula providing for the devolution of powers in respect of certain specified matters to the Punjabi and Hindi-speaking regions was evolved on the 7th March, 1956. An outline of the scheme was also placed before Lok Sabha on the 3rd April, 1956 (See Appendix IV).

25. The Regional Formula provided, among other things, that

- (i) The State of Punjab will be bilingual; Punjabi (in Gurmukhi Script) and Hindi (in Devnagari script) were to be recognized as the official languages of the State;
- (ii) The State would be divided into the Punjabi Region and the Hindi Region comprising the following areas:—

Hindi Region—Kangra, Simla, Karnal, Rohtak, Gurgaon, Hissar and Mohindergarh districts, Ambala District excluding the Rupar and Chandigarh Assembly constituencies and Jind and Narwana tehsils of Sangrur district;

Punjabi Region—Gurdaspur, Amritsar, Bhatinda, Jullundur, Hoshiarpur, Ferozepur, Ludhiana, Patiala and Kapurthala districts, Rupar and Chandigarh Assembly constituencies in Ambala district and Sangrur district excluding Jind and Narwana tehsils;

- (iii) the official language of each Region would, at the district level and below, be the respective regional language;
- (iv) the general safeguards proposed for linguistic minorities would be applicable to the Punjab, as to the other States;
- (v) the Punjabi language would, in furtherance of the policy to promote the growth of all regional languages, be encouraged and developed.

A suitable provision was also made in Article 371 (1) of the Constitution, which reads as follows:—

“371. (1) Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the President may, by order made with respect to the State

of Andhra Pradesh or Punjab, provide for the constitution and functions of regional committees of the Legislative Assembly of the State, for the modifications to be made in the rules of business of the Government and in the rules of procedure of the Legislative Assembly of the State and for any special responsibility of the Governor in order to secure the proper functioning of the regional Committees."

26. In pursuance of the above provision, the President issued an order in November 1957 for the constitution of the Regional Committees for the two regions. The order provides for the following matters, being regarded as regional matters, to be discussed by the Regional Committees:—

- (1) Local self-government, that is to say, the constitution and powers of municipal corporations, improvement trusts, district boards and other local authorities for the purpose of local self-government or village administration including panchayats.
- (2) Public health and sanitation, local hospitals and dispensaries.
- (3) Primary and secondary education.
- (4) Agriculture.
- (5) Preservation, protection and improvement of stock and prevention of animal diseases, veterinary training and practice.
- ou) (6) Ponds and the prevention of cattle trespass.
- (7) Protection of wild animals and birds.
- (8) Fisheries.
- (9) Cottage and small-scale industries.
- (10) Markets and fairs.
- (11) Inns and inn-keepers.
- (12) Co-operative societies.
- (13) Charities and charitable institutions, charitable and religious endowments and religious institutions.
- (14) Development and economic planning, within the framework of the general development plans and policies formulated by the State Legislature.

27. The Regional Committees were set up with effect from the 4th November, 1957 with the coming into force of the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957 issued by the President under Article 371 of the Constitution (See Appendix V).

A 'rough' map showing the district boundaries of the Hindi and Punjabi Regions as defined in the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957 referred to *ibid*, as furnished by the Government of Punjab, is appended at the end of this Report for facility of reference.

28. The Regional Formula thus has two main aspects, *viz.*, Linguistic and Legislative.

Linguistic Aspect

The Language policy of the Punjab State is based on the aforesaid Regional Formula. The whole State of Punjab, except Chandigarh Capital, has been demarcated into Hindi and Punjabi Regions. For the time being Chandigarh Capital is in neither region though its representative sits in the Regional Committee for the Punjabi region.¹¹ The medium of instruction at the primary and secondary stages of education is governed by the Sachar Language Formula (See Appendix VI) and the PEPSU Language Formula (See Appendix VII) which are in operation in the areas of the erstwhile Punjab and PEPSU, respectively.

Under the Regional Formula, the official language of each region is, at the district level and below, the respective regional language. The State is bilingual recognising both Punjabi (in Gurmukhi Script) and Hindi (in Devnagri Script) as the official languages of the State.

Legislative Aspect

Under the Regional Committees Scheme, there is one Legislature for the whole of Punjab, which is the sole law-making body for the entire State, and there is one Governor aided and advised by the Council of Ministers. Legislation relating to the specified matters is referred to the Regional Committees.

29. As the trend of events showed, the Regional Committees had an ominous start. The Committee had the benefit of hearing the views of the first two Chairmen of the two Regional Committees. Both of them stated that the status of the Chairmen of these Committees was not duly recognised and it was after two years of the

¹¹See "The first Schedule" to the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957 (Appendix V).

appointment of Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of the Regional Committees that the Punjab Government paid salaries to them. The first Chairman of the Punjabi Regional Committee further testified that the Regional Committees had been ignored and he had to suffer personal humiliation. He also drew the attention of the Committee to a Resolution passed by the Hindi Regional Committee on the 4th May, 1960 relating to the removal of compulsion with regard to the teaching of Punjabi in the Hindi region of the Punjab State¹², which was not accepted by the State Government.

30. The question relating to the status of these two Committees was brought to the forefront on the 12th March, 1959 when a Member of the Punjab Vidhan Sabha gave notice of a Privilege Motion regarding the publication of the proceedings of the Hindi Regional Committee in some newspapers. On this, the then Speaker of the Punjab Vidhan Sabha referred the matter to the Government of India with a view to seeking clarification on the various far-reaching implications arising therefrom. In his Report to the Punjab Vidhan Sabha on the 22nd March, 1960 he, *inter alia*, summed up his views as follows:

“* * * though the formation of the Regional Committees is provided by the Constitution itself and in that sense these Committees may be said to be Statutory Committees, Article 371 clearly states these Committees are Regional Committees of the Legislative Assembly and cannot claim a separate existence of their own or independence of the Assembly.

While the Regional Committees have only to report to the Assembly on the Bills referred to them, it is the function of the Assembly to pass these Bills. This difference establishes the fact that the Committees cannot pass any legislation but can only report to the Assembly like a Select Committee. In other words, the Committees have no legislative or law-making powers. Under paragraph 7 of the Presidential Order, the Regional Committees can only recommend legislative action to the State Government. The Committees do not pass any legislative measures. The only two important functions conferred on the Regional Committees by the Presidential Order are those in paragraphs 5 and 7, and

¹²Ministry of Home Affairs U.O. No. F. 8/3/66, dated 28.2.1966.

in both cases, the conclusions of the Committee are to be expressed in the form of a report or recommendation and not of a legislative act like passing of a Bill. Moreover, when the Assembly does not agree with the Bill as reported by a Regional Committee, the matter has to go to the Governor who has to consider the Bill on its merits and is not bound to accept the Bill as reported by the Regional Committee.

It follows from what is stated above that the Regional Committees are only Committees of the Assembly though constituted by a constitutional order of the President, and have no independent legislative functions. Their conclusions are no doubt given special importance in the sense that they cannot be ignored by the Assembly and that if the Assembly differs from a Committee the Bill goes to the Governor whose decision is, for all practical purposes, final. But these facts do not make the Regional Committees any less the Committees of the Assembly or endow them with an independent legislative authority. * * * The fact that the Committees are not elected by the Assembly or nominated by the Speaker only indicates their special constitution but does not mean that they have an independent status. Their being statutory bodies does not lead to the inference that they acquire an independent status as legislative bodies.

* * * the Regional Committees are Committees of the Assembly with a special statutory position assigned to them but not sub-legislatures or in any sense law making bodies, independent of the Assembly. * * *."

31. A prominent witness, who was closely associated with the evolution of a compromise formula between the two sections of Punjab in the shape of the Regional Scheme right from its inception, stated before the Committee that the ruling given by the Speaker, Punjab Vidhan Sabha, that the Regional Committees under the formula were just like other ordinary Committees of the Assembly, sounded the death-knell of this formula. According to him, the Regional Formula provided that the language of Punjab in the Punjabi Region is 'Punjabi' and in the Hindi Region it is 'Hindi' but it was not implemented till 1961. Even after 1961, when it was introduced as a result of the Akali agitation, it was not implemented fully. The Committee have very carefully gone into the mass of

evidence placed before them—both oral and written—in this behalf and they are constrained to observe that the Regional Formula was not worked in letter and spirit and circumscribed as it was by the various interpretations given to it, it failed to satisfy the expectations of the people for whose benefit it was evolved.

32. As has emerged from the evidence, other drawbacks of the Regional Committee Scheme were:—

- (a) The rules of procedure for the Committees were made by the Home Ministry of the Government of India and the powers of the Punjab Legislative Assembly to change their own rules in this behalf were completely taken away. This placed the authority of the Executive over the Legislature in this behalf.
- (b) The Committees were not allowed to initiate proposals for legislation on subjects allotted to them.
- (c) The Committees were not empowered to make suggestions for expenditure in respect of their regions. So the Committees could not make any contribution regarding development and administration.
- (d) The Committees were not given any power to question the Ministers in their Committees on questions of day-to-day administration of their regions.
- (e) The Committees were not provided with any Secretariat.

33. The Committee also observed from a record note of the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's talks with Sant Fateh Singh on August 7, 1965, that the Sant complained that the Regional Formula had not been faithfully implemented and the Prime Minister gave an assurance that this question, along with other matters mentioned by the Sant, would be looked into.

34. The Committee were informed by almost all the witnesses that the Regional Formula had completely failed to achieve the purpose for which it was intended and its working had not satisfied anybody. As to its future, a majority of witnesses were of the view that even if these Committees were given all the powers and prestige, they would evoke no enthusiasm anywhere. A few witnesses, however, thought that the Regional Formula in a modified form might be given a trial.

35. The Committee believe that if the Regional Scheme had been worked in the spirit in which it was envisaged and strengthened

from time to time, the problems that face the people of Punjab would not have arisen and a new form of administration for States which are bilingual or which have sizeable linguistic minorities would have been evolved which would have surely served as model in other parts of the country. But the situation after ten years of the initiation of the scheme, as it is today, has completely shaken the faith of the people in this kind of arrangement.

36. The Committee are of the view that the Regional Formula as it has been worked has failed to reduce the tensions between the people of the Punjabi and Hindi-speaking areas, and that no rejuvenation of the scheme which falls short of making the Regional Committees full-fledged Legislatures, at this juncture would be capable of solving the problem which has been very much accentuated by the passage of time and by various other factors which have culminated in the recent political controversies and the demand for the reorganisation of the State behind the question of language, script, services etc..

IV

Demand for Haryana State

37. The Committee received a large number of memoranda from, and heard evidence given before them by, the representatives of Haryana Lok Samiti, Haryana All-Party Action Committee, Haryana Arya Sammelan, Punjab High Court Bar Association etc., asking for the creation of a separate Haryana State consisting of the Hindi-speaking area of the present Punjab and some other Hindi-speaking areas of the adjoining States.

38. It was represented to the Committee that before 1857, the areas now contained in Meerut and Agra Divisions of U.P., Ambala Division of Punjab, that is upto the river Sutlej, Alwar and Bharatpur districts of Rajasthan and Delhi territory were in the North Western Province, which later came to be known as Haryana Prant.

In the uprising of 1857, the people of this area were in the vanguard of that movement termed by the Britishers as 'mutiny', but called by all patriotic Indians as the 'War of Independence'. This movement did not succeed and the British Government decided to break down the morale of the people and their resistance to their rule. As a result of that, in 1858, the areas beyond Jamuna, that is areas of Meerut and Agra Divisions were separated and made a part of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. The new province which covered the districts of Simla, Ambala, Hissar, Karnal, Rohtak, Gurgaon and Delhi was known as Delhi Province. In 1912, a portion of Delhi Division was carved out in order to house the new Capital of the country which was shifted from Calcutta to New Delhi and it was made a Commissioner's Province with an area of 528 sq. miles. Shifting of the Capital from Calcutta to New Delhi was necessitated on account of turmoil in Bengal as a result of the revolutionary movement to free India from the shackles of slavery. In 1915, a small area of 45 sq. miles from U.P. comprising some 65 villages and including the township of Shahdara were added to the Province of Delhi. The remaining six districts were made parts of Ambala Division and included in Punjab.

Ever since the dismemberment of this region, there has been a continuous demand from the people of these areas of Punjab, Rajasthan, Delhi and U.P. to constitute a separate Province.

39. It has been urged by the Haryana Lok Samiti that the demand for a separate Haryana Prant is quite independent of the demand for a Punjabi-speaking State. There are two well defined linguistic areas in Punjab—the Hindi-speaking and Punjabi-speaking. As such Punjab can neither be called bilingual nor unilingual. The Committee were told that in the field of agriculture, education, industry and in the services, the Haryana region had not been given its due share, with the result that it remained backward as compared to the Punjabi region. Further, although the Haryana region suffered from lack of rain-fall, it was not provided with sufficient irrigation facilities as compared to the Punjabi region, even when the crops produced in this area, *viz.*, rice and sugar-cane, required more supply of water and thereby the production of those crops could be increased substantially. In the educational field also, most of the engineering and medical colleges were dominated by students from the Punjabi region. In the matter of industries, Haryana area was neglected as compared to the other region of the Punjab.

40. The Committee note that in March, 1965, the Government of Punjab appointed a Committee consisting of eminent Legislators and administrative, financial and planning experts, called the Haryana Development Committee to look into the development problems of that region. The Committee, in its Final Report (1966), observed (p. 170):

“The factual position ** ** clearly indicates that the Haryana Region lags far behind the other Region in almost all the main developmental sectors in spite of the implementation of the three Five-Year Plans. These persisting imbalances in the development of the two regions have to be rectified in the shortest possible time.....”.

To illustrate the imbalance between the development of the two regions, the Haryana Development Committee have given an instance “that the provision made for medicines at the Rohtak Hospital in 1964-65 was only Rs. 0.84 lakhs for 330 beds as against Rs. 8.14 lakhs for 662 beds at Patiala”. (p. 11 *ibid*).

41. One of the Cabinet Ministers of the Punjab Government, who came from Haryana, and appeared before the Committee, also urged that there was great disparity in both regions in regard to irrigated land, distribution of fertilizers, electrification programme and overall balanced regional development. In this connection he submitted to the Committee a statement showing the statistical data, region-wise,

in Punjab based on Haryana Development Committee Report, 1966 (See Appendix VIII). This shows at a glance the comparative position of the Haryana Region *vis-a-vis* the Non-Haryana Region and the Hill Region in various socio-economic fields.

42. A spokesman of the Punjab High Court Bar Association urged that while the developmental imbalance of Haryana was an important consideration in regard to its formation into a separate State, the actual demand for Haryana State was much older. In his opinion the present region of Haryana *minus* Kangra and Kulu but including Faridabad, Bahadurgarh, Sonapat etc. would be a viable State. The creation of Haryana Prant, according to him, within the present territorial areas of the Hindi Region would also be a step in the right direction. Another spokesman of the High Court Bar Association told the Committee that it was only certain vested interests of urbanised and mercantile communities in the Punjabi region who were opposed to the demand for the re-distribution of Punjab on the linguistic principle.

43. The demand for the separation of Haryana area of the Punjab was also put before the States Reorganisation Commission. In para 541 of their Report, the Commission observed that the complaint from this area was one of inadequate representation in the civil administration of the State and relative economic backwardness. The Commission, however, did not express any opinion on the relative merits of separation of the Haryana area of Punjab.

44. The burden of the argument adduced by the protagonists of the Haryana Prant is:

- (i) backwardness of Haryana and its economic and political exploitation by the people of Punjabi-speaking areas;
- (ii) imposition of compulsory teaching of Punjabi in the Hindi region.

It was contended by the spokesman of the Haryana Arya Sammelan that the people of Haryana were backward and merely 'hewers of wood and drawers of water'. The attention of the Committee was also drawn to the Resolution passed unanimously by the Hindi Regional Committee on the 4th May, 1960 demanding the immediate stoppage of compulsory teaching of Punjabi in the Hindi Region. This Resolution, the Committee learn, was ultimately rejected by the State Government. The same was stated to be the fate of the Resolution passed on the 15th November, 1958 by the Hindi Regional

Committee demanding allocation of developmental funds on the basis of area and population of the two regions.

45. It was represented to the Committee that unless the Haryana areas had a separate administration of their own, manned by the "sons of the soil" no justice was possible to the people of those areas nor their development feasible as the needs of the areas demanded.

46. From the evidence, both oral and written, given before the Committee, it emerged conclusively that—

- (i) the people of Haryana were opposed to the use of Punjabi language in any case; and
- (ii) the areas comprising the Haryana region would like to remain as a compact State or territory and would not countenance any dismemberment of any portion thereof.

Merger of Hill Areas of Punjab in Himachal Pradesh

47. According to the memorandum submitted to the Committee by the Chief Minister, Himachal Pradesh (Dr. Y. S. Parmar), the hill areas of Punjab comprise the districts of Kangra, Kulu, Simla, Lahaul-Spiti, Tehsil Pathankot, particularly Dalhousie and Bakloh, of Gurdaspur District, Tehsil Una of Hoshiarpur District, Tehsil Kalka of Ambala District, Nalagarh Sub-Division and Morni of Sub-Division Narain-garh of Ambala District, etc.

The two districts of Kulu and Lahaul & Spiti are surrounded on three sides by Himachal Pradesh and on the Northern side by Jammu and Kashmir. There is Indo-Tibetan border of these two districts with Himachal Pradesh on the Eastern side. These two districts are in Himachal zone and have been described as its pocket and enclaves. In the same memorandum the Chief Minister, Himachal Pradesh, has stated that "the residents of the Punjab hills find themselves in a peculiarly difficult position. For purposes of language, they are in the Hindi region, while for purposes of administration, they are in the Punjabi Region. Thus they are neither here nor there."

48. In a memorandum submitted to the Committee by the people of Kulu, Lahaul and Spiti, it has been urged:—

"In the event of redistribution of Punjab, it will be difficult for the people of the Hills either to join Punjab State or Haryana Prant. The innocent Hill man shall be like a lamb between a wolf and a butcher. His only safe and honourable place shall be in the Himachal Pradesh. At present, he is the victim of these two dominant units and is not at all happy and satisfied. He believes that his safety can only be guaranteed in Himachal Pradesh. He is further convinced that no amount of weightage, safeguards and assurances can satisfy the aspirations and sentiments of his fellow brothers. His special needs and peculiar problems cannot be appreciated by the people of the plains. He feels and rightly so that the only answer to his special needs and problems is the formation of a Hill State. In no case he will be willing to join either Punjabi State or Haryana Prant."

49. In the mass of evidence placed before the Committee—both oral and written—by the representatives of the various organisations, bodies, Panchayat Samitis etc. in the Hill areas of Punjab, a strong case has been made out that in the event of redistribution of Punjab on linguistic basis, the hill areas should logically be the natural and integral part of Himachal Pradesh from the point of view of linguistic, cultural, historical and social affinities of the people in the Hill areas. It has also been urged that the hilly region, having its own problems and its own administrative difficulties which hamper the general progress of the territory and impede the successful execution and implementation of the national plans, should form a recognizably distinct and different region.

50. In support of this demand, it has been contended, that the language of the hill areas is 'Pahari' which is neither Hindi nor Punjabi—the origin of Pahari language and culture being embedded in Sanskrit and Prakrit. The people of these areas speak 'Pahari' and they have greater affinity for each other in comparison to the people belonging to the plains. Sir G. A. Grierson in his monumental work 'THE LINGUISTIC SURVEY OF INDIA' has said that "in most of the Simla Hill States and Kulu the language is *Pahari*."* The map of the Punjab "showing the prevalent language in each Tehsil" appearing opposite page 261 of the Report of Census of India (1891), Vol. XIX, Part I also clearly shows this region as having 'Pahari' language.

51. Apart from the question of language, the people of the hill areas have common culture, customs and traditions, way of life and above all, an intense desire to live together as one compact whole. The merger of hill areas in Himachal Pradesh will result in greater cultural, linguistic and economic homogeneity and the people of those areas will live together with greater co-operation, satisfaction and happiness.

52. It emerged from the evidence given before the Committee that there is a deep-rooted grievance among the hilly people that people from the plains wield a more dominant position in the present Punjab and they have always tried to exploit the simple folk of the hilly tracts. The people of the hill areas feel that no amount of weightage, safeguards or assurances can satisfy their aspirations and sentiment if they are tagged on either to the Punjabi State or Haryana Prant.

53. The Committee also discussed with the Chief Minister of Punjab the complaint made by the representatives of the Hill areas:

*Linguistic Survey of India by Grierson, Vol. IX, Part I, p 607.

of the Punjab, who had earlier appeared before them, that these areas were relatively less developed as compared to the adjoining areas of the Himachal Pradesh. The Chief Minister while admitting that this was so, stated in extenuation that the Central Government financed the Himachal Pradesh Government to the extent of 70 per cent of its budget. The Committee, however, note that the *per capita* income in the Hill Region is Rs. 310 as compared to Rs. 467 in the non-Haryana Region and Rs. 339 in Haryana Region (See Appendix IX).

54. There is a strong feeling among the people of some hilly districts of Punjab that in the present set-up, the representatives of their areas play no part in the formation of the Ministry and in the election of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker of the Punjab Legislative Assembly because the polls in the General Elections in the mountaineous regions of the State are not held simultaneously with the rest of the State, which invariably are held during winter, when those regions are snow-bound. Consequently, the formation of the Ministry and election of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker of the Punjab Assembly is over before the polls in the hilly regions, with the result that the democratic right of the formation of the Ministry is denied to the people of these areas.

55. The representatives of the Kulu District Congress Committee also complained to the Committee that in the matter of nomination to the Legislative Council and the Rajya Sabha, the people in the hill areas were not being given a fair deal. Another complaint of discrimination which was voiced before the Committee was that generally officers who were on the verge of superannuation or those who were just on probation, were posted in the hill areas. The result was that they could not do much to look after the weal and welfare of the hill folk.

These representatives also expressed their resentment on the alleged purchase of land by some of the Ministers and Officers of the Punjab Government and their relations for the growth of orchards in the Kulu District. When the Committee pursued this matter with the Chief Minister of Punjab, he told them that when he heard of some such complaints, he immediately issued orders that all such transactions should be brought to his notice.

56. People from the hill areas have a strong feeling that their representation in the services is negligible i.e., people from the plains get greater chances in the services as compared to them. As such, economic exploitation, lesser chances in the services, no hand in the formation of the Ministry of the State due to late elections—all these causes have generated in them a sense of general distrust of the

men of the plains. It was emphasised before the Committee that by merging these areas with Himachal Pradesh, this feeling of distrust will vanish automatically and people will feel contented and happy.

57. On the question of viability, opinion was expressed before the Committee by the witnesses from hill regions that Himachal Pradesh could become viable within ten to fifteen years. If Himachal Pradesh and all the hill areas of Punjab were brought together, it would become viable much earlier. Although the Hill areas could not naturally produce large quantities of foodgrains in comparison to the plains, they could produce fruits and vegetables and add to the revenues by encouraging tourist traffic and production of electricity. Recent developments in Himachal Pradesh strengthen this belief and create a hope for the better in future. The Committee are of the view that by adding certain areas to the present Himachal Pradesh, it will facilitate the economic development of the whole area.

58. One solitary view placed before the Committee by a political party was that "Kangra was wrongly included in the Hindi Region. Kangra District and Una and Pathankot Tehsils etc. are all Punjabi-speaking and should form part of the Punjabi State." The Committee are, however, of the view that the merger of hill areas of Punjab in Himachal Pradesh will be in the general interest of those areas from the point of view of geographical homogeneity, linguistic and cultural affinity and economic well-being of the people inhabiting those areas.

VI

Conclusions and Recommendations

COOPERATIVE SOLUTION

59. It was the earnest desire of the Committee to find a cooperative solution of the vexed linguistic problem facing Punjab which would be universally acceptable to all. After perusing the large number of memoranda/representations received by the Committee and hearing the various view-points expressed by the different witnesses representing the various shades of opinion, it soon became evident that it was not possible to arrive at any 'cooperative solution' which would be unanimously acceptable to all without reservations. Nor is unanimity possible or necessary on all matters in a democratic set-up. The next best thing was for the Committee to look for a solution which would be acceptable to the largest number of people and which would also be in the best interests of not only the people and the State of Punjab but also in the best interests of the country as a whole from the point of view of affinity between the various communities and the economic and cultural well-being of the people.

VARIOUS ALTERNATIVES

(a) *Status Quo*

60. The bulk of the evidence before the Committee suggests the re-organization of the State on linguistic basis. Even the Chief Minister of the Punjab State admitted that the present position needed a change and *status quo* in its entirety was not possible. But a section of the people from the Punjab canvassed before the Committee that the *status quo* might be maintained in the Punjab. In support of this argument, it was urged that Punjab was not a unilingual State but a bilingual State with the people speaking both Hindi and Punjabi spread over throughout the State, although in varying percentages. Another argument advanced in favour of the *status quo* was that any division of the State would adversely affect the economy of the State and the resulting units would not be financially viable. A third argument advanced in favour of the *status quo* was that any reorganisation of the State would not be in the interests of the security of the country and would weaken the defence of India.

61. The Committee have carefully considered all the arguments advanced for and against the reorganisation of the existing State of Punjab. The witnesses who appeared before the Committee could not satisfactorily prove to them as to how the linguistic reorganisation of the State of Punjab would adversely affect the economy of the area or the defence of the country. The Committee had no authentic data before them to show that it would be so. The Committee requested the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, to furnish a note or a paper on the viability of the proposed Punjabi-speaking State from the point of view of defence and finance but the Government expressed their inability to comply with their request as the former did not like to involve themselves either way 'in a controversy'.* Although this Committee are not an expert body on matters relating to the defence and finance but it should be self-evident that security or defence of the country should not be affected by a mere linguistic reorganisation of the State. Defence is a Central subject and the State Governments have nothing to do with it. On the contrary, it should strengthen the defence of the country, if there are on the borders people whose political and economic aspirations are fully satisfied and they can devote all their energies towards the task of nation-building and development, instead of frittering away their energies in political agitations or the like. While the Committee agree that financial viability should be considered as an important factor while creating a unit, nevertheless having regard to the economic progress of the State so far (which judged from the *per capita* income in each region of the State, which is the highest in the whole country) it can be safely visualized that the human and material resources (both tapped and untapped) of the State are sufficient to make each unit economically viable. Looked at from another aspect, it was urged before the Committee that no State in the Union is at present economically viable, as most of the States are dependent on the Union Government for grants and loans. Be that as it may, the argument of viability has no force in denying a well-recognised and well-established principle of formation of States on linguistic basis which has been universally applied in the rest of the country.

*D.O. No. 38/3/66-S.R. dated the 11th March, 1966 from Shri B.S. Raghavan Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs to Shri M.C. Chawla, Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat.

62. As regards the State being bilingual, it had been already recognised in the Regional Formula that there were two distinct regions, namely, the Punjabi Region and the Hindi Region. In each region were included the predominantly Punjabi-speaking and the Hindi-speaking districts respectively. Thus, the State was already divided into a distinct Punjabi Region and the Hindi Region. People of neither region are satisfied with the *status quo*. An overwhelming majority of the memoranda received by the Committee and of the witnesses who appeared before them were in favour of the two regions being made full-fledged States with suitable adjustment of boundaries which could be done by a Boundary Commission or any other expert body appointed for the purpose.

63. In the opinion of the Committee, maintenance of *status quo* in the State would cause further unrest among the people. Past experience has shown that the present bilingual State of Punjab has been the scene of internal disorder, agitations and counter-agitations. Any make-shift arrangement is not likely to provide a lasting solution to this vexed question. The Committee, therefore, feel that it is high time that some permanent and satisfactory solution of this problem is found.

64. An apprehension was expressed before the Committee by a section of the Punjabi-speaking Region who was opposed to the bifurcation of the existing State of Punjab that in the event of creation of a new Punjabi State, a large-scale migration of population and capital, and consequent human suffering, might take place. The Committee's attention was also drawn in this connection to the "Questionnaire* regarding the proposed Provinces of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharashtra" which was issued by the Linguistic Provinces Commission set up under the aegis of the Constituent Assembly of India (known as Dar Commission) wherein the Commission posed this specific question and asked for public opinion as to the steps that should be taken for its prevention. The Committee note that this particular aspect was not ultimately touched upon by that Commission's Report. Similar fears were expressed at the time of the formation of the Andhra State and Maharashtra and

*Reports of the Committees of the Constituent Assembly of India (Third Series), page 222 (Serial No.19 of the Questionnaire).

Gujarat States but experience has shown that they did not materialize. Obviously, such fears are ill-conceived and ill-founded. This is more so in the present case especially when Hindus and Sikhs have close ethnic, racial, religious and cultural relationship.

(b) *Strengthening of Regional Committees*

65. A view was expressed before the Committee that the present State of Punjab might remain united and more powers could be given to Regional Committees, but it was not specifically stated as to how such Committees could be given more powers or what the nature of those powers was. A vague suggestion was made that the decisions of the Regional Committees could be final in respect of the subjects entrusted to them. In fact, it was also mooted that they might function something like "Sub-Legislatures", but what the powers and functions of "Sub-Legislatures" would be was never specified. As has been stated in detail in Chapter III earlier, the working of the Regional Committees has been an utter failure. Suffice it to say that no body, including the Ministers of the Punjab, was satisfied with the working of these Committees and, in fact, some of the witnesses before the Committee emphatically said that the sooner they were scrapped the better. The Committee, therefore, feel that the idea of continuing Regional Committees in any form should be given up.

(c) *Reorganisation on Linguistic Basis*

66. It would not perhaps be out of place to refer here to the following passage* from the Report of the Linguistic Provinces Commission [Dar Commission (1948)] which enunciates the cardinal principle for the formation of linguistic provinces, which rest upon two alternative grounds:—

“* * *: upon the theory that these linguistic groups are sub-nations and as such contracting parties to the constitution from which the Federation and the Centre derive their existence and power; alternatively it rests upon * * * the administrative advantage, which may result from bringing together people speaking one language, in imparting education and in the working of courts, legislatures, governmental machinery and democratic institutions.”

67. The only alternative which found the largest measure of support was that the present State of Punjab should be reorganised

*Para 12 of Chapter I of the Report *ibid.*

on a linguistic basis on which basis all the States in the country had been formed. This will not only satisfy the political and economic aspirations of the people of the respective areas but also end once for all the political controversy on a vexed question in this strategic border area and help remove the tension prevailing for the last so many years.

68. A suggestion was made that the question of formation of a Punjabi-speaking State might be referred to the people of Punjab for decision by a referendum and the wishes of the people ascertained. Apart from the fact that no such referenda were held for the reorganisation of the rest of the States in the country on linguistic basis, such a course is neither feasible nor desirable. The wishes of the people are easily known through their elected and representative bodies and other leaders of public opinion.

CONCLUSIONS

69. After carefully considering all the view-points represented before the Committee and taking all relevant factors into consideration, the Committee have come to the conclusion that it would be in the larger interests of the people of these areas and the country as a whole that the present State of Punjab be reorganised on linguistic basis. The Punjabi Region specified in the First Schedule to the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957, should form a unilingual Punjabi State, the hill areas of the Punjab included in the Hindi Region of the Punjab which are contiguous to Himachal Pradesh and have linguistic and cultural affinity with that Territory should be merged with Himachal Pradesh. The remaining areas of the Hindi-speaking region of the Punjab should be formed as a separate unit called the Haryana State. The distribution of population and density of population in the (i) Hill area, (ii) Haryana area and (iii) other areas of the existing State of Punjab are indicated in Appendix X. In case there are any boundary adjustments to be made among the three States of Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Haryana, a Committee of experts be set up immediately to suggest the necessary adjustments.

70. A view was expressed before the Committee that a Vishal Haryana Prant be formed by bringing together of certain areas of Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Delhi and the Haryana areas of the Punjab. The Committee have refrained from expressing opinion on these view-points or suggestions nor have they applied their mind to these proposals as the Committee consider that these mat-

ters do not fall within the scope of their competence. A suggestion was also made that the Haryana area of the Punjab might be joined with Delhi, as originally it was detached from old Delhi Province. Here too the Committee cannot make any recommendation. The Committee leave it to the Government to consider in due course whether, after retaining New Delhi Municipal Committee area intact under the direct administration of Central Government, it is feasible to join Delhi Municipal Corporation areas with the Haryana Prant which the Committee have proposed in this report.

71. The question of parts of Rajasthan being added to the new Punjabi State or the Haryana State was considered to be beyond the competence of the Committee and hence the Committee did not examine it.

72. The Committee trust that all the various political and other elements in the country in general, and Punjab in particular, will accept the solution proposed in a co-operative spirit and work for the harmony and prosperity of the heroic people inhabiting the present State of the Punjab.

HUKAM SINGH
Chairman,

NEW DELHI;
The 15th March, 1966.

*Parliamentary Committee on the
Demand for Punjabi Suba.*

NOTES

I

I give my full support to the conclusions embodied in para 69 of this Report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Demand for Punjabi Suba. The note which I append to this Report is for two reasons. The first is to clarify my position on one point *viz.*, the position of the Government of India towards the principle of the formation of the provinces on linguistic basis.

In this Report reference is made in para 16 to the appointment of a Committee at the Jaipur Session of the Congress, consisting of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, to review the position in the light of the Report of the Dar Commission and the new problems that had arisen since Independence. In their Report "this Committee was the first to sound a note of warning against the linguistic principle". The following two passages from the J. V. P. Committee's report quoted in this Report in para 16 do not show the intensity of the adverse attitude which that Committee had shown to the principle of linguistic basis for the formation of the States in the Union. I reproduce below the passage *in extenso* of that Report given in para 62 of the States Reorganisation Commission's Report at page 16. It stated that:

- "(a) when the Congress had given the seal of its approval to the general principle of linguistic provinces, it was not faced with the practical application of the principle and hence it had not considered all the implications and consequences that arose from this practical application;
- (b) the primary consideration must be the security, unity and economic prosperity of India and every separatist and disruptive tendency should be rigorously discouraged;
- (c) language was not only a binding force but also a separating one; and
- (d) the old Congress policy of having linguistic provinces could only be applied after careful thought had been given to each separate case and without creating serious administrative dislocation or mutual conflicts which would jeopardise the political and economic stability of the country." (S.R.C. Report, page 16).

Besides this unambiguous expression of its views against the linguistic principle, there is one para in the Report which categorically dealt with the demand of Maharashtra for merger of the Vidarbha districts in it. It was suggested by the J. V. P. Committee if Maharashtra wanted to unify the Marathi-speaking area into a common State, it might do so but the districts of Vidarbha could not be merged unless they themselves expressed a desire to merge in Maharashtra. In fact it was implied in that suggestion that Vidarbha could be merged in Maharashtra if the people of Vidarbha expressed their desire to be so merged. This declaration by the J. V. P. Committee is the Magna Carta of the people of Vidarbha, and their opposition to the merger of the Vidarbha districts in Maharashtra is based on this strong ground.

The short extract from J. V. P. Committee's Report quoted in this Report does not give the correct image of the opposition of the Congress Committee to the linguistic principle.

The J. V. P. Committee who recognised that "if public sentiment is insistent and overwhelming", on the creation of linguistic provinces, "we, as democrats, have to submit to it, but subject to certain limitations in regard to the good of India as a whole and certain conditions which we have specified", have always maintained that the linguistic principle as the main factor for consideration in the formation is not the view or the policy of the Union Government, though it was a fact that it had invariably surrendered to the fanaticism of the linguistic propagandist. That occurred when Andhra was separated from Tamilnad and also when Maharashtra was separated from Gujarat by an Act of the Central Legislature. The unanimous recommendation of S. R. C. for creation of a separate State for Vidarbha and keeping Bombay City as a separate State was not accepted by the Government of India.

But, judging on the basis of evidence on record before the Parliamentary Committee, it was clear to us that the demand of Punjabi Suba had the support of a very great majority of the people of Punjab and the reorganisation of Punjab into Punjabi Suba, Haryana State and the formation of Himachal Pradesh, with Kangra valley and other hill-tracts present inside the boundaries, was the only cooperative solution of the problem which the demand for Punjabi Suba has created.

There is one more reason which I wish to refer in justification of my support for the creation of three States, Punjabi Suba, Haryana and the Himachal Pradesh.

The recommendations of the Committee in this Report create three small States. I believe that the Government of India have not yet noticed that there is a growing discontent against the existence of large and unwieldy States in the Indian Union. The States are autonomous. The bigger size of a State gives it a better chance of influencing the Central Government. That is how the old Moghul Empire in India was gradually balkanised into a number of Subas which thought themselves in course of time as sovereign States free to enter into treaties and agreements with the agencies of foreign governments. Both the Moghul Empire and the Marathas' territories were lost to the real sovereignty bit by bit by treaties made by the petty subedars with the British merchants etc. Besides, in a democratic set up a big State not being compact is not efficiently governed or administered.

There is a feeling of discontent in almost all the States of India in the South against the big States in the North e.g., U. P., M. P. and Maharashtra. If these three join, the remaining States feel themselves helpless. There is a demand from smaller States which should be satisfied. And it will be a good start in that line if the three States, the formation of which is recommended in the body of this Report are conceded. I have no doubt that the Union Government will have a perennial trouble regarding the law and order situation in the Indian Republic. It is better to correctly assess the situation, envisage what is likely to follow and take effective steps to remove the causes for dissatisfaction, giving no time for the agitation to grow strong and become difficult of being controlled except by the adoption of coercive measures.

There are distinct symptoms now indicating that the demand for the separation of Vidarbha from Maharashtra and formation of it into a separate State as recommended by the S. R. C. Report will be renewed soon by the people of Vidarbha. So also the demand for the merger of Goa and the settlement of boundaries between Maharashtra and Karnatak will assume serious form giving rise to agitation. The best thing for the Government is to consider the question of reorganisation of the States once more and settle them in accordance with the demands made by the people. Any other attitude will only add to the discontent and harm the unity which has been formed since the Pakistan trouble started.

NEW DELHI;

M. S. ANEY.

The 15th March, 1966.

II

Let me at the outset make it clear that I am in general agreement with the recommendations of the Committee. If I have thought a separate note necessary, it is because I feel that certain factors have arisen during the course of the Committee's work which deserve some comment and I feel further that in spite of the fact that the Committee have a limited jurisdiction, it would have been better if the Committee were able to indicate clearly and categorically about the formation of Haryana Prant. I also feel that a definite time limit should be recommended for finalising the whole process of reorganisation of the Punjab into linguistic States.

The appointment of this Parliamentary Committee, with the Speaker as its Chairman, was welcomed as an earnest of the Government of India's desire not only to reconsider but finally settle the vexed question of carving out a Punjabi-speaking State. I was, therefore, happy to associate myself with the labours of this Committee. But I strongly deprecate and deplore the attitude of the Government after the formation of the Committee. A regular pressure-tactic was applied to make this Committee subordinate to the Government and a hue and cry was raised both inside and outside Parliament to create an atmosphere of hostility towards this Committee. Some even did not hesitate to cast reflections on the Committee and its Chairman. I am glad that the Committee as a whole did not relent and decided to proceed with its work and submit its Report to the Parliament. I am only sorry that owing to unforeseen circumstances such as the death of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Committee could not finish its deliberations as quickly as it had contemplated earlier.

The most objectionable and reprehensible aspect of these developments was the appointment of a sub-Committee by the Congress Working Committee while the matter was already under discussion by this Parliamentary Committee in which all parties and sections of opinion were represented and which was a more representative and competent body to work out a cooperative solution. No such Committee was appointed by the Congress Party when the States Reorganisation Commission was doing its job. While conceding that the ultimate decision on the matter rests with the Government and

the Government would necessarily in a democracy be guided by the Ruling Party, it would have been proper for this Committee to give such directions to its members and Government as they deemed fit. But the public announcement of the decision of this Congress sub-Committee and the Prime Minister's statement that the decision would be binding on the Government showed that it was a deliberate attempt to bypass this Committee and undermine its importance. It also proved that the Congress Party wanted to take political advantage of a particularly developing situation. I think this haphazard and vague declaration of the Congress sub-Committee was very largely responsible for the unfortunate and untoward incidents that happened in Punjab and Delhi subsequently.

It is my considered opinion that having conceded and implemented the principle of forming linguistic States the Government of India will be open to the charge of making invidious distinctions if this principle is not applied to the Punjabi language. The creation of linguistic States is now an accepted national policy. Any departure from this would generate suspicion, mistrust and bitterness, leading to fissures in the national life of India.

The opponents of the Punjabi-speaking State often point to the policies and utterances of Master Tara Singh and his small group of followers as a proof of their contention that the demand is not only communal but essentially secessionist. Master Tara Singh's leadership has been repudiated effectively and categorically by the Sikh masses. If his ouster from the Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee and the Akali Dal was not enough proof of it, the matchless performance of the Sikh peasantry on the Indo-Pakistan border during the recent Indo-Pak hostilities should have sufficed to allay any misgivings entertained by sections of nationalist opinion in the Punjab and outside in this regard. The Sikhs have proved it with their blood that no section of Indians is more loyal to India than they are. Opposition to the creation of a Punjabi-speaking State on this basis is not only communal but is tantamount to a slur on the patriotism of the brave Sikh masses who have contributed more than their mite to the defence of their motherland.

I am convinced that, strictly on the merits of the question, there is an irrefutable case for the carving out of a Punjabi-speaking State, on par with other linguistic States of the Union of India. Punjabi is one of the recognised languages mentioned in the Constitution of India. While all other languages mentioned in the Constitution have got States to themselves, the boundaries of which are roughly coterminous with the contiguous areas inhabited by the

respective linguistic groups, Punjabi is the only language which has been denied this right.

If extraneous considerations were not allowed to come in the way of linguistic reorganisation of other regions, I do not know why these considerations should be allowed to have a decisive say in this case. Every reorganisation brings some disruption and dislocation in its wake. Any region under joint administration for a length of time inevitably leads to a common pool, in actual developments as well as potential, of industry, irrigation, power, education and administration. The dislocation following upon reorganisation of administrative regions may conceivably result in some set-back to development programmes in the initial stages. But the emotional and psychological satisfaction, apart from other inherent benefits of unilingual States, often lead to a generation of popular enthusiasm which makes for greater participation of the people in the tasks of development. It cannot be denied that when, first, Andhra and, later on the Malayalam-speaking regions were separated from Madras, or Gujarat was separated from Bombay, or, above all, when the areas under the erstwhile State of Hyderabad were dispersed into three States, it had led to certain disruption and dislocation in the areas concerned. But that did not prove to be an insurmountable block in the subsequent development of the States carved out. In any case, these difficulties did not prevent the creation of linguistic States in those areas. There will be similar difficulties in the case of the Punjab. But I do not believe these difficulties can be allowed to have a greater say in this region than was the case in other areas.

Some alternatives to the Punjabi-speaking State have been canvassed, the most prominent among which is the enlargement of the powers of the regional Councils. Some of the protagonists of this alternative go to the extent of suggesting the creation of three zones—Punjab, Hindi and Himachal—with a common Governor, High Court, Power and Irrigation Board and Public Service Commission. I have no hesitation in saying that these alternatives will not solve the problem. Time, of course, was when Hindi-speaking, Pahari-speaking and Punjabi-speaking States could be combined under one Governor, High Court, Public Service Commission, etc. The PSP was, in fact, the first to suggest it, ten years ago in its memorandum to the S.R.C. If the Government of India had accepted the PSP formula at that time, it could have led to a permanent solution of the problems facing us now. But the Government of India has never done the right thing at the right moment. It does not concede even the right thing unless forced to do so by the people. The inevitable result of such procrastination is that the right moment passes off,

leaving behind disappointment, frustration and despair which render the possible earlier solution unacceptable and unworkable. I am convinced that there is no alternative now to a full-fledged Punjabi-speaking State.

I, therefore, see no alternative to the graceful conceding of a full-fledged Punjabi-speaking State. If there are any difficulties, an effort has to be made to find a solution of these difficulties and not to scuttle the scheme under cover of finding solutions for the difficulties concerned.

One such difficulty, as sometimes pointed out by the opponents of the Punjabi-speaking State, is the fate of Kangra and other hilly areas of the Punjab on the one hand, and of Haryana districts on the other. But this is not an insuperable difficulty. The hilly areas of the present State of the Punjab can be profitably merged with Himachal Pradesh, which will not only yield emotional satisfaction to the inhabitants of these areas but also serve to make Himachal Pradesh viable. As far as the Haryana districts are concerned, the creation of a Haryana Prant with Delhi and some adjoining areas of Rajasthan (like Bharatpur) and U.P. (like in Agra and Saharanpur divisions) will meet the wishes of the people of the area and the needs of the situation. Even if, for some reason, the present boundaries of U.P. considered to be sacrosanct, a new State comprising the Haryana districts and Delhi (with New Delhi under Central Administration) will be a State of about 10 million people, and economically quite viable.

I am conscious of the fact that, strictly speaking, the terms of reference of this Committee refer only to the present State of the Punjab and that this Committee cannot arrogate to itself the functions of a States Reorganisation Commission. But when difficulties are pointed out, solutions cannot be withheld on technical grounds. I have, therefore, been compelled to include in my observations areas belonging at the moment to Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Delhi and U.P. In any case it is my belief that considerations of viability of the some of the areas which may have to be put under a new administration consequent on the formation of a Punjabi-speaking State, cannot be allowed to prevent the formation of the State. The future of non-Punjabi areas is a problem for which the Government of India has to find a solution and not use it as a means of perpetuating the present arrangements.

I would, therefore, recommend the carving out of a Punjabi-speaking State before the next General Elections. To begin with, the boundaries of the new State can be coterminous with the Punjabi-speaking region of the State of Punjab. But an expert Boundary Commission can be appointed to demarcate the exact boundaries of the State on a permanent basis.

NEW DELHI;

S. N. DWIVEDY.

The 17th March, 1966.

III

On principle, I agree with the Report except the shape of Haryana Prant. The people of Haryana have argued that they want to be separated from the Punjabi region because of:—

1. Backwardness of Haryana and its economic and political exploitation by the people of Punjabi-speaking areas; and
2. The imposition of compulsory teaching of Punjabi in the Hindi region.

In my opinion, if Haryana is amalgamated with old Delhi city the chances of the Haryana people being exploited by Delhi people are much more than even by the people of the present Punjabi-speaking region—as there are more advanced people living in old Delhi city. In my opinion, Delhi is a cosmopolitan city and its administration should always remain directly under the charge of the Central Government.

I am of the definite view that the present Hindi region minus the Hilly Areas should be created a full-fledged Haryana State so that the people of this backward area should have an opportunity to develop themselves. It is not within the competence of the Committee to touch any adjoining State in any form. So the question of Haryana being attached to Delhi does not arise.

I would also like to point out that the use of Golden Temple, the sacred place by Sant Fateh Singh and others for political purposes is highly objectionable. The Government may have to decide whether the use of Gurudwaras, Temples, Churches and Mosques should be allowed to continue for political purposes or not. In my opinion politics should not be mixed with religion.

NEW DELHI;

BANSI LAL.

The 17th March, 1966.

IV

Since linguistic States have in principle been accepted by the country, the demand of the Punjabi-speaking people for a separate State cannot be resisted too long. Therefore, while supporting the demand for the creation of a Punjabi-speaking State, I nevertheless feel that it would have been better if the unilingual formula had been effectively implemented thereby ensuring the great State of Punjab continuing as at present and bringing about the emotional integration of the Punjabi and Hindi-speaking regions of the existing State of Punjab, because of the obvious reason that the further division of the State into smaller units might render their long term economic stability or viability doubtful.

While agreeing with the conclusion and recommendation as contained in para 69 of the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Demand for Punjabi Suba that the present State of Punjab be reorganised on a linguistic basis, I, however, wish to add that such reorganisation should not open the flood gates for changing the boundaries of other adjoining States which have been enjoying stable administration and the largest measure of emotional integration amongst their citizens. For example, the State of Rajasthan brought into existence 17 years ago by the merger basically of the former princely States, went through many difficulties to settle down into a homogeneous, well-governed and compact unit that it is today. This situation should not be permitted to be disturbed in any manner either by loss or addition of territory as a consequence of the division of Punjab.

In para 71 the Committee have observed: "The question of parts of Rajasthan being added to the new Punjabi State or the Haryana State was considered to be beyond the competence of the Committee and hence the Committee did not examine it." Nevertheless, I feel that this matter could have been presented in more positive and absolute terms. It should be made clear that the proposed Punjabi-speaking State or Haryana State would be carved out of the existing Punjab State alone, and that no other adjoining State would, as a consequence, suffer loss of its existing territories in terms of the categorical assurance given by the Hon. Home Minister, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, in the Rajya Sabha in reply to Shri I. K. Gujral's Starred Question No. 71 on 5th November, 1965.

NEW DELHI;

KARNI SINGH.

The 17th March, 1966.

V

While agreeing with the conclusion and recommendation as contained in para 69 of the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Demand for Punjabi Suba that the present State of Punjab be reorganised on a linguistic basis, I, however, wish to add that such reorganisation should not open the flood gates for changing the boundaries of other adjoining States which have been enjoying stable administration and the largest measure of emotional integration amongst their citizens. For example, the State of Rajasthan brought into existence 17 years ago by the merger basically of the former princely States, went through many difficulties to settle down into a homogeneous, well-governed and compact unit that it is today. This situation should not be permitted to be disturbed in any manner either by loss or addition of territory as a consequence of the division of Punjab.

NEW DELHI;

SURJIT SINGH MAJITHIA.

The 17th March, 1966.

VI

I am sorry, I cannot be party to a report which, on the Committee's own admission, has failed to carry out the task assigned to it (*vide* Home Minister's statement in Lok Sabha on the 6th September, 1965 namely, finding "a cooperative solution" which would satisfy the needs of the Punjabi and Hindi-speaking regions of the Punjab State. In its concluding chapter, the Committee confesses: "After perusing the large number of memoranda/representations received by the Committee and hearing the various view-points expressed by the different witnesses representing the various shades of opinion, it soon became evident that it was not possible to arrive at any 'co-operative solution'...." I feel constrained to observe that the Committee did not even explore the possibilities of arriving at such a 'cooperative solution', and instead seemed eager to produce a report which suited the predilections and prejudices of most of its own members.

2. The very composition of this Committee had aroused misgivings in the minds of a large section of the people in Punjab that this Committee was a loaded Committee, and which therefore, could not be expected to take an objective view of the problem. Because of these misgivings, the Punjab Jana Sangh, the Punjab Hindu Sabha, the Punjab Sanatan Dharma Pratinidhi Sabha, certain members of the Punjab High Court Bar, Chandigarh, the Punjab Depressed classes League, and the Punjab Ekta Samiti declined to appear before this Committee. For entirely different reasons, the Akali Dal (both Fateh Singh Group as well as Tara Singh Group) also decided not to appear before the Committee. With all these major organised groups in Punjab thus having refused cooperation to the Committee, this Committee's findings have been robbed of the sanction that Parliamentary Committee would normally have.

3. The Committee has recommended that "the present State of Punjab should be reorganised on a linguistic basis, on which all the States in the country had been formed". It is surprising that the Committee should have its recommendation on such a patently incorrect statement. Not all our States have been formed on a linguistic basis. Jammu and Kashmir State and Goa are two glaring exceptions. The country has not accepted language as the sole criterion for the formation of States. The States Reorganisation Commission

very pertinently pointed out that "it is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of the single test of either language or culture, but that a balanced approach to the whole problem is necessary in the interests of national unity".

4. In the case of Punjab, however, the S.R.C. in its learned report analysed threadbare the demand for a Punjabi-speaking State. I do not propose to repeat here the formidable reasons given by the Commission to explain why it had had to reject the demand. I may only quote some of its concluding remarks. It said: "Quite clearly with this widespread dispersion of the Punjabi language in recent years and the intermingling of Hindi-speaking and Punjabi-speaking people, it would be impossible to create a compact unilingual State". And further, "the creation of a Punjabi-speaking State would offer no solution to the language problem, the present arrangement for the recognition of both Punjabi and Hindi could not be done away with, and the controversies would not in all probability come to an end and while no major problem would be solved, both the languages might suffer". I regret that the Committee has not cared to debate the detailed arguments advanced by the S.R.C. against a Punjabi-speaking State and blandly affirmed that "whatever might have been the position then, an overwhelming majority of the people in the State now support its reorganisation on linguistic basis." I hold that all the objections the S.R.C. had to partitioning this already partitioned State have as much validity in 1966, if not more, than they had in 1956.

5. So far as the development and propagation of Punjabi language is concerned, the progress made during these last ten years leaves no scope for complaint. The Punjabi Language is being read all over the Punjab. A Punjabi University has been established at Patiala. At Chandigarh, a Punjabi Language Department has started functioning.

The progress of Punjabi would have been still more rapid if it had not been tied down to Gurumukhi, the scriptural script of the Sikhs, to the exclusion of the more widely known scripts of Punjabi, Devanagri and Persian. And if now Punjab is partitioned and Punjabi continues to be tagged with Gurumukhi, the area of the Punjabi language would become restricted to just a few districts. Its progress would naturally be retarded. No sincere well wisher of the Punjabi language, I am sure, would desire this.

6. For all these years, every important Committee or Commission which has dealt with this demand for a Punjabi-speaking State has acknowledged that the demand has basically a communal motivation.

The Government of India has fully concurred with this view. On August 28, 1961, explaining to the Lok Sabha why Government could not accede to this demand, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru said "So far as the Punjabi Language is concerned everything that has been asked for has been conceded and full opportunities have been provided for the growth of that language. The question therefore of demanding a Punjabi Suba in order to give facilities to the Punjabi language does not arise. The demand for a Punjabi Suba thus can only be considered as a communal demand even though it is given a linguistic base. It seemed to us that the acceptance of the proposal which basically was communal would be wrong in regard to the formation of a State". This Parliamentary Committee refuses to see this fact and even affirms: "The bulk of the evidence given before the Committee, however, refutes this argument" (that this demand is basically a communal one). I am afraid I cannot indulge in any such self-delusion. And so I think it necessary to point out that all the complaints we hear about Sikhs being discriminated against in a bilingual Punjab are entirely baseless. The Das Commission set up in 1961 to examine these allegations of discrimination, fully confirmed this. In fact the situation is quite the contrary. One has only to look at the list of top Punjab officials to be convinced about this.

7. It is a matter of regret that in making its recommendation the Committee has not given serious thought to the implications it has for the country's defence. The objection that division of Punjab would weaken our defences has been replied with the naive argument that "defence is a Central subject and the State Governments have nothing to do with it". A queerer explanation still which has been given for treating this objection lightly is that this Committee was not "an expert body" and further that the Ministry of Home Affairs declined to give any expert advice on the matter. I have specifically referred to this to point out how casually this matter has been dealt with. On my part, I can only draw attention to the expert opinion on this subject hitherto available namely that of the S.R.C. "The first essential objective of any scheme of reorganisation", the S.R.C. said, "must be the unity and security of India". Emphasising the necessity of having larger States on the frontiers, the Commission said: "It seems clear to us that, when a border area is not under the direct control of the Centre, small units and multiplicity of jurisdictions would be an obvious handicap from the point of view of national security". The size, and resources of a border State, together constitute a major factor in the defence potential of the State. Lest there be any tendency to regard this only as an academic objection, I may refer to a small but significant fact mentioned in his evidence of the

Punjab Chief Minister. He said that during the recent Indo-Pakistan crisis he had experienced great difficulty in securing civilian trucks from other States required for military purposes. The fact that Defence was a Central subject did not obviate his difficulty.

8. The Committee has not given any opinion about the economic viability of the States which would emerge following a linguistic division of Punjab. As on the question of defence, here too it has pleaded lack of expert data. I wish, therefore, if it had to make recommendations for the division of the State it had made it subject to the proviso that such States should be financially viable. It is wrong to play down the importance of this factor of economic viability by arguing as the Committee has done, that "no State in the Union is at present economically viable, as most of the States are dependent on the Union Government for grants and loans". In this context I would only like to point out that the economy of the whole of present Punjab is dependent upon the Bhakra Nangal irrigation and power system, with which the dam on Beas at Pong is inextricably linked. The system caters to the needs of both the so called Punjabi region and Hindi region. Bifurcation of these two regions is bound to create difficulties for both the proposed new States from the economic point of view.

9. A natural corollary of the Punjabi-speaking State would be a separate Haryana State. The basic problem of the Haryana region is its economic backwardness. The creation of a separate Haryana State may satisfy the ambitions of a few politicians but it is surely no solution for its economic backwardness.

The protagonists of Haryana have not even cared to study the economic and financial implications of creating such a small State and have been keen only to whip up parochialism for the furtherance of their personal aims. The masses in Haryana, I am sure, wish to live in a united Punjab, but would like to be assured rapid economic development without imposition of Punjabi as the sole language of administration. It is unfortunate that instead of trying to find ways and means to allay Haryana's present grievances, the Committee has suggested a remedy worse than the malady itself—partition of Punjab.

10. The Committee's recommendation, if implemented, will let open a veritable Pandora's Box. For several years now, fissiparous forces have been lying low. If Government acts up to the Committee's recommendation and carves two States out of the present Punjab, all these forces would burst out with full fury and make another bid to attain their frustrated aims. It is never difficult to

appeal to narrow parochialism, and the grant of Punjabi Suba, euphemistically described by this Committee as 'linguistic reorganisation of Punjab', may touch off a spate of agitations all over the country. Already, the Vidarbha demand has been revived. There have been demands also that U.P. and Punjab be split up and that a separate Konkan State be formed. The situation in the north eastern parts of the country is extremely explosive. At a time when all attention should be paid to strengthening the unity of the country, it is unfortunate that a step is being contemplated which can only shatter this unity.

11. The Committee has argued that "maintenance of the *status quo* in the State would cause further unrest among the people". The Committee has therefore commended its report as a "permanent and satisfactory solution of this problem". Ironically, even before the Committee's report has been published, the mere suggestion that the *status quo* is going to be changed has plunged the entire State into a turmoil the like of which has not been seen since 1947. The present situation in Punjab can convince any one that the solution now commended is certainly not a solution "acceptable to the largest number of people" as the Committee has claimed.

12. In conclusion, I would once again like to stress that an effort must be made to arrive at a "cooperative solution" of the Punjab problem by ascertaining the wishes of all sections of the people and trying to harmonise them. That precisely was the task entrusted to the Committee by Parliament. I admit the task is not easy, but it is certainly not impossible. My strongest misgiving against this majority report is that it has not even attempted it.

NEW DELHI;

A. B. VAJPAYEE.

The 17th March, 1966.

VII

While we generally support the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Demand for Punjabi Suba and congratulate it for the bold conclusions arrived at on some of the ticklish problems of this region, we are sorry we cannot agree with Para 70 of the Report.

The Committee has refrained from expressing opinion on the question of Vishal Haryana Prant, comprising certain areas of Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Delhi and the Haryana areas of the Punjab or the second proposal of merging the proposed Haryana State with Delhi. We would be failing in our duty if we do not express our views on these questions in their broad perspective.

The historical background regarding dismemberment of this region after the Ist War of Independence in 1857 has been given in paragraph 38. We may only add that this Suba known as Delhi Suba was formed by Akbar with the following boundaries:—

“Its length from Palwal to Ludhiana on the back of Sutlej is 165 Kos. Its breadth from the Sarkar of Rewari to the Kumaon Hills is 140 Kos. and again from Hissar to Khizrabad is 130 Kos. On the East lies the Capital, Agra. On the North East it marches with Khairabad in the Suba of Oudh; to the North are mountains; on the South the Subas of Agra and Ajmer; on the West is Ludhiana”.

The Suba of Delhi consisted of 8 Sarkars of Delhi, Badaun, Kumaon, Sambhal, Saharanpur, Rewari, Hissar and Sirhind.

Even before Akbar the entity of this area remained in one form or the other with marginal adjustments according to requirements of different periods of our history. This area was known as ‘Hindustan’. The areas around Delhi assumed importance from times immemorial. The earliest settlement is traceable to the 10th Century B.C. to the epic period of Mahabharata. The past of this city shrouded in darkness until 1st Century B.C. when Raja Dillu of the Mauryan Dynasty founded a new city about the site

where the Qutab Minar stands today. There is again a lapse of another 10 centuries until any concrete evidence is found about the existence of a city in this vicinity. It is said that in the ruins of this old city in the middle of 11th century Raja Anangpal founded another city. At the end of 12th century, with the defeat of Prithvi Raj Chauhan, Delhi passed on into the hands of Muslim rulers. The British defeated Marathas in 1803 A.D. and the city's future passed into the hands of new foreign rulers.

Ancient legend has it that 'He who rules Delhi rules India'. Delhi has seen rise and fall of many empires. Its economy has been supported by the hinterland around it, as mentioned in the Delhi Suba boundaries above. It occupied a very strategic position from defence point of view as this area was the next and the last chance of ruling kings to keep invaders away from sweeping across the rich plains of the 'Gangetic Valley'.

The Punjabi Suba will be a border State with Pakistan. This Suba will be a vanguard of our defence in the West and would have the same importance as the land of five rivers, the Punjab, had before 1947, in the past.

The remaining area of the present Punjab, i.e., the Hindi-speaking areas known as Haryana, will be a better second line of defence if it has more hinter-land, more agricultural and industrial potential.

The British Government broke the moral fibre and the spirit of the people of this area by fragmenting this area at 4 places as a punishment for participation in First War of Independence in 1857. It is now in the National interest to bring these areas together and form the Greater Haryana including areas of Delhi, U.P. and Rajasthan, from the point of view of both Defence and Economic Development. The people of this area have historical, cultural and economic ties. They have common language, dress, marriage rites, laws of succession, system of land tenure and customs. This land is also known as 'Hindustan'—'India in miniature' and the people and the language as 'Hindustani' or *Khari Boli*. In more than one sense it constitutes the heart of the country.

The area of Union Territory of Delhi is 578 sq. miles since 1915. The population has increased from 4.13 lakhs in 1911 to 26.44 lakhs in 1961. The population is increasing between 1.25 lakhs to 1.50

lakhs every year. Rural area is eroding fast reducing hinterland and agricultural production. Need of land for housing is increasing, land for industries is required, insistence of neighbouring States to have a uniform sales-tax with Delhi is adversely affecting trade and commerce and its distributive character in the absence of hinterland which was mainly responsible for growth and development of Delhi in the past. The Government prepared a Master Plan for Delhi for planned development of Delhi to find an answer to these problems. After the labour of several years and with the help of foreign experts it came to the conclusion that the area of 5,000 sq. miles around Delhi consisting of Tehsils of Sonapat, Baghpat, Rohtak, Jhajjar, Ballabh Garh and Gurgaon of Punjab, and Meerut, Hapur, Bullandshahr, Ghaziabad and Sekandrabad of U.P., i.e. the area within a radius of about 45 miles, be planned and developed in an integrated manner. The Planners were handicapped in making a forthright recommendation regarding jurisdiction of one authority over the whole area of National Capital region on account of the Government attitude not to disturb the boundaries of different States adjoining Delhi. Even within limitations it was suggested that a statutory high-powered authority be set up charged with the duty of the preparation and implementation of the Master Plan for the National Capital Region. This could not be done as it involved limitation on jurisdiction of the Punjab and U.P. on their areas falling within the National Capital Region. It is for this confusion that provisions of Master Plan for Delhi could not make any headway in the Greater Delhi area. Due to increasing problems the people of the region continue to suffer.

The population of Delhi increased very fast between 1941 and 1961—from 9·17 lakhs in 1941 to 17·44 lakhs in 1951 and 26·44 lakhs in 1961. In the wake of partition of the country more than 5 lakhs displaced persons from West Pakistan settled in Delhi. They have influenced the life, culture and character of Delhi. Those sturdy and hardworking men have added a new glorious chapter to the history of Delhi. They stood on their own legs. They are talented persons who grasp opportunities quickly. Their enthusiasm and zeal to build economy of Delhi by expanding their existing factories and industries and opening new ones is dampened by various limitations in a small area of Union Territory of Delhi. They feel bewildered and irked for want of more opportunities to serve their country. They can do so when Delhi has openings with a large hinterland both in Punjab and U.P.

Irrigation and drainage in the Central Yamuna Valley Region have not been properly developed. Yamuna and its canals are

within the jurisdiction of Punjab, Delhi and U.P. Due to this multiple jurisdiction, and overlapping and divided responsibilities, the schemes of irrigation, water-supply and drainage to check floods etc. are not implemented with promptitude. The influence of the Yamuna from Delhi northward is extended 120 miles south to Agra and 100 miles west to Hissar as well as about 50 miles east beyond Meerut. The origin of the river reaches far north into the Himalayas and is first subject to control at the Tajewala Diversion Weir, 125 miles north of Delhi. This makes a total area of approximately 30,000 sq. miles. In order to solve these problems it is necessary to bring all these areas under one jurisdiction.

Shri K. M. Pannikar, a Member of the States Reorganisation Commission, suggested in his Minute of Dissent on the Report of the Commission division of U.P. in the interest of better and efficient administration.

The erstwhile Delhi Vidhan Sabha passed a resolution unanimously on 29th October, 1953 requesting the Delhi State Government to recommend to the Government of India that the boundaries of Delhi State be enlarged by including the contiguous districts of the Punjab and U.P. so that a unit administratively and economically sound is created. The erstwhile Delhi Vidhan Sabha had representatives of Bharatiya Jana Sangh & P.S.P. also. A Committee was appointed to work out details and they prepared a case for 'Greater Delhi' for submission before the States Reorganisation Commission. The plan of 'Greater Delhi' included the areas of Agra Division, Meerut Division, part of Rohilkhand Division of U.P., Ambala Division of Punjab, areas of PEPSU, Alwar and Bharatpur Districts of Rajasthan and Delhi State.

This scheme was endorsed by the Delhi State Political Conference in 1954.

The need of increasing boundaries of Delhi by encompassing surrounding areas of U.P. and Punjab was emphasized in Delhi State Political Conferences in 1959 and 1964.

For the reasons given here and others, which had been expressed and submitted in various memoranda before the Committee or the evidence given by the representative organisations from this region, it is clear that there is a strong body of opinion for carving out a *new State*, call it Delhi, Vishal Haryana, Haryana or Yamuna Pra-

desh. This is a long standing demand of the people of this region. The metropolis of Delhi is the heart and soul of this area and it is neither in the national interest nor in the interest of healthy economic and social development that Delhi and its surrounding areas are artificially kept separate. Therefore, we would urge upon the Government to settle this issue now. If such issues are not solved in time and allowed to simmer, they create a volcanic situation. We are quite sure that the demand of the people of this area to have their own State of Delhi will continue to grow and will not rest till they achieve their objective. The Government can of course delay but will not be able to deny this right to the people of the area. It is wise for the Government to accede to this demand.

NEW DELHI;
The 17th March, 1966.

BRAHM PERKASH.
SHANTA VASISHT.

VIII

It is a matter of regret to see that while the deliberations of this Committee are coming to a conclusion, there have been out-breaks of violence in the State of Punjab and so many precious lives have been lost. It is a pity that the hope of finding a satisfactory solution to all concerned in a peaceful manner has been marred by this happening, whereas our hope was that the formation of a separate Punjab State would bring greater joy to the people of Punjab. One cannot but escape the conclusion that it is the confused way of thinking and mishandling of the situation by the Government both in Punjab and at the Centre that is responsible for all this. I feel that the manner in which this Committee was formed and the manner in which it proceeded with its deliberations was likely to result in trouble. Hence my repeated pleas to go a little slower. I felt out of step with the Committee.

In spite of having raised the matter several times, I have not yet been able to understand the Government's approach to the question referred to this Committee or whether this was a Parliamentary Committee or a Select Committee. The statement made by the Home Minister on the subject in the Rajya Sabha said something while what was said in the Committee at its earlier meetings was something different. More surprising of all was that the first meeting of the Committee scheduled and due notice of which was given to be held on a Monday was suddenly called on Saturday preceding to suit the convenience of the Cabinet Sub-Committee. I received the minutes of that meeting on my arrival on Sunday. The minutes contained nothing and my request for information as to what actually happened in the meeting several times has gone unheeded. Surely, this is not the way of dealing with a Committee.

Another objectionable feature of the Committee's procedure was that members began by expressing their views on the subject without even waiting to see the representation or to interview witnesses or anything else from the first day. A compilation of the evidence and summaries tabulated by the office were received after most of the members had expressed their views. The order in which the witnesses were called also was rather unusual. One would have thought that the Government of the province would have been the first to come before the Committee, but they were the very last.

Since my father Sardar Patel's name was used several times by many people during the course of discussion, and his words that he would like to say in a State administered by the Sikhs was quoted, I had requested that His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala should

be called as a witness so as to have the benefit of his views, but also to explain the context and the circumstances in which Sardar Patel had used such words. My request has remained unheeded even though His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala did come to India before the Committee's final conclusions were arrived at. He would have surely come to India a few days earlier, if requested. The whole matter has been bungled badly leaving a bad taste behind.

Having myself advocated the formation of a separate State for Gujarat on linguistic basis, how could I oppose the desire of any linguistic minority to have a separate State for itself. But no proper explanation has been given to the Committee as to why the Regional Formula or other suggestions were not acted upon or were even given a fair trial. Is this demand for separate Punjabi Suba also the result of administration of the late Sardar Partap Singh Kairon?

With so many years of experience after the formation of the State of Gujarat, I feel Gujarat has not often been able to set its points of views, before Government because of its smaller size and hence smaller representation in Parliament as compared to say Maharashtra or Uttar Pradesh. I feel that if all States in the Union of India are to feel comfortable and not feel over-powered or preponderated upon the largest states, formation of states nearly of equal size would be necessary. For instance, what is happening with the Narbada Scheme. It will not only be beneficial to the Gujarat but to the whole of India. It has been described by Expert Engineers as the most economical irrigation and power project in India, but it is being shelved for so many years only because Gujarat has not the large representation as the other States have. Hence this question will soon have to be faced by the country. The question of making States equal in size and representation will have to be considered.

NEW DELHI;
The 17th March, 1966.

DAHYABHAI V. PATEL,

Chairman's Note

The Member raised the same points on several occasions in the Committee. I explained to him the position on each such occasion and other Members also tried to explain but the Member does not seem to be satisfied.

NEW DELHI;
The 18th March, 1966

HUKAM SINGH,
Chairman,
Parliamentary Committee on the
Demand for Punjabi Suba.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

(Vide para 2 of the Report)

*STATEMENT RE: DEMAND FOR PUNJABI SUBA

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Sir, in the statement I made in this House on September 6, 1965, I had referred to Prime Minister's talks with Sant Fateh Singh in which he had made it clear that no effort would be spared by Government to remove the sense of grievance in regard to the language question, the functioning of regional committees and other matters and that if there were any deficiencies, they would be looked into and put right. I had also mentioned the fact that the demand for a Punjabi Suba had been revived by Sant Fateh Singh.

I am sure I am voicing the opinion of everyone in this House and outside that we were greatly relieved to learn that particularly in the face of Pakistan's aggression, Sant Fateh Singh did not pursue the idea of his fast, and as expected of a distinguished patriotic leader, gave his whole-hearted support to the defence effort.

In my statement on the 6th September, 1965, I had said that the whole question could be examined afresh with an open mind and that Government would be prepared to have further talks on the subject. I had also expressed the hope that a cooperative solution would be discovered based on goodwill and a reasoned approach.

Government have now decided to set up a committee of the Cabinet to pursue this matter further. The Committee will consist of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Shri Y. B. Chavan and Shri Mahavir Tyagi.

Sir, I would request you and the Chairman, Rajya Sabha to set up for the same purpose a Parliamentary Committee of Members of both Houses of Parliament presided over by you, Sir.

I am confident that the efforts of this Cabinet Committee and of the Parliamentary Committee will lead to a satisfactory settlement of the question.

*L.S. Debs. dt. 23.9.1965, c. 7191.

APPENDIX II

(Vide para II of the Report)

List of bodies, organisations, associations and individuals who gave evidence before the Committee.

Sl. Nos.	Names of witnesses	Dates on which evidence was given
1	2	3
1	SHIROMANI GURDWARA PRABANDHAK COMMITTEE, AMRITSAR	10-1-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Sardar Ravel Singh, Member, Executive Committee, Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee.	
	2. Sardar Lachman Singh Gill, M.L.A., General Secretary, Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee.	
2	PASMANDA SIKHS COMMITTEE, PUNJAB, AMRITSAR	27-1-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Sardar Tara Singh Lyallpuri, M.L.A., President, Pasmanda Sikhs Committee, Punjab.	
	2. Sardar Karnail Singh Marthi.	
3	SIKH MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS LEGISLATURE PARTY OF PUNJAB	27-1-1966 and 28-1-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Giani Kartar Singh, M.L.A.	
	2. Sardar Harcharan Singh Brar, M.L.A.	
4	HARYANA LOK SAMITI, ROHTAK	29-1-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Prof. Sher Singh, M.L.C., President, Haryana Lok Samiti.	

I	2	3
	2 Mahashaya Bharat Singh, Municipal Commissioner (Rohtak), General Secretary, Haryana Lok Samiti.	
	3 Shri Mehar Chand, Member, Haryana Lok Samiti Executive Committee.	
	4 Shri Devi Singh Tewatia, Barrister-at-Law, Member, Haryana Lok Samiti Executive Committee.	
5	HARYANA ALL-PARTY ACTION COMMITTEE, CHANDIGARH	29-1-1966 and 5-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Ch. Devi Lal, M.L.A., Chairman, Haryana All-Party Action Committee.	
	2. Shri Mool Chand Jain, Advocate, General Secretary, Haryana All-Party Action Committee.	
	3. Shri Dharmvir Vashisht, ex-M.L.A.	
	4. Shri Ram Saran Chand Mital, M.L.A.	
6	PUNJAB STATE COUNCIL, COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA, CHANDIGARH	1-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Shri Avtar Singh Malhotra, Secretary, State Council, Communist Party of India.	
	2. Sardar Teja Singh Swatantra, M.L.C.	
7	HARYANA ARYA SAMMELAN, ROHTAK	1-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti, M.P., Convenor, Haryana Arya Sammelan.	
	2. Acharya Bhagwan Dev, Chairman, Haryana Arya Sammelan.	
	3. Shri Harphool Singh Arya, Member, Executive Committee, Punjab Arya Pratinidhi Sabha.	
8	DR. Y. S. PARMAR, CHIEF MINISTER, HIMACHAL PRADESH	2-2-1966
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH CONGRESS COMMITTEE, SIMLA .	2-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Shrimati Satyavati Dang, President, Himachal Pradesh Congress Committee.	
	2. Shri Tapindra Singh, Deputy Speaker, Himachal Pradesh Assembly.	

1	2	3
10	DISTRICT CONGRESS COMMITTEE, KANGRA . . .	2-2-1966

Spokesman :

1. Dr. Salig Ram, President, District Congress Committee, Kangra.

11	DISTRICT CONGRESS COMMITTEE, KULU . . .	3-2-1966
----	---	----------

Spokesmen :

1. Shri Lal Chand Prarthi, M.L.A., President, D.C.C., Kulu.
2. Shri Beli Ram, M.L.C.
3. Shri Taj Singh, Advocate, Chairman, Zila Parishad, Kulu.
4. Shri Birbal, Chairman, Panchayat Samiti, Banjar, District Kulu.
5. Shri Mohan Lal, Chairman, Panchayat Samiti, Naggar, District Kulu.
6. Shri Mehar Chand, Vice-Chairman, Panchayat Samiti, Naggar, District Kulu.
7. Shrimati Dhanwanti Devi, Member, Zila Parishad, Kulu.

12	PUNJAB PRADESH COMMITTEE, REPUBLICAN PARTY OF INDIA, JULLUNDUR . . .	3-2-1966
----	--	----------

Spokesmen :

1. Shri Ajit Kumar, M.L.A., Member, State Executive Committee, Punjab Pradesh Committee, Republican Party of India.
2. Shri Piara Ram Dhanowali, General Secretary, Punjab Pradesh Committee, Republican Party of India.

13	PUNJAB PRADESH CONGRESS COMMITTEE, CHANDIGARH	3-2-1966
----	---	----------

Spokesmen :

1. Shri Bhagwat Dayal Sharma, President, Punjab Pradesh Congress Committee.

1	2	3
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Sardar Amar Singh, M.L.C., Vice-President, Punjab Pradesh Congress Committee. 3. Sardar Gulab Singh, M.L.A., General Secretary, P.P.C.C. 4. Pandit Mohan Lal, M.L.A., Member, P.P.C.C. Executive. 5. Shri Brish Bhan, Member, P.P.C.C. 6. Sardar Darbara Singh, Home Minister, Punjab. 7. Sardar Gurdial Singh Dhillon, Minister of Transport, Punjab. 	
14	PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY, PUNJAB	4-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sardar Sajjan Singh Margindpuri, Acting Chairman, P.S.P., Punjab Branch. 2. Shri Surendra Mohan, Joint Secretary, P.S.P., Central Office. 	
15	CONGRESS LEGISLATORS OF PUNJAB BELONGING TO HAR- YANA DISTRICTS	4-2-1966
	<i>Spokesman :</i>	
	Shri Hardwari Lal, M.L.A.	
16	PUNJAB STATE COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (MARXIST), JULLUNDUR	4-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet, Secretary, Punjab State Committee, C.P.I. (Marxist). 2. Shri Gurbukhish Singh, Acting Secretary, Punjab State Committee, C.P.I. (Marxist). 3. Shri Mohan Singh Mahawa, Member, State Committee, C.P.I. (Marxist). 	
17	MEMBERS OF THE PUNJAB HIGH COURT BAR ASSOCIATION, CHANDIGARH	5-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Shri Anand Swarup, Chairman, Punjab State Bar Council.	

I	2	3
	2. Shri Partap Singh Daulta, ex-M.P., Senior Advocate, High Court, Punjab.	
	3. Sardar Dara Singh, Senior Advocate, High Court, Punjab.	
	4. Shri Chandra Bhan Gupta, M.L.C., Advocate, High Court, Punjab.	
18	DELHI PRADESH CONGRESS COMMITTEE, DELHI	5-2-1966

Spokesmen :

	1. Shri Shiv Charan Gupta, M.P., Member, Delhi Pradesh Congress Committee.	
	2. Shri Naval Prabhakar, M.P.	
	3. Shri H.K.L. Bhagat, Deputy Mayor, Delhi.	
	4. Shri Bhiku Ram Jain, Municipal Councillor.	
	5. Shri Fateh Singh, Municipal Councillor.	
19	SETH RAM NATH, EX-CHAIRMAN, PUNJABI REGIONAL COMMITTEE, PUNJAB	7-2-1966
20	SHRI BALWANT RAI TAYAL, EX-CHAIRMAN, HINDI REGIONAL COMMITTEE, PUNJAB	7-2-1966
21	SPONSORING COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF U.P., PUNJAB, RAJASTHAN AND DELHI, NEW DELHI	7-2-1966

Spokesmen :

	1. Pandit Krishna Chandra Sharma, M.P., Chairman, Sponsoring Committee.	
	2. Shri Shiv Charan Gupta, M.P.	
	3. Shri Gajraj Singh Rao, M.P.	
	4. Shri Ram Chandra Vikal, M.L.A. (U.P.)	
	5. Shri Ram Saran Chand Mital, M.L.A. (Punjab).	
	6. Shri Sri Chand, ex.-M.L.A. (U.P.).	
	7. Shri Jag Parvesh Chandra, ex-M.L.A. (Delhi).	
	8. Shri P. K. Jain.	
22	SWAMI RAMESHWARANAND, M.P.	7-2-1966

1	2	3
23	JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE ARYA PRATINIDHI SABHA, PUNJAB AND ARYA PRADESHIK SABHA PUNJAB, NEW DELHI	7-2-1966
	<i>Spokesmen :</i>	
	1. Shri Yash, M.L.A. (Punjab), President, Arya Pradeshik Sabha, Punjab.	
	2. Prof. Ram Singh, President, Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Punjab.	
	3. Principal L. D. Dikshit, Convenor.	
24	SHRI SURENDRA NATH KHOSLA, ADVOCATE, EX-M.L.A. (PUNJAB), MEMBER, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SWATANTRA PARTY, PUNJAB UNIT	8-2-1966
25	CHIEF MINISTER AND CERTAIN OTHER MINISTERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF PUNJAB	21-2-1966 and 22-2-1966
	1. Shri Ram Kishan, Chief Minister, Punjab.	
	2. Sardar Darbara Singh, Home Minister.	
	3. Chaudhry Ranbir Singh, Minister, Public Works Department.	
	4. Sardar Gurdial Singh Dhillon, Minister of Transport.	
	5. Sardar Ajmer Singh, Minister of Planning.	
	6. Shri Prabodh Chandra, Minister of Education.	
	7. Shrimati Om Prabha Jain, Minister of Health.	

APPENDIX III

(Vide para 11 of the Report)

List of bodies/individuals who were invited by the Committee to give oral evidence before them but did not appear before the Committee or declined to do so.

Serial Nos.	Names of bodies/individuals
<hr/>	
1.	Shiromani Akali Dal, Golden Temple, Amritsar.
2.	Punjab State Bhartiya Jan Sangh, Jullundur.
3.	Punjab State Hindu Maha Sabha, Amritsar.
4.	Shri Sanatan Dharma Pratinidhi Sabha Punjab, New Delhi.
5.	Shiromani Akali Dal c/o Master Tara Singh, Amritsar.
6.	Swatantra Party, Punjab Unit, Patiala.
7.	Punjab Samyukta Socialist Party, Ludhiana.
8.	Certain Members of the Punjab High Court Bar, Chandigarh (Ch. Sri Chand, M.L.C., and others).
9.	Punjab Depressed Classes League, Kharar.
10.	Punjab Ekta Samiti, Amritsar.

APPENDIX IV

(Vide para 24 of the Report).

No. F. 48/1/56-SRI

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(S.R.I. SECTION)

An Outline of the Scheme for Regional Committees in the Punjab State

(Laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha on 3rd April, 1956)

1. There will be one legislature for the whole of the reorganised State of the Punjab, which will be the sole law-making body for the entire State, and there will be one Governor for the State, aided and advised by a Council of Ministers responsible to the State Assembly for the entire field of administration.

2. For the more convenient transaction of the business of Government with regard to some specified matters, the State will be divided into two regions, namely, the Punjabi-speaking and the Hindi-speaking regions.

3. For each region there will be a regional committee of the State Assembly consisting of the members of the State Assembly belonging to each region including the Ministers from that region but not including the Chief Minister.

4. Legislation relating to specified matters will be referred to the Regional Committees. In respect of specified matters proposals may also be made by the Regional Committees to the State Governments for Legislation or with regard to questions of general policy not involving any financial commitments other than expenditure of a routine and incidental character.

5. The advice tendered by the Regional Committees will normally be accepted by the Government and the State Legislature. In case of difference of opinion, reference will be made to the Governor whose decision will be final and binding.

6. The regional committees will deal with the following matters:

- (i) Development and economic planning, within the framework of the general development plans and policies formulated by the State legislature;

- (ii) Local Self-Government, that is to say, the constitutional powers of municipal corporations, improvement trusts, district boards and other local authorities for the purpose of local self-government or village administration including Panchayats;
- (iii) Public Health and sanitation, Local hospitals and dispensaries;
- (iv) Primary and secondary education;
- (v) Agriculture;
- (vi) Cottage and small-scale industries;
- (vii) Preservation, protection and improvement of stock and prevention of animal diseases, veterinary training and practice;
- (viii) Pounds and prevention of cattle trespass;
- (ix) Protection of wild animals and birds;
- (x) Fisheries;
- (xi) Inns and Inn Keepers;
- (xii) Markets and fairs;
- (xiii) Cooperative societies; and
- (xiv) Charities and charitable institutions, charitable and religious endowments and religious institutions.

7. Provision will be made under the appropriate Central statute to empower the President to constitute regional committees and to make provision in the rules of business of Government and the rules of procedure of the Legislative Assembly in order to give effect to the arrangements outlined in the preceding paragraphs. The provisions made in the rules of business and procedure for the proper functioning of regional committees will not be altered without the approval of the President.

8. The demarcation of the Hindi and Punjabi regions in the proposed Punjab State will be done in consultation with the State Government and the other interests concerned.

9. The Sachar formula will continue to operate in the area comprised in the existing Punjab State, and in the area now comprised in the PEPSU State, the existing arrangements will continue until they are replaced or altered by agreement later.

10. The official language of each region will, at the district level and below, be the respective regional language.

11. The State will be bilingual recognising both Punjabi (in Gurmukhi script) and Hindi (in Devnagri script) as the official languages of the State.

12. The Punjab Government will establish two separate departments for developing Punjabi and Hindi languages.

13. The general safeguards proposed for linguistic minorities will be applicable to the Punjab like other States.

14. In accordance with and in furtherance of its policy to promote the growth of all regional languages, the Central Government will encourage the development of the Punjabi language.

APPENDIX V

(Vide para 27 of the Report)

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 4th November, 1957

S.R.O. 3524.—The Following Order made by the President is published for general information:—

THE PUNJAB REGIONAL COMMITTEES ORDER, 1957

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of article 371 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes, with respect to the State of Punjab, the following Order, namely:—

1. (1) This Order may be called the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957.

(2) It shall come into force on the 4th day of November, 1957.

2. In this Order,

- (a) "Assembly" means the Legislative Assembly of the State;
- (b) "Chief Minister" means the Chief Minister of the State;
- (c) "Council" means the Legislative Council of the State;
- (d) "Minister" means a Minister of the State and includes a Deputy Minister of the State;
- (e) "region" means the Hindi region or the Punjabi region as specified in the First Schedule;
- (f) "regional committee" means a regional committee constituted by paragraph 3 of this Order;
- (g) "scheduled matters" means the matters specified in the Second Schedule;
- (h) "Schedule" means a Schedule appended to this Order;
- (i) "State" means the State of Punjab.

3. (1) There shall be two regional committees of the Assembly, one for the Punjabi region and the other for the Hindi region, consisting respectively of the members of the Assembly who for the time being represent the constituencies within that region:

Provided that the Chief Minister and the Speaker shall not be members of either regional committee.

(2) Every Minister shall have the right to speak in, and otherwise to take part in the proceedings of, any regional committee, but shall not, by virtue of such right, be entitled to vote at any meeting of the regional committee of which he is not a member.

4. All scheduled matters shall be within the purview of the regional committees to the extent and in the manner provided by this Order.

5. Every Bill which is not a Money Bill and contains mainly provisions dealing with scheduled matters shall, upon introduction in the Assembly or if it has been introduced in and passed by the Council, upon transmission to the Assembly be referred to the regional committee or committees concerned for consideration and report to the Assembly.

6. Any Bill referred to the regional committees under paragraph 5 may, if so recommended by them, be passed by the Assembly with such variations as may be necessary in its application to the two regions.

7. Each regional committee shall have the power to consider and pass resolutions recommending to the State Government any legislative or executive action with respect to scheduled matters, so however that, the executive action relates to general questions of policy and the legislative or executive action does not involve any financial commitment other than expenditure of a routine and incidental character.

8. The modifications directed in the Third Schedule shall be made in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Punjab Legislative Assembly and shall not in any way be affected by any amendments that may hereafter be made in the said Rules by the Assembly under article 208 of the Constitution.

9. The modifications directed in the Fourth Schedule shall be made in the Rules of Business of the Punjab Government and shall not in any way be affected by any amendments that may hereafter be made in the said Rules by the Governor under clause (3) of article 166 of the Constitution.

10. The Governor shall have special responsibility for securing the proper functioning of regional committees in accordance with the provisions of this Order.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE

[See paragraph 2(e)]

Hindi Region

1. Kangra District.
2. Simla District.
3. Karnal District.
4. Rohtak District.
5. Gurgaon District.
6. Hissar District.
7. Mohindergarh District.

* 1 *

8. Ambala District excluding the Rupa, Morinda² (SC) and Chandigarh Assembly Constituencies.
9. Jind and Narwana tehsils of Sangrur District.

Punjabi Region

1. Gurdaspur District.
2. Amritsar District.
3. Bhatinda District.
4. Jullundur District.
5. Hoshiarpur District.
6. Ferozepur District.
7. Ludhiana District.
8. Kapurthala District.

¹The words "Kandaghat and Natagarh tehsils of Patiala District" omitted *vide* the Punjab Regional Committees (Amendment) Order, 1962 (S.O. 1981 dated 21st June, 1962).

²Inserted *vide* the Punjab Regional Committees (Second Amendment) Order, 1962 (S.O. 3193 dated 17th October, 1962).

9. Rupar, Morinda³ (SC) and †Chandigarh Assembly Constituencies in Ambala District.

10. Patiala, District⁴ * * * *

11. Sangrur District excluding Jind and Narwana tehsils.

†Chandigarh Capital Project will not form part of either of the two regions. So long, however, as it does not become a full-fledged constituency on population basis, its representative will sit in the regional committee for the Punjabi region.

THE SECOND SCHEDULE

[See paragraph 2(g)]

Scheduled Matters

1. Local Self-Government, that is to say, the constitution and powers of municipal corporations, improvement trusts, district boards and other local authorities for the purpose of local self-government or village administration including panchayats.
2. Public health and sanitation; local hospitals and dispensaries.
3. Primary and secondary education.
4. Agriculture.
5. Preservation, protection and improvement of stock and prevention of animal diseases; veterinary training and practice.
6. Pounds & the prevention of cattle trespass.
7. Protection of wild animals and birds.
8. Fisheries.
9. Cottage and small-scale industries.
10. Markets and fairs.
11. Inns and inn-keepers.
12. Co-operative societies.
13. Charities and charitable institutions, charitable and religious endowments and religious institutions.

³Inserted *vide* the Punjab Regional Committees (Second Amendment) Order, 1962 (S.O. 3193 dated 17th October, 1962).

⁴The words "excluding Kandaghat and Nalagarh tehsils" omitted *vide* the Punjab Regional Committees (Amendment) Order, 1962 (S.O. 1981 dated 21st June, 1962).

14. Development and economic planning, within the framework of the general development plans and policies formulated by the State Legislature.

THE THIRD SCHEDULE

(See paragraph 8)

The following modifications shall be made in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Punjab Legislative Assembly, namely:—

1. In Rule 2, after the definition of "Private member" the following definitions shall be inserted, namely:—

"'region' means the Hindi region or the Punjabi region as specified in the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957;

'regional Bill' means a Bill which is not a Money Bill and contains mainly provisions dealing with scheduled matters;

'regional committee' means a regional committee constituted by paragraph 3 of the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957;

'scheduled matters' means the matters specified in the Second Schedule to the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957."

2. After Rule 157, the following shall be inserted, namely:—

"(ee) REGIONAL BILLS

157A. *Special provisions regarding regional Bills.*—Notwithstanding anything contained in Rules 130 to 157, the provisions hereinafter made in relation to regional Bills shall apply to all such Bills; and if any question arises whether a Bill is a regional Bill or not, the question shall be referred to the Governor and a certificate issued by him in this behalf shall be final.

157B. *Motion for introductions of regional Bills.*—When a regional Bill is introduced or on some subsequent occasion the member-in-charge may make one of the following motions in regard to his Bill, namely:—

- (a) that it be referred to the regional committee or committees concerned, or

- (b) that it be circulated for purposes of eliciting opinion thereon by a date specified in the motion:

Provided that no such motion as aforesaid shall be made by any member other than the member-in-charge except by way of amendment to the motion made by the member-in-charge.

157C. *Discussion on principle of regional Bill.*—(1) on the date on which one of the motions referred to in Rule 157B is made or on any subsequent day to which the discussion thereof is postponed, the principle of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed but the details shall not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles.

(2) Where a motion that a Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon is carried, and the Bill is circulated in accordance with that direction and the opinions are received thereon, the member-in-charge, if he wishes to proceed with the Bill thereafter, may move that the Bill be referred to the regional committee or committees concerned.

157D. *Procedure before regional committee.*—When a Bill has been referred to a regional committee, the regional committee shall follow the procedure laid down in Chapter XIXA.

157E. *Procedure after presentation of report.*—(1) After the presentation of the report of a regional committee on a Bill, the member-in-charge may move that the Bill as reported by the regional committee be taken into consideration:

Provided that any member of the Assembly may object to its being taken into consideration if a copy of the report has not been made available for the use of members for seven days and such objection shall prevail, unless the Speaker allows the report to be taken into consideration.

(2) When the member-in-charge moves that the Bill as reported by the regional committee be taken into consideration any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be re-committed to the regional committee.

(3) When a Bill is referred to both the regional committees under Rule 157B and the Bill as reported by one regional committee is different from the Bill as reported by the other regional committee, the Bill may be passed with such variations as may be necessary in its application to the two regions.

157F. *Scope of debate on report of regional committees.*—The debate on a motion that the Bill as reported by the regional com-

mittee be taken into consideration shall be confined to consideration of the report of the regional committee and the matters referred to in that report or any alternative suggestions consistent with the principle of the Bill.

157G. *Restrictions on amendments to the Bill in certain cases.*—A member of the regional committee who signs its report without a minute of dissent shall not move an amendment to the Bill when it is under consideration in the Assembly.”

3. After Rule 171, the following Rule shall be inserted, namely:—

“171A. *Special provisions regarding regional Bills.*—(1) When a Bill as reported by a regional committee is not passed by the Assembly in the form in which it has been reported but is passed in a form which, in the opinion of the Speaker, is substantially different from that as reported by the regional committee, or is rejected by the Assembly, the Speaker shall submit to the Governor—

- (a) in any case where the Bill has been passed by the Assembly in a substantially different form, the Bill as passed by the Assembly together with the Bill as reported by the regional committee;
- (b) in any case where the Bill is rejected by the Assembly, the Bill as reported by the regional committee.

(2) The Governor shall as soon as possible after the submission to him of the Bill, return the Bill to the Assembly with a message recommending either that Bill be withdrawn or that it be passed in the form in which it has been reported by the regional committee or in the form in which it has been passed by the Assembly and the message received from the Governor shall be reported by the Speaker to the Assembly and accordingly, the Bill shall be deemed to have been withdrawn, or as the case may be, be deemed to have been passed by the Assembly in the form recommended by the Governor”.

4. In Part I of the Chapter XVII, after Rule 179, the following Rule shall be inserted, namely:—

“179A. *Special provision regarding regional Bills.*—When a regional Bill as passed or deemed to have been passed by Assembly is received from the Council under Rule 175 with a message that it has not agreed to the Bill or is returned by the Council under Rule 176 with amendments, the Bill shall be referred to the regional committee or committees concerned and the other provisions of the Rules regarding regional Bills shall then, as far as may be apply”.

5. In Part II of Chapter XVII, after Rule 188, the following Rule shall be inserted, namely:—

“188A. *Special provision regarding regional Bills.*—When a regional Bill originating in the Council has been passed by the Council and is transmitted to the Assembly under Rule 180 or when such a Bill as further amended by the Council is received by the Assembly and laid on the Table under sub-rule (1) of Rule 188, the Bill or the amended Bill as the case may be, shall be referred to the regional committee or committees concerned and the other provisions of the Rules regarding regional Bills shall then, as far as may be, apply”.

6. After Chapter XIX, the following new Chapter shall be inserted, namely:—

“CHAPTER XIX-A

Regional Committees

225A. *Chairman and Vice-Chairman.*—A regional committee shall, as soon as may be, elect two members of the committee to be respectively Chairman and Vice-Chairman thereof and, so often as the office of the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman becomes vacant, the regional committee shall elect another member to be Chairman or Vice-Chairman, as the case may be.

225B. *Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.*—(1) The Chairman of a regional committee shall be elected by the members of the regional committee on such date as the Governor may fix for the purpose and the Secretary shall send to every member notice of this date.

(2) At any time before noon on the day preceding the date so fixed, any member may give notice in writing addressed to the Secretary of a motion proposing the name of another member for the office of the Chairman, and the proposal shall be seconded by another member and shall be accompanied by a statement by the member whose name has been proposed that he is willing to serve as Chairman if elected:

Provided that a member shall not propose his own name or second a motion proposing his own name or propose or second more than one motion.

(3) A member in whose name a motion stands on the list of business may, when called, moved the motion or withdraw the motion, and shall confine himself to a mere statement to that effect.

(4) The motions which have been moved and duly seconded shall be put one by one in the order in which they have been moved, and decided, if necessary, by division. If any motion is carried, the person presiding shall, without putting the latter motions, declare elected the member proposed in the motion.

(5) Before the election of a Chairman, the Governor shall appoint a member of the regional committee, who does not intend to contest the election, to preside at the meeting.

(6) The procedure for the election of the Vice-Chairman shall be the same as that in respect of the Chairman except that the date for the election shall be fixed by the Chairman and the Chairman shall preside at the meeting.

225C. Vacation and resignation of, and removal from, the offices of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.—A member holding office as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of a regional committee—

- (a) shall vacate his office if he ceases to be a member of the Assembly;
- (b) may at any time, by writing under his hand addressed, if such member is the Chairman to the Vice-Chairman, and if such member is the Vice-Chairman, to the Chairman, resign his office; and
- (c) may be removed by a resolution of the regional committee passed by a majority of all the then members of the Committee.

225D. Powers of the Vice-Chairman or other person to perform the duties of the office of, or to act as, Chairman.—(1) While the office of Chairman is vacant, the duties of the office shall be performed by the Vice-Chairman, or if the office of the Vice-Chairman is also vacant, by such member of the regional committee as the Governor may appoint for the purpose.

(2) During the absence of the Chairman from any sitting of the regional committee, the Vice-Chairman, or if he is also absent, such other person as may be elected by the regional committee, shall act as Chairman for that meeting.

(3) The Vice-Chairman or any other member competent to preside over a meeting of a regional committee under these rules, shall, when so presiding, have the same powers as the Chairman when so presiding.

225E. Chairman and Vice-Chairman not to preside while a resolution for his removal from office is under consideration.—(1) At any meeting of a regional committee, while any resolution for the removal of the Chairman from his office is under consideration, the Chairman or while any resolution for the removal of the Vice-Chairman from his office is under consideration, the Vice-Chairman, shall not, though he is present, preside, and the provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 225D shall apply in relation to every such meeting as they apply in relation to a meeting from which the Chairman, or as the case may be, the Vice-Chairman, is absent.

(2) In any such case, the Chairman or Vice-Chairman as the case may be, shall be entitled to vote only in the first instance on such resolution but not in the case of any equality of votes.

225F. Quorum.—(1) In order to constitute a meeting of a regional committee, the quorum shall be as near as may be one-third of the total number of members, the fraction, if any, being ignored.

(2) If at any time fixed for any meeting of a regional committee, or if at any time during any such meeting, there is no quorum, the Chairman shall either suspend the meeting until there is a quorum or adjourn the meeting to some future day.

225G. Sitzings of regional committee.—The sittings of a regional committee shall be held in private and within the precincts of the Assembly building on such days and at such time as the Chairman may fix.

225H. Voting.—(1) All questions at any sitting of a regional committee shall be determined by a majority of votes of the members present and voting.

(2) In the case of an equality of votes on any matter, the Chairman or the person acting as such shall have a second or casting vote.

225I. Power to appoint sub-committees.—(1) A regional committee may appoint one or more sub-committees to examine any matters that may be referred to the said sub-committee or sub-committees.

(2) The order of reference to a sub-committee shall clearly state the point or points for investigation. The report of the sub-committee shall be considered by the regional committee.

225J. Power to appoint joint committees.—(1) Where a Bill has been referred to both the regional committees, any regional Committee may desire to obtain the concurrence of the other regional committee in setting up a joint sub-committee of the two regional

committees to consider the Bill. If such a motion is carried in a regional committee, a message shall be sent to the other regional committee for its concurrence in the motion and, in case of its concurrence in the motion, for the nomination of its members to serve on the joint sub-committee in accordance with sub-rule (3).

(2) If the other regional committee does not agree to the motion, there shall be no reference of the Bill to the joint sub-committee.

(3) A joint sub-committee shall consist of the member-in-charge and ten members from each of the regional committees.

(4) The joint sub-committee shall elect a Chairman from among its members.

(5) The report of the joint sub-committee shall be submitted to both the regional committees and considered separately by them.

²
255K. *Report by regional committee.*—(1) As soon as may be after a Bill has been referred to a regional committee, the regional committee shall meet from time to time in accordance with Rule 225G to consider the Bill and shall make a report thereon within the time fixed by the Assembly:

Provided that the Assembly may, at any time on a motion being made, extend the time for the making of the report to a date to be specified in the motion.

(2) The report of a regional committee shall ordinarily be signed by the Chairman on behalf of the committee:

~~Provided~~ Provided that if the Chairman is absent or is not readily available, the report shall be signed by the Vice-Chairman or, in his absence, by any other member specially chosen for the purpose by the regional committee.

(3) Any member of the regional committee may record a minute of dissent on any matter or matters connected with the Bill or dealt with in the report.

(4) A minute of dissent shall be couched in temperate and decorous language and shall not refer to any discussion in the regional committee nor cast aspersions on the committee.

(5) If, in the opinion of the Chairman, a minute of dissent contains words, phrases or expressions which are unparliamentary or otherwise inappropriate, he may order such words, phrases or expressions to be expunged from the minute of dissent.

225L. *Presentation of report.*—(1) The report of a regional committee on a Bill together with minutes of dissent, if any, shall be presented to the Assembly by the Chairman thereof or in his absence, by any member of the regional committee.

(2) In presenting the report, the Chairman or in his absence the member presenting the report shall, if he makes any remarks, confine himself to a brief statement of facts but there shall be no debate at this stage.

225M. *Printing and publication of reports.*—The Secretary shall cause every report of a regional committee together with the minutes of dissent, if any, to be printed and a copy thereof shall be made available for the use of every member of the Assembly.

²
225N. *Power to recommend legislative and executive action.*—A regional committee shall have the power to consider and pass resolutions recommending to the State Government any legislative or executive action with respect to scheduled matters, so however, that, the executive action relates to general questions of policy and the legislative or executive action does not involve any financial commitment other than expenditure of a routine and incidental character.

225O. *Proceedings of regional committee.*—The Rules of Procedure regarding debate and amendments in a regional committee shall be the same as those of the Assembly in these respects.

225P. *Power of regional committee to regulate its procedure and that of its committees.*—A regional committee shall have power to make bye-laws not inconsistent with these Rules, to regulate its own procedure and the procedure of its sub-committees.

²
225Q. *Chapter XX not to apply to regional committees.*—The provisions of Chapter XX relating to the Committees of the Assembly shall not apply to the regional committees".

THE FOURTH SCHEDULE

(See paragraph 9)

The following modifications shall be made in the Rules of Business of the Punjab Government, namely:—

Amendment in Part I of the Rules—

In the Schedule annexed to the Business of the Punjab Government (Allocation) Rules, 1953, as in force on the 31st

August, 1955, under the heading "General Administration" after item 26, the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

- "27. All matters relating to regional committees constituted under paragraph 3 of the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957, including resolutions passed by such committees".

Amendment in Part II of the Rules—

In the Rules of Business of the Government of Punjab, 1953, as in force on the 31st August, 1955—

- (1) In rule 2, after clause (d), the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

"(e) 'regional committee' and 'scheduled matters' shall have the same meanings as in the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957".

- (2) After rule 9, the following rule shall be inserted, namely:—

"9A. The Council shall normally give effect to the recommendations of a regional committee made under paragraph 7 of the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957, in regard to any legislative or executive action with respect to scheduled matters, but if the Council is of the opinion that it would not be expedient to give effect to any such recommendation or that the regional committee was not competent to make any such recommendation, the matter shall be referred by the Chief Minister to the Governor whose decision thereon shall be final and binding on the Council and action shall be taken accordingly".

- (3) In the Schedule, after item 27, the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"28. All matters relating to regional committees including resolutions passed by such committees".

APPENDIX VI

(Vide para 28 of the Report)

SACHAR FORMULA

Proposals on language question in East Punjab

I. There are two spoken languages in the East Punjab namely, Punjabi and Hindi and there are also current two scripts namely, Gurmukhi and Devnagri.

Punjabi shall be the regional language in the Punjabi-speaking area and Hindi shall be the regional language in the Hindi-speaking area. The Provincial Government will determine such areas after expert advice.

Punjabi shall mean Punjabi in the Gurmukhi script and Hindi in the Devnagri script.

II. Punjabi shall be the medium of instruction in Punjabi-speaking area in all schools upto the Matriculation stage, and Hindi shall be taught as a compulsory language from the last class of the Primary Department and upto the Matriculation stage in case of girls in the girls schools in the middle classes only.

There will, however, be cases where the parent or guardian of the pupil may wish him to get instruction in Hindi on the ground that Hindi and not the regional language is his mother tongue. In such cases, without questioning the declaration of a parent or a guardian arrangements will be made for instruction in Hindi during the primary stage, provided there are not less than forty pupils in the whole school wishing to be instructed in Hindi or ten such pupils in each class. Under these arrangements Hindi will be the medium of instruction for the pupils in the primary stage, but the regional language shall be taught as a compulsory language from the fourth class and to girls in girls schools from the 5th class. In the secondary stage also the medium of instruction for these pupils will be Hindi if one-third of the total number of pupils in a Government, Municipal or a District Board school request for instruction in Hindi. Government will also require aided schools to arrange for instruction in Hindi, if desired by one-third of the pupils, provided that there are no adequate facilities for instruction in Hindi in the area. If this

condition of one-third is not satisfied then in order to facilitate the switching over to the regional language as medium in the secondary stage, Hindi speaking pupils will be given the option of answering questions in Hindi for the first two years of the secondary stage. The regional language would, however, be a compulsory subject throughout the secondary stage.

III. Hindi shall be the medium of instruction in Hindi speaking area in all schools upto the matriculation stage, and Punjabi shall be taught as compulsory language from the last class of the Primary Department and upto the matriculation stage and in case of girls in the girls schools in the middle classes only.

There will, however, be cases where the parent or guardian of the pupil may wish him to get instruction in Punjabi on the ground that Punjabi and not the regional language is his mother-tongue. In such cases without questioning the declaration of a parent or a guardian arrangements will be made for instruction in Punjabi during the primary stage, provided there are not less than forty pupils in the whole school wishing to be instructed in Punjabi or ten such pupils in each class. Under these arrangements, Punjabi will be the medium of instruction for the pupils in the primary stage, but the regional language shall be taught as a compulsory language from the fourth class and to girls in girls schools from the 5th class. In the secondary stage also the medium of instruction for these pupils will be Punjabi if one-third of the total number of pupils in a Government, Municipal or a District Board School request for instruction in Punjabi. Government will also require aided schools to arrange for instruction in Punjabi, if desired by one-third of the pupils, provided that there are no adequate facilities for instruction in Punjabi in the area. If this condition of one-third is not satisfied then, in order to facilitate the switching over to the regional language as medium in the secondary stage, Punjabi-speaking pupils will be given the option of answering questions in Punjabi for the first two years of the secondary stage. The regional language would, however, be a compulsory subject throughout the secondary stage.

IV. To meet unforeseen situations arising out of the demand for imparting education in a language other than the regional language, Government may issue further necessary directions.

V. In an unaided recognised school, the medium of instruction will be determined by the management. It will not be obligatory on them to provide facilities for instruction in any other medium but it will be incumbent on them to provide for the teaching of Punjabi or Hindi, as the case may be, as a second language.

VI. English and Urdu will, for the present, continue as official and court languages; these will be replaced progressively by Hindi and Punjabi in the light of the principles laid down in the resolution adopted by the working Committee of the Indian National Congress at its meeting held on 5th August, 1949.

VII. These proposals do not apply to those pupils whose mother-tongue is neither Punjabi nor Hindi. Suitable arrangements will be made for the education of such pupils in their mother-tongue if there is a sufficient number of such pupils at one place to make these arrangements possible.

Sd/- BHIM SEN SACCHAR.

Sd/- GOPI CHAND BHARGAVA.

Sd/- UJJAL SINGH.

Sd/- KARTAR SINGH.

New Delhi,

dated the 1st October, 1949.

APPENDIX VII

(Vide para 28 of the Report)

PEPSU LANGUAGE FORMULA

PEPSU is a bilingual State consisting of two zones known as Hindi-speaking and Punjabi-speaking zones. In the Hindi-speaking zone, Hindi is taught from the very first primary class and Punjabi as second compulsory subject from 3rd primary standard and similarly Punjabi from the 1st primary class and Hindi as second compulsory language from 3rd primary standard in the Punjabi-speaking areas. Hindi is medium of instruction in Hindi zone and Punjabi in Punjabi-speaking zone.

APPENDIX VIII

(Vide para 41 of the Report)

*Study of Statistical data region-wise in Punjab

(Based on the Report of the Haryana Development Committee 1966)

Sr. No.	Item	Hill region	Non-Haryana region	Haryana Region	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Population (in lakhs)	24.29	103.51	75.27	203.07
2	Area (in Sq. miles)	12437	18032	16835	47304
3	Rural population percentage of total population of the region	89.9	75.3	82.8	
4	Urban population percentage of total population of the region	10.1	24.7	17.2	
5	Working population percentage of the total population of the region—				
	(i) Agriculture	29.5	17.5	26.8	
	(ii) Secondary and Tertiary sector	11.5	14.0	10.9	
6	Gross area irrigated as percentage of the total cropped area	17	63	30	
7	Percentage of electrified towns/villages to the total number in the region	19	29	18	
8	Per capita consumption of electricity in the region	9	46	37	
9	Number of registered factories per lakh of population in the region	6	36.5	14.9	
10	Literates as percentage to the population in the region—				
	(i) Total	27.1	26.7	19.8	
	(ii) Female only	14.8	17.6	9.1	

*Submitted to the Committee by Choudhry Ranbir Singh, Minister, Public Works Department, Punjab, on the 22nd February, 1966.

I	2	3	4	5	6
II Region-wise budget allocation (in lakhs rupees) of breakable schemes—					
(i) 1961-66	2145.6	5512.72	4363.33	12021.65	
	(17.8%)	(45.9%)	(36.3%)		
(a) 1963-64	283.82	1104.91	750.23		.96
	(13.3%)	(51.6%)	(35.1%)		
(b) 1964-65	361.49	1110.4	936.73	2408.62	
	(15%)	(46.1%)	(38.9%)		
12 Net area sown (in lakh acres)	12.33	90.05	85.65	188.03	
13 Net irrigated area (in lakh acres)	2.21	51.80	29.89	83.90	
14 Cropped area (in lakh acres)	18.32	113.20	109.33	240.85	
15 Percentage of net area cultivated to the cultivable area	89.45	90.62		
16 Percentage of double cropped area to net sown area	25.70	27.65		
17 Area under food-grains and cash crops (in lakh acres)— (total)	15.80	91.85	98.90		
(i) food-grains	14.78	72.15	86.82		
(ii) Cash crops	1.02	19.70	12.08		
18 Number of agricultural electric connections	18272	9936		
19 Villages and towns electrified	767	3217	1175	5159	
20 Energy sold in lakh K.Ws (1963-64)	216.86	5046.78	3013.13	8276.77	
21 Cooperative credit as on 30-6-64—					
(i) Coop. Credit (in lakh rupees)	288.75	1121.08	460.63	1870.46	
(ii) No. of agricultural workers (in lakhs)	7.16	18.14	20.11	45.41	
(iii) Credit per agricultural worker (in rupees)	40.33	61.80	22.90	41.19	
(iv) Total cropped area (in Lakh acres)	18.32	113.21	109.32	240.85	
(v) Cooperative credit per cropped acre (in rupees)	15.76	9.90	4.21	7.76	

1	2	3	4	5	6
22	Consumption of fertilizer in tons:—				
(i)	1956-57	3197 (10.6%)	19994 (66.3%)	6949 (23.1%)	
(ii)	1963-64	12794	120245	44416	
(iii)	1964-65	20063 (7.1%)	186639 (66.2%)	75320 (26.7%)	
23	Agricultural machinery— (1960-61):				
(i)	Plough	282000	1011424	657008	
(ii)	Tractors	170	4778	2918	
(iii)	Oil Engine Pumps	470	6500	1128	
(iv)	Electric pumps and Tube-wells	1059 (12.1%)	5980 (68.1%)	1735 (19.8%)	
24	Yield per acre of Principal crops (in lbs) (1961-62 and 1963-64)—				
(i)	Paddy	1246	1456	1586	
(ii)	Wheat	194.7	1705.3	1116	
(iii)	Maize	1244	1054	826	
(iv)	Jawar, Bajra and Barley	521	1556	312	
(v)	Gram	633	630	537	
(vi)	Cotton	134	262	253	
(vii)	Sugarcane	2076	2818	3337	
(viii)	Oil Seeds	310	590	534	
25	Comparison of C.C.A. on Bhakra Canals:—				
(i)	1919 Project	..	826.8	2362.1	3188.9
(ii)	1939-42 Project	..	913	2392.8	3305.8
(iii)	1946-Project	..	1423.1	1863.2	3286.3
(iv)	1948-Project	..	2207.8	2733.4	4941.2
26	Power Looms in the Decentralised Sector				
		..	9422	412	9834
27	Metalled roads (mileage) maintained by B. & R. and Local Bodies, per 100 Sq. miles—				
(i)	1950-51	2.8	9.5	7.0	6.8
(ii)	1963-64	5.6	19.5	17.8	15.2
28	Rail Mileage (in miles)—				
(i)	Broad-gauge	60.6	1175.6	433.1	
(ii)	Metre-gauge	..	100.6	348.1	

1	2	3	4	5	6
29	Total number of registered factories	145	3776	1124	5045
30	Number of registered working factories.	121	3425	1032	4578
31	Average number of workers employed in working factories, as on 31-12-1964.	5815	102449	57788	166097
32	Small-scale units registered as on 31-12-1964	747 (4.2%)	12839 (72.5%)	4133 (23.3%)	17719 ..
33	Allocation of Scarce Commodity—				
	(i) Steel black Sheets	64	2152	764	2980
	(ii) Allocation of pig iron. (1964-65) in tons	65	43584	4891	48540
	(iii) Annual allocation of Hard coke for 1964 in wagons	16	2881	725	3622
34	Milch animal population (1961, figure)—				
	(i) Cows	1317	4788	3781	9886
	(ii) Buffaloes	1424	6581	4759	12764
	(iii) Cows per square mile.	11	27	22	21
	(iv) Buffaloes per sq. mile	11	36	28	27
35	Veterinary hospitals (1963-64)	47	166	112	385
36	Outlying dispensaries (1963-64)	43	187	92	322
37	Literacy—				
	(i) Male	485006	1931926	1174245	3591177
	(ii) Female	172804	833489	319926	1326219
38	Educational facilities—				
	(i) School-going children in High Schools.	45467	186459	143933	
	(ii) No. of institutions (High)	242	830	484	
	(iii) Technical Institutions :				
	College—(i) No.	..	3	1	4
	(ii) Seats	..	810	120	930
	Polytechnics :				
	(i) No.	4	8	6	18
	(ii) Seats	390	1410	1015	2815

1	2	3	4	5	6
Industrial training					
	(i) No. . . .	7	25	17	49
	(ii) Seats . . .	2456	9520	7184	19160
39	Civil Hospitals and . . .	29	93	53	175
	Dispensaries	90	245	149	483
	No. of beds	2148	6852	3880	12880

Sd. RANBIR SINGH CHOUDHRY,
Minister, P.W.D.,
Government of Punjab.

APPENDIX IX

(Vide para 53 of the Report)

**State Income Estimates of the Punjab at Current Prices—1961-62*

(Rupees in lacs)

Sectors	Hill Region	Non- Haryana Region	Haryana Region	Punjab State
I	2	3	4	5
1. Agriculture	2,625.91	21,424.92	10,452.03	34,502.86
2. Animal Husbandry	897.24	6,270.16	4,068.82	11,236.22
3. Forestry	318.74	57.49	71.26	447.49
4. Fishery	8.39	10.71	2.90	22.00
5. Mining	7.20	6.69	57.07	70.96
6. Factory Establishments	191.22	2,664.56	1,044.56	3,900.34
7. Small Enterprises	1,136.97	4,731.22	2,980.13	8,848.32
8. Public authorities	1,041.80	3,560.93	2,126.60	6,729.33
9. Other Commerce and Transport	751.90	6,431.60	3,359.25	10,542.75
10. Banking and Insurance	46.85	348.94	121.66	517.45
11. Professions and Liberal Arts]	422.07	2,784.14	1,255.27	4,461.48
12. Home Property	200.34	715.07	381.81	1,297.22
13. Total	7,648.63	49,006.43	25,921.36	82,576.42
14. <i>Per capita</i> Income (in rupees)	310	467	339	401

Note.—Estimates for Ambala and Sangrur districts have been bifurcated into the two regions on population basis.

Source:—Economic and Statistical Organisation,
Punjab.

* Haryana Development Committee (Final Report) 1966, p. 202.

APPENDIX X

(Vide para 69 of the Report)

*Distribution of Population and Density of Population

(In lacs)

Serial No.	District	Population 1961			Area in Sq. Mile	Persons per Sq. Mile
		Rural	Urban	Total		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
HILL REGION						
1	Simla . . .	0.59 (51.9)	0.54 (48.1)	1.13 (0.6)	222	507
2	Kangra . . .	10.19 (95.9)	0.44 (4.1)	10.63 (5.2)	5,283	201
3	Lahaul and Spiti . .	0.20 (100)	0.0 (0.0)	0.20 (0.1)	4,710	4
NON-HARYANA REGION						
4	Jullundur . . .	8.77 (71.5)	3.50 (28.5)	12.27 (6.0)	1,342	915
†5	Hoshiarpur . . .	10.87 (88.1)	1.46 (11.9)	12.33 (6.1)	2,222	555
6	Ludhiana . . .	7.08 (69.2)	3.15 (30.8)	10.23 (5.0)	1,323	773
7	Ferozepore . . .	12.94 (79.9)	3.25 (20.1)	16.19 (8.0)	3,888	416
8	Amritsar . . .	10.71 (79.8)	4.64 (20.2)	15.35 (7.6)	1,926	782
9	Gurdaspur . . .	7.89 (79.8)	1.99 (20.2)	9.88 (4.9)	1,335	740
10	Patiala . . .	7.90 (75.3)	2.59 (24.7)	10.49 (5.2)	1,926	545
11	Bhatinda . . .	8.32 (78.8)	2.23 (21.2)	10.55 (5.2)	2,658	397

*Haryana Development Committee (Final Report) 1966, —Annexure I—page 191.

†According to the First Schedule of the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957 (See Appendix V), Hoshiarpur District is included in the Puniabi Region.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	Kapurthala . . .	2.64 (77.0)	0.79 (23.0)	3.43 (1.7)	643	535
13	Ambala . . .	3.94 (71.4)	1.58 (28.6)	5.52 (2.7)	972	568
14	Sangrur . . .	7.76 (80.8)	1.84 (19.2)	9.60 (4.7)	1,983	484
HARYANA REGION						
15	Hissar . . .	12.99 (84.4)	2.41 (15.6)	15.40 (7.6)	5,363	287
16	Rohtak . . .	12.26 (86.3)	1.94 (13.7)	14.20 (7.0)	2,332	609
17	Gurgaon . . .	10.35 (83.4)	2.06 (16.6)	12.41 (6.1)	2,350	528
18	Karnal . . .	12.35 (82.9)	2.56 (17.1)	14.91 (7.3)	3,075	485
19	Mahendragarh . . .	4.95 (90.3)	0.53 (9.7)	5.48 (2.7)	1,342	408
20	Ambala . . .	5.40 (65.7)	2.82 (34.3)	8.22 (4.0)	1,328	619
21	Sangrur . . .	4.08 (87.7)	0.57 (12.3)	4.65 (2.3)	1,045	445
TOTAL PUNJAB . . .		162.18 (79.9)	40.89 (20.1)	203.07	47,304	429

Notes.—1. Under columns 3 and 4 figures in brackets represent percentages to total population in the District/Region.

2. Under column 5 and 6 figures in brackets represent percentages to Punjab totals.

Source :—Census of India, 1961

'ROUGH'

MAP OF PUNJAB SHOWING HINDI AND PUNJABI REGIONS



HINDI REGION
PUNJABI REGION

Note:

This map shows only the district boundaries of the Hindi and Punjabi Regions as defined in the Punjab Regional Committees Order, 1957, notified by the Ministry of Home Affairs vide their No. S.R.O. 3524 dated the 4th November, 1957. While forwarding this map, the Government of Punjab has stated that it shows only the district boundaries except for the Narwana and Jind Tehsils of Sangrur and Rupar and Kharar tehsils of Ambala which fall in different zones. The Punjab Government have further stated that this is a 'rough' map. (Vide D.O. No. 2244-DDPR-66 dated the 19th/20th January, 1966 from Shri Rajendra Sareen, Deputy Director, Public Relations, Punjab, Chandigarh to Shri M.C. Chawla, Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi).

© 1966 BY THE LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT.

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF
BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (FIFTH EDITION) AND PRINTED BY THE GENERAL
MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI.
