CHAPTER - III

Origin of the idea of Haryana as a Separate State (Up to 1956)

In the preceding chapter, we have discussed the origin of the word 'Haryana', its land and people and have also given a bird's eye view of its historical growth till the achievement of independence by India in 1947.

In this chapter, we are going to trace the origin of the idea of Haryana as a separate state of the Indian Union and its growth till the appointment of States Reorganisation Commission by the Government of India.

The origin of the idea of Haryana as a separate state is shrouded in mystery. However, it is not correct to say that the demand for the formation of Haryana was a recent outcome of the Akali demand for a Punjabi Suba. It is not possible to agree with the view of Satya Mehta who says: The demand for a separate Haryana province is essentially a part of the post-partition political developments in the State. There is no doubt that the people of this region were dissatisfied and had long standing grousse that the non-Haryana Punjabis was the dominant and exploiting element in the trade, commercial and administrative life of their region but they felt it in a greater measure with the penetration of Punjabis displaced persons in every walk of their life in this region. The movement for Haryana Prant was, thus, initiated by the educated and wealthier section of the

Haryana people who foresaw in this new development greater possibilities for themselves. To this end, they gave support to the demand of Punjabi Suba and criticised the Halsa-Punjab slogan, for the hope for a Haryana Prant lay only in the achievement of a Punjab Suba.¹

Although it is true that the demand got momentum with the Akali's demand of a 'Punjabi Suba', the demand itself is much older. In the course of interview, I was given to understand that the idea was mooted out by Swami Satya Nand in 1923 when he was staying at Amrit Dhara Bhawan, Lahore.² He discussed it with Ch. Shadi Ram, an advocate of Sonapati (then a student of Law College, Lahore) and Ch. Suraj Mal, now settled at Hissar and suggested to them to make efforts to have a separate province of Haryana with Delhi as its capital. The matter was discussed at the All India Jat Students Conference held at Meerut in 1924 and presided over by Ch. Chhotu Ram, the then Agriculture Minister of Punjab.³ At that conference, a resolution was unanimously adopted to the effect that the Government of India be requested to create a separate province of Delhi comprising the districts of Ambala division, Agra division, Meerut division and districts of Muradabad, Saharanpur, Bijnore, Pilibhit, Badayun and Bharatpur, Dholpur and Alwar tracts of Rajasthan. In 1926, the Muslim league, while suggesting changes
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3. Interview with Ch. Shadi Ram Advocate, Sonapati on 15.10.78.
4. IMA.
in the then set up of Delhi State declared that the Hindi-speaking region (Ambala Division) should be detached from the Punjab and included in the Delhi State. Similarly, in 1928, the All Parties Conference at Delhi repeated this demand. The same year in the commemoration volume presented to the Commissioner of Delhi Sir J.P. Thompson, the elites of Delhi expressed their wish to form a separate and bigger state by uniting with Delhi the Hindi-speaking region of Punjab.

Lal Desh Bandhu Gupta, the editor of TEB also started the move for the formation of the Prant. He said, "Hindi-speaking region had never been a part of the Punjab. Ever since its inclusion in Punjab, this region had been suffering economically, politically and culturally. It was essential for the development of this region to separate it from Punjab proper and form a new state by uniting with it certain adjoining parts of Delhi, Rajasthan and U.P." 

Indian Statutory Commission

The proposal for the formation of Haryana on the above lines was also put forward at the time of the arrival of the Indian Statutory Commission (Simon Commission) in India. The Punjab legislative Council adopted a resolution in the Budget session of 1928 for constituting a Committee of the Council for the purpose of collaborating with the Indian statutory commission
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during their visit to this province. The committee, known as
The Punjab Reforms Committee, was set up in May, 1928 to present
the case of Punjab for constitutional reforms before this
Commission. The members of this committee were: Mr. Owen Roberts,
Sardar Ujjal Singh, Dewan Bahadur Raja Narender Nath, Dr. Gokal Chand
Narang, Ch. Chhotu Ram, Ch. Zaffarulla Khan and Sardar Sikandar
Hayat Khan. The committee examined the proposal and reported
against the formation of such a province. They were of the
opinion that:

While there may be advantages from the administrative
point of view in reducing the size of the united
provinces, and there may be some justification for
creating a more or less homogeneous Jat Province, to
our mind the proposal has no attraction for the
Punjab or to the Ambala division which it is sought
to sever from the Punjab. In the first place, the
diversity in the tenancy and other provincial and
local laws would present insurmountable difficulties,
as it would be no easy matter to select and propagate
laws and enactments which would be acceptable to all
the various components of the new province. It is most
unlikely that the tenants of the Meerut and Agra Division
would acquiesce in the introduction of the Punjab enactments,
while the Hindu Jats of the Southern Punjab can hardly be
expected to view with equanimity any desire or move to
scrap their cherished laws and privileges.

In the opinion of the Committee, there was yet another and
a stronger objection to the scheme. The Ambala division at that
time, comprised predominantly the Hindu districts and if it was
taken away from the Punjab, it would reduce the present strong
Hindu-minority into a small minority and thus upset the existing
balance between the various communities.—By disturbing
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the existing equilibrium, they should be placing temptations in the way of the community which would have a marked preponderance over others. The committee reported that the Hindus, who are 32 percent of the present total population of the Province will be reduced to 17 percent if the Ambala division is excluded from Punjab. The committee, however, reported that if there was a strong and clearly expressed desire on the part of the majority of the population inhabiting the Agra, Meerut and Ambala division in favour of a separate province, the question will deserve serious consideration for the territories comprised in these divisions have a strong claim for amalgamation on the grounds of linguistic, cultural and historical affinity.

Regarding the merging of Delhi with the new province, the committee were of the opinion that "Delhi, as the capital of India, should remain as at present, a unity by itself unaffected by leanings and prejudices of other provincial units".¹

Sri Ram Sharma is of the opinion that the demand for the formation of Haryana came to the fore with the rise of political consciousness in the nineteen twenties² when Mahatama Gandhi was going to London to attend the second session of the Indian Round Table Conference, a deputation of Haryana leaders met him at Bedil, a small railway station

---
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near Delhi and suggested to him the formation of Haryana as a separate province. He, however, did not attach much importance to this demand as, according to him, the foremost task at that time was to achieve India's independence.

At the Round Table Conference, the unity of Haryana with Punjab was criticised and the Government was requested to put an end to this artificial unity for betterment of both the people of Ambala division and Punjabis.

Indian Round Table Conference

At the second session of the Indian Round Table Conference at London, Sir Geoffrey Corbett presented a scheme for the re-distribution of the province of Punjab to solve the communal problem. He advocated that the Ambala division should be separated from Punjab and joined with Agra and Meerut divisions of U.P. to form a new province. The communal problem in Punjab, according to him, could be summed up as follows:

A. The Muslims, being a majority of the population, claim to have a majority in the legislature. For this, they consider separate electorate to be necessary because their numerical majority is not sufficient to outweigh the greater wealth and influence of other communities, to which the Muslim ryots are stated to be heavily indebted.

B. The sikhs would prefer joint electorate. But if the Muslims have separate electorate, the sikhs claim—
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(i) that Muslim representation by separate electorate must be less than 50 percent of the whole legislature.

(ii) that the Sikhs also must have separate electorate with substantial weightage, as claimed by Muslims in provinces where they are in minority.

(c) The Hindus desire joint electorate, but they are willing to accept any compromise which satisfied the following principles:

(i) There must be no reservation of seats for a majority community which would give it a 'Statutory majority in the legislature'.

(ii) The reservation of seats for a minority community must not be less than its population basis, that is, weightage must not be conceded to other communities at the expense of the minority community.

Regarding the claims by Muslim and Sikh communities, Sir Geoffrey Corbett was of the opinion that though these claims were not unreasonable and may not be abandoned, yet the fact was that in the Punjab, as then constituted, the communities were so distributed that their legitimate claims were irreconcilable. Further, he was of the opinion that "if then a solution is practically impossible in Punjab as now constituted, the logical remedy would be to re-adjust the boundaries of Punjab. It would be unwise and unjustifiable to 'jerrymander' provincial boundaries for communal purposes. There is, however, a demand for a general redistribution of the provinces." To quote chapter IV of the
Nehru Committee Report: 'the present distribution of provinces in India has no rational basis. It is merely due to accident and circumstances attending the growth of the British power in India'. The resultant provinces, though possibly convenient for the British rule, are not necessarily suitable units for responsible Government. Re-distribution should be considered on the following grounds:

- linguistic, ethnical and historical;
- economic, geographical and administrative

Proposing to present this problem of the Punjab province in the light of the report of the Nehru Committee, Sir Geoffrey Corbett said that historically, the Ambala division was a part of Hindustan; its inclusion in the province of the Punjab was an incident of British rule. Its language was Hindustani, not Punjabi; and its people were akin to the people of the adjoining Meerut and Agra divisions of U.P. rather than to the people of Punjab. He added:

Economically, the most important factor in the life of an agricultural people is irrigation. It is administratively desirable that an irrigation system should be controlled by a single provincial Government, otherwise there will inevitably be disputes about the distribution of water, involving perhaps a permanent inter-provincial Irrigation Commission or the intervention of the federal Government. The Ambala Division is not irrigated from the five rivers, but from the Jamuna system, on which the adjoining districts of United Provinces also depend. But the Ambala district and the North-West corner of the Ambala district, which are watered by the Satluj and contain the head-works of the Sirhind Canal, should remain in Punjab.'

Memorandum submitted by Sir Geoffrey Corbett (circulated at the request of M.K. Gandhi) before the Minority Committee of Indian Round Table Conference.
Thus, in any rational scheme for the redistribution of provinces, the Ambala division, less the Sisla district and the North-West corner of Ambala district, would be separated from the Punjab. The undivided United Provinces might also be divided into a Western province of Agra, which would include the Ambala division and an Eastern province of Oudh.1

Sir Geoffery's scheme of the separation of Ambala division from Punjab was strongly opposed by Raja Narender Nath, on the ground that it would reduce the Hindu population of the province of Punjab from 29 percent to 23 percent.2

Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya and Master Tara Singh who were present at the conference also opposed the scheme tooth and nail.3 Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya did not like the idea of detachment of any part of U.P. resulting in the shrinkage of that province. Besides, being a staunch Hindu, he did not like the scheme which aimed at taking away the Hindu population of Ambala division from the Punjab, resulting in an overwhelming Muslim majority in the Punjab at the cost of Hindus and Sikhs.4 Master Tara Singh also opposed the scheme strongly as it was bound to retain a weighty majority of the Muslim population and reduce the importance of the Sikhs.

Thus, the Corbett scheme could not materialise in the teeth of vocal opposition.

The idea was revived with the introduction of the Government of India Act, 1935 and the people of Delhi became

---
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great advocate of the new province based on the Corbett lines. In 1936, a conference to reiterate the demand was held at Hindu College, Delhi, which was presided over by Ch. Chhotu Ram, Pt. Thakur Dass Shargava, the then M.L.A. was the Chairman of the reception committee and Asaf Ali and Desh Bandhu Gupta were the Secretary and Treasurer respectively.¹

After this, the demand suffered a temporary set-back due to the outbreak of second world war and the partition of the country.

In 1946, the Akalis, in their evidence before the Cabinet Mission qualified their opposition to the partition of India by putting forth the proposal that, in the event of India being divided, they would like to have an independent sovereign state of the Sikhs to come into being.² They wanted to separate the areas of West Punjab and Haryana tract from the then united Punjab and get the remaining part as a separate and independent entity. The demand, however, was strongly opposed and condemned by the national leaders as well as by the patriotic and far-sighted Sikhs also.³ After independence, the Sikhs were not satisfied with the new state of East Punjab which had a majority of the Hindus and at their Ludhiana conference, again demanded an ‘autonomous unit’ of the Sikhs in free India. Master Tara Singh said “We have a culture different from the Hindus. Our culture is Guruwachi culture

¹ Interview with Ch. Shadi Ram, Advocate, Sonepat on 15.10.1971
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and our literature is also in Gurummi script. We want to have a province where we can safeguard our culture and traditions". Thus, Master Tara Singh and his Akali party wanted a separate state in which besides Sikh majority, Punjabi would not only be the mother-tongue but official language, also. This, however, was not acceptable to Hindi-speaking people who characterised this demand as purely communal.

The question of the organisation of states on linguistic basis was examined by the Linguistic Provinces Commission, of the constituent Assembly in July-December, 1946. It recommended that no new provinces should be formed for the time being and that the question could be taken up when India has been physically and emotionally integrated, Indian States problem solved, the national sentiment strengthened and other conditions were favourable, on the ground that:

(i) India was burdened with problems more urgent than the problem of redistribution of provinces, such as those of defence, food, refugees, inflation and production;

(ii) It could not afford to add to its anxieties the heat, controversy and bitterness which the demarcation of boundaries and the allotment of capital cities of Bombay and Madras would evolve;

(iii) The economic consequences of splitting up of existing provinces into several new provinces required a great deal of study, preparation and planning; and
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The administrative personnel available at the time was inadequate to bear the additional burden of running new governments.¹

The J.V.P. Committee (consisting of Jawahar Lal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya), appointed by the Congress Party and which submitted its report in April, 1949, also agreed with the above view and did not consider the time opportune for reorganisation of provinces on linguistic basis, because it was likely to:-

(i) divert attention from more vital matters;
(ii) retard the process of consolidation of nations gains;
(iii) dislocate the administrative, economic and financial structure of the country and seriously interfere with the progressive solution of our economic and political difficulties; and
(iv) let loose, while we were still in the formative stage, forces of disruption and disintegration.²

The Committee further added that they were clearly of the opinion that no question of rectification of the boundaries in the provinces of North India should be raised at the present moment whatever the merits of such a proposal might be. Hence, the demand of the sikhs for a sikh Province was shelved for the time being.

However, to resolve the language controversy, the Punjab Government announced its decision to adopt a language formula,

known as "Sachar formula" of which the following were the main points:

(i) Hindi (in Devnagri script) and Punjabi (in Gurmukhi script) are both recognised as the regional languages of the province.

(ii) Punjabi shall be the medium of instruction in Punjabi-speaking area in all schools up to the matriculation stage and Hindi shall be taught as a compulsory language from the last class of the Primary department and up to the matriculation stage and in case of girls in girls schools in the middle class only. Likewise, Hindi shall be the medium of instruction in the Hindi-speaking area in all schools up to matriculation stage and Punjabi shall be taught as a compulsory subject from the last class of the Primary department and up to the matriculation stage, but in the case of girls in girls schools up to the middle class only.

(ii) There will, however, be cases where the parents or guardian of a pupil may wish his/her to get instructions in Hindi in the Punjabi-speaking area and in Punjabi in the Hindi-speaking area on the ground that Hindi/Punjabi and not the regional language is his/her mother-tongue. In such cases, without questioning that declaration of the parents or guardians, arrangement will be made for instructions in Hindi/Punjabi during the primary stage provided there are not less than forty pupils in the whole school wishing to be instructed in Hindi/Punjabi or ten such pupils in each class. However, the regional language shall be taught as a compulsory language from the fourth class in the case of boy’s schools and from the fifth class to girls in girls schools.

1. See Appendix I.
(iv) To meet an unforeseen situation arising out of the demand for imparting education in a medium other than the regional language, the government may issue for 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 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) 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.

For the above purpose, the following areas were to constitute the Hindi-speaking zone—Rohtak, Gurgaon, Karnal and Kangra districts; all the portions of the Hissar district lying in the South of the Ghaggar river; and Jagadhri and Narayangarh Tehsils of Ambala districts. The Punjabi-speaking zone was to consist of Amritsar, Jullundur, Gurdaspur, Ferozepur, Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur districts, all the portions of Hissar district lying to the East of Ferozepur and Patiala side of Ghaggar river and Ruper and Kharar Tehsils of Ambala district.

Simla and Ambala tehsils of Ambala district were to be bi-lingual areas.

2. Ibid.
The "Sashar formula" was widely acclaimed by the sikhs including Akalis, though they criticised the right of the parents to choose the medium of instruction for the education of their children.1 The proposal, however, met with severe criticism at the hands of the Hindu Organisation like the Arya Samaj, Hindu Mahasabha and the Jan Sangh. In order to counter the Akali demand of 'Punjabi Suba' and the claim of 'Punjabi' as the regional language of the Punjabi-speaking area, these organisations and the Hindu vernacular press started a campaign that the Hindus in this area should declare 'Hindi' as their mother-tongue. A meeting of the Headmasters and Principals of Hindu High School was called to oppose the introduction of Punjabi. The Headmasters and Principals of Khalsa High School retorted by calling a meeting on May 23, 1951 and resolved that the rights of 'Punjabi' should be safeguarded and Sashar formula should be implemented.2

The question of the language of the State and the choice of the medium of instruction in the schools may not have been as difficult and complicated an issue as they appeared to be subsequently but for the fact that they got mixed up with the question of the reorganisation of the states. The situation was further complicated by the Hindus of the Punjabi-speaking area who refused to recognise the Punjabi language as their mother-tongue although they spoke Punjabi in their daily life and homes.3 When the census data was being collected in 1951, some

Hindu communalists, including the congressmen among them, ran a campaign in the state to disown Punjabi as their mother-tongue, and record Hindi as their mother-tongue. The situation became so tense that it led to disorder at various places and communal attacks resulting in a law and order problem. On February 10, 1951 an altercation occurred between a section of Hindu and Sikhs in a village in Jullundur district, leading to a disturbance, as a result of which one person was killed. The conditions became such that the Prime Minister had to direct that the language should not be recorded in the census at all.

At the time of the general elections in 1952, most of the political parties in their respective election manifestoes demanded the reorganisation of the states on linguistic basis. The relevant portions of the manifesto of the Akali Dal is as under:

The true test of democracy, in the opinion of the Shiromani Akali Dal, is that the minority should feel that they are really free and equal partners in the destiny of the country. To bring home this sense of freedom to the Sikhs, it is vital that a Punjabi-speaking province be carved out from the different states of the country on the basis of Punjabi language and culture. This will not only be in fulfilment of the pre-partition congress programme and pledges, but also be in entire conformity with the universally recognised principles governing the formation of provinces. The Shiromani Akali Dal is in favour of the formation of provinces on a linguistic and cultural basis throughout India but holds it as a question of life and death for the sikhs that a new Punjab be created immediately.

The Prime Minister, Jawahar Lal Nehru, however, opposed the creation of Punjabi Suba during his speeches when he was on the election tour of the Punjab. Speaking at an election meeting at
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Patiala on January 4, 1952, when a few squatters in the meeting interrupted him during his speech by shouting out the slogan: "Lake Rahenge Punjabi Suba", Nehru declared "I will not allow India to be divided again. I will not allow any further trouble. If there is any trouble in any part of India, I would put it down with all my strength".

Thus the situation had become very complicated. U.M. Trivedi, one of the members of Lok Sabha while presenting the linguistic picture in Punjab in his speech on December 20, 1953, said: "In Gurdaspur, it is shown that 99 percent of the population speaks Punjabi. In the tehsil of Dera Pur, 7 miles from Gurdaspur, they say that 99 percent is Hindi-speaking population. Who is going to swallow such a story?" At the same time, it could not be denied that the demand for the formation of a Punjabi-speaking state had come primarily from a section of one religious community. So we see that the situation in 1951-53 had come to be that the demand for the reorganisation of Punjab had taken a communal turn and the people of Punjab had come to be split into two distinct categories, one supporters of Punjabi Suba, comprising largely Sikhs with a sprinkling of Hindus and the other, the entire Hindu population led by the Arya Samaj and other Hindu organisations.

STATE REORGANISATION COMMISSION AND THE CASE FOR HARYANA

Due to persistent demands from various parts of the country for the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis, on December 22, 1953, the then Prime Minister of India, Jawahar Lal Nehru
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made a statement in Parliament to the effect that a commission
would be appointed 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
units as well as the nation as a whole is promoted. This
was followed by the appointment of this commission under the
Resolution of the Government of India in the Ministry of
Home Affairs, No.53/69/53-Public, dated December 29, 1953
(Appendix-A).

Generally, the demand for the reorganisation of States
is equated with the demand for the formation of linguistic
provinces. This is because the movement for redistribution of
British Indian Provinces was, in a large measure, a direct
outcome of the phenomenal development of regional languages
in the nineteenth century which led to an emotional integration
of different language groups and the development amongst them
of a consciousness of being distinct cultural units. The authors
of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, 1918 however, approached
the problem with greater objectivity. They examined the suggestion
for the formation, within the existing provinces, of sub-provinces
on a linguistic and racial basis, with a view mainly to providing
suitable units for experiments in responsible government. Although
they rejected the idea as impracticable, they commended the
objective of smaller and more homogeneous units. They observed;

We cannot doubt that the business of government would be
simplified if administrative units were both smaller and
more homogeneous; and when we bear in mind the prospect
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of immense burdens of government in India being transferred to comparatively inexperienced hands, such considerations acquire additional weight. It is also a strong argument in favour of linguistic or racial units of government that by making it possible to conduct the business of legislation in the vernacular, they would contribute to draw into the arena of public affairs men who were not acquainted with English.

A few years later, the Indian Statutory Commission (Simon Commission) while considering the question of redistribution of provinces, however, gave only qualified support to the linguistic principle when it stated that "If those who speak the same language form a compact and self-contained area, so situated and endowed 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. But it is not the only test——race, religion, economic interest, geographical continuity, a due balance between country and town and between coast line and interior, may all be relevant factors". The view of the Indian Statutory Commission was supported by O'Donnell Committee, which was appointed in September, 1931 to examine and report on the administrative, financial and other consequences of setting up a separate administration for the Oriya-speaking peoples and to make recommendations regarding its boundaries in the event of its separation.

The Stand taken by the Indian National Congress

The Indian National Congress lent indirect support to the linguistic principle as early as 1905 when it backed the

demand for annuling the partition of Bengal which had resulted in the division of the Bengali-speaking people into two units. However, it was at its 1920 session at Nagpur that the Congress accepted the linguistic redistribution of provinces as a clear political objective and in the following year the principle was adopted for the purposes of its own organisation.\(^3\)

In 1927, when the Indian Statutory Commission was appointed, the Congress adopted a resolution expressing the opinion that "the time has come for the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis",\(^2\) and the principle was also favoured by the Nehru Committee of All Parties Conference, 1928 which stated:

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.\(^3\)

It, however, recommended that the redistribution of provinces should take place on the basis of the wishes of the population, language, geographical and economic principles. Of all these factors, however, in the opinion of the committee "the main considerations must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned".

2. Ibid.
Between the years 1928 and 1947, the Congress reaffirmed its adherence to the linguistic principle on three occasions. At its Calcutta session held in October 1937, it reiterated its policy regarding linguistic provinces and recommended the formation of the Andhra and Karnataka provinces. By a resolution passed at Wardha in July 1938, the working committee gave an assurance to deputations from Andhra, Karnataka and Kerala that linguistic redistribution of the provinces would be undertaken as soon as the Congress had power to do so; and

In its election manifesto of 1945-46, the Congress repeated the view that administrative units should be constituted on a linguistic and cultural basis. In their manifesto, "They assured the people of this vast subcontinent that the culture, language and script of the different linguistic areas in India shall be protected and guaranteed the freedom of different territorial areas within the nation to develop their own life and culture within the larger framework and declared for this purpose that such territorial areas and provinces should be constituted as far as possible on linguistic and cultural basis."

There was, however, a clear change in the outlook of the Congress leaders with the achievement of independence. Speaking before the Constituent Assembly on November 27, 1947, soon after partition, the Prime Minister, while conceding the linguistic principle, remarked "first things must come first and the first thing is the security and stability of India." This was followed
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by the appointment, on the recommendation of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly, of a linguistic provinces commission, known as the 'Dar Commission' under the Chairmanship of S.K.Dar, a retired judge of the Allahabad High Court. The Commission recommended the postponement of the consideration of this question on the plea that a reorganisation of the States mainly on linguistic consideration was not in the larger interests of the Indian nation under prevailing circumstances. Among many other factors which should be given due weight, the Commission mentioned history, geography, economy and culture. The Commission listed certain generally recognised tests which a linguistic area must satisfy before it could be formed into a province. These were:

(i) geographic contiguity and absence of pockets and corridors;
(ii) administrative convenience;
(iii) financial self-sufficiency;
(iv) capacity for future development; and
(v) a large measure of agreement within its borders and amongst the people speaking the same language in regard to its formation, care being taken that the new province should not be forced by a majority upon a substantial minority of people speaking the same language.

In 1948, a committee was appointed by the Indian National Congress at its Jaipur Session, to consider the question of
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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. This committee known as the J.V.P. Committee (consisting of Jawahar Lal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhai Patel and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya) was the first Congress body to sound a note of warning against the linguistic principle when 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. This committee also suggested a postponement of the redistribution of the provinces on linguistic basis under the plea— that such a step would cause serious administrative dislocation and
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political and economic instability. The Committee made a special reference to the problem of States Reorganisation of the Northern areas and categorically expressed itself against any such “rectification of the boundaries------in the immediate future”.¹

By then the latest Congress stand on the subject as announced at the Hyderabad session in January 1953 and reiterated in the Working Committee resolution adopted in May 1953, and further reaffirmed at Kalyani in January 1954, was that in considering the reorganisation of states all relevant factors should be borne in mind, such as the unity of India, national security and defence, cultural and linguistic affinities, administrative convenience, financial consideration and economic progress both of the States and the nation as a whole.² However, this change of attitude on the part of the Congress did not slow down the pace with which the demand for linguistic states was gaining momentum. Forced by 93 days' fast of P.Sriramulu and his death, the Government of India had to concede the demand for Andhara and finally decided to appoint a high-powered commission to consider the question of the reorganisation of the States.

On the basis of the announcement made by the Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in the House of people on December 22, 1953, a commission was set up by the Government of India to enquire and report on the reorganisation of the States. It consisted of Syed Fazal Ali, the then Governor of Orissa, as Chairman;

Friday Nath Kunaru, then a member of the Council of State; and K. N. Panditkar, the then Ambassador of India in Egypt. The Commission were asked to make recommendations to the Government of India not later than June 30, 1955. This date, however, was subsequently extended to September 30, 1955.

Jawaharlal Nehru, while commenting on the reorganisation of States on linguistic basis said:

The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind.

The first essential condition is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Financial, economic and administrative consideration are equally important, not only from the point of view of each State but for the whole nation.

India has embarked upon a great ordered plan for her economic, cultural and moral progress. Changes which interfere with the successful prosecution of such a national plan would be harmful to the national interest.

According to their terms of reference, the Commission were at liberty to devise their own procedure for collecting information and for ascertaining public opinion. After giving careful thought to the procedure to be followed, the Commission issued a Press Note on February 23, 1955 inviting written memoranda from members of the public as well as public association interested in the reorganisation of the States. It was announced in this press note that all memoranda should reach the Commission by April 24, 1955. However, the Commission did not adhere to this date and continued receiving communications ranging from simple telegrams...

indicating the wishes of particular localities to well-
considered memoranda dealing with the problem as a whole
almost to the very end of their task. The total number of
such documents received by the Commission was 1,52,250.
Besides, the Commission interviewed a large number of people
(over nine thousand). These interviews were held in private
to enable the persons interviewed to express their views freely
and frankly. The Commission toured the entire country, visiting
104 places and travelling over thirty eight thousand miles.

Commission’s findings (Basis of the organisation)

Regarding the reorganisation of States, the Commission’s
findings in general, were:

(1) The present structure of the States of the Indian Union
has been largely determined by the accidents and circumstances
attending the expansion of British rule in India.

(ii) The formation of British Indian provinces in the 18th
and 19th centuries was governed by considerations of administrative
convenience and economy and reasons of military strategy and
security. With the emergence of nationalism towards the end of
the 19th century, the policy of balance and counterpoise began
to over-ride purely administrative consideration in making
territorial changes.

(iii) At the time of their integration, the former princely
states were in different stages of development. Some territorial
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expedients had therefore, to be adopted to fit these units into the constitutional structure of India which added to the disparities already existing between British Indian Provinces. These disparities led to the classification of the States of the Indian Union into three categories, namely Part A, Part B and Part C States.

4. The British gave only qualified support to the linguistic principle in making territorial adjustments between administrative units.

5. The Indian National Congress accepted in 1920 the linguistic redistribution of provinces as a political objective. During recent years, however, there has been a growing recognition of the need to balance the linguistic principle with other factors such as national unity, administrative, economic and other considerations.

6. Andhra was formed by the separation of Telugu-speaking districts of Madras, but in determining the boundaries of even this State, factors like cultural affinity, administrative convenience and economic well-being were considered along with language.

7. In the interest of national unity, it is necessary that the administrative and political structure of the country should be based on the primacy of the nation.

The administrative set up in strategic areas should be determined primarily by considerations of national security. When border areas are not under the direct control of the centre, it would be safer to have relatively large and resourceful States.
It is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of a single test of language and culture; a balanced approach which takes all relevant factors—financial viability, wishes of the people, geographical contiguity, unity and security of the nation—into account is necessary.

Finally, the Commission were of the opinion that the problems of reorganisation vary from region to region. It has to be kept in mind that the interplay for centuries of historical, linguistic, geographical, economic and other factors has produced peculiar patterns in different regions. Each case, therefore, has its own background. Besides, the problems of reorganisation are so complex that it would be unrealistic to determine any case by a single test alone. Conclusions have to be reached after taking into consideration the totality of circumstances in each case.

The Case for Haryana Prant

The demand for a Punjabi-speaking Province and the appointment of States Reorganisation Commission gave an impetus to the movement for the formation of Haryana as a separate state. In its memorandum submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission, the Akali Party recommended that Punjab should be divided into three regions on language basis, as under:
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(a) **Punjabi-speaking region:** (Punjab) Gurdaspur, Amritsar, Faridpur, Ludhiana, Jullundur, Hoshiarpur, Ambala, Karnal (except Panipat tehsil), Hissar(Sirsa, Fatehbad and Thana Tohana) districts.

(Pepsi) Patiala, Barnala, Bhatinda, Kapurthala, Fategarh Sahib, Sangrur (except Jind and Narwana tehsil) districts.

(b) **Hindi-speaking region:** (Punjab) Rohtak, Gurgaon, Hissar (except Sirsa, Fatehbad and Thana Tohana) districts and Panipat tehsil of Karnal district.

(Pepsi) Mahendergarh district and parts of Jind and Narwana.

(c) **Himachal Pradesh:** President Himachal, Kandaghat district of pepsi and Simal and Kangra districts of Punjab.

Such a division, the Akali Dal asserted, would demarcate the territory in three compact geographical contiguous areas and it would bring about the desired change of uniting the people on linguistic and cultural basis and would render administration easier and more efficient.

The Jan Sangh, Hindu Maha Sabha and the Arya Samaj criticised the demand for a Punjabi Suba as a purely communal demand camouflaged as a demand for linguistic States and advocated the formation of 'MAHI PUNJAB', comprising of the Punjab, Pepsi Himachal Pradesh, Delhi and a few districts of western U.P. which would be more suitable in the changed political situation of the State after the partition of 1947.\(^1\) The consideration of unity and security of India must outweigh all other considerations, they argued. It was necessary therefore, that the western frontier along with "aggressive and hostile" Pakistan should be properly

\(^1\) Mehta, Satya; *Partition of Punjab*, pp.483-87.
safeguarded. The strategic geographical position of Punjab, in their opinion, demanded that it should be strong enough to face the challenge. "Statesmanship and practical needs of administration then demand that this truncated Punjab be consolidated, enlarged and reinforced by the integration of all these princely States dotted over it as islands to form "Maha Punjab" having a unified and uniform administration. ¹ The Akalis demand for a Punjabi Suba was described by them as analogous to the Muslim league demand for division of the country, in prepartition days. ² It was being supported by the Communist party to weaken the frontier region of India; ³ they asserted. The Congress Party also supported the demand for the enlarged Punjab. Ch. Lehri Singh, the then Irrigation and Power Minister of Punjab, while speaking at a public meeting at Badaur, criticised the demand for the formation of separate Haryana Prant and described it as "hasty, ill-thought out and ill-conceived." ⁵ He added that those who demanded separate Haryana Prant or Punjabi Suba were actually acting upon the footprints of M.A. Jinnah: The events of 1947 should be a lesson for those who wanted further partition of Punjab, he asserted. The Punjab Government in its memorandum submitted to States Reorganisation Commission also advocated the formation of a greater Punjab comprising the Punjab, Pepsu,

¹ Memorandum submitted by Jan Sangh to States Reorganisation Commission, Ambala Cantt, Joshi Printing Press.
² Nehta, Satya; Partition of the Punjab, P.498.
³ Imit.
⁴ Imit. P.499.
⁵ The Tribune, Ambala, June 24, 1954.
Himachal Pradesh, Delhi and a few districts of U.P. They maintained that the considerations of unity and security of India must outweigh all other considerations.

The States Reorganisation Commission was confronted with a large number of memorandums given by the people of Haryana region for the formation of Haryana as a separate state. They alleged that they had been discriminated against by the more advanced Punjabees in all the fields of education, administration, politics, trade and commerce. Speaking in Lok Sabha on December 23, 1955 Pt. Thakur Dass Bhargava gave figures from various departments, ministries, Parliament and State legislature to prove that Haryana region had only 5.5 percent representation.

19 members of Punjab legislature and two members of Parliament representing the Ambala division, in a memorandum submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission, urged the formation of a new State, comprising the Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab, Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh, Delhi State, Meerut and Agra division of U.P. and the contiguous part of Nataya Union and Bikana, with Delhi as the capital. The new state,

2. I contracted the Home Ministry for getting those memorandums but they refused to show them to me as they were in their "Secret department" and they had instructions not to show these to anybody whatsoever he may be.
3. Thakur Dass Bhargava, an advocate at Hisar, was President of Harijan Sewak Sangh, Hisar; M.L.A.(Central) 1928-30 and 1945-47-50; Member Provisional Parliament 1950-52 and first and second Lok Sabha; Secretary Congress Party in Parliament and a member of the Panel of Chairman in the first and second Lok Sabha.
the memorandum said, will have an approximate area between 30,000 and 40,000 square miles with a population of about 2 crores.

One such memorandum was given by the Delhi Administration also. The Chairman of the committee which presented this demand was Shri Nuruddin Ahmed. The other members were Gajraj Singh, MLA, Gurgaon; Mr Mushtaq Ahmed, MLA, Delhi; Indhvir Singh, MLA, Delhi and Daljit Singh, MLA, Delhi. This memorandum made it clear that Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab have got no similarities whatsoever with the State and differed in language and culture. Hence a separate state should be formed by uniting it with Delhi State and the adjoining parts of UP and Rajasthan.

The Communist Party

The Communist Party, in its memorandum to States Reorganisatic Commission, also supported the formation of Haryana which was in line with their All India Policy of re-organisation of the Indian territory on linguistic basis. They argued that such areas as Gurgaon, Rohtak and Karnal were joined with Punjab, as a punishment for their taking active part in 1857 struggle, though they were predominantly Hindi-speaking areas. The party recommended that Pepsu State should be dissolved and merged in the Punjab but the Hindi-speaking areas of the Punjab and Pepsu should be made into a separate Hindi-speaking state Haryana. The Punjab Government had itself, they argued, admitted the bilingual

1. Delhi Government's Memorandum submitted to States Reorganisation Commission on the formation of Hidjab

Delhi Prant.
character of the state by introducing "Sachar formula". Their memorandum categorically declared that their approach was basically different from that of the Akali party, for it was put forward as a common demand of all Punjabis and was based on the rational principle of linguistic homogeneity. The Akali approach, on the other hand, was entirely communal. Similarly, they criticised the slogan of the "Maha Punjab" as there was no cultural, economic or historical justification for lumping all this territory together into one State. 1

THE PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY

The Praja Socialist Party, in its memorandum submitted to States Reorganisation Commission, advocated the creation of three states:

(i) **Pahari State** comprising Pahari-speaking areas of the Punjab, Pepsu and certain districts of U.P.

(ii) **Greater Delhi or Haryana State** comprising Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab, Pepsu and certain districts of Agra and Meerut division of U.P.

(iii) **Punjabi** comprising of the contiguous Punjabi-speaking area of the Punjab and Pepsu.

The memorandum, with a view to countering fissiparous and separatist tendencies and affecting better administrative coordination and economy, recommended a common Governor, a common High Court, a common Public Service Commission and interchangeable

service for all the three states of this region! Jai Parkash Narayal
warned all the parties concerned against the suppression of the
language question. "This way lies danger to national unity. Let us
not invest this natural desire with the epithets of parochialism
or treat it as a crime against the nation. The present exagge-
ration and aberrations of linguism would not have appeared had
we frankly accepted the linguistic case and proceeded fairly and
squarely to meet it," he said.

On April 3, 1955, the All India Linguistic States Conference
was held at Ambala. Ch. Randhir Singh (PSP) started his speech with
the slogan, 'Punjabi Suba Ban Ke Rahega'; 'Haryana Prant Ban Ke
Rahega' and 'Himachal Ban Ke Rahega'? He said that the distribution
of states on linguistic basis was the fundamental right of the
people and added that if our demand was not met through appeals
and by filling the jails of the Government by Gandhian weapons
of satyagraha and by filling the jails of the Government to have
it accepted. All this conference, a resolution was passed which
urged the Government of India to announce unequivocally that
homogeneous linguistic states would be formed by the end of this
year. The resolution further said that the Government of India
should disintegrate PEPSU with a view to (1) regrouping the
Punjabi-speaking areas of the Punjab, Peepsu and Rajasthan to
constitute a Punjabi-speaking state; (ii) regrouping of Hindu-
speaking areas of Peepsu, Punjab, Western, U.P. and Delhi State to

2. Janta, 11:3 (February 12, 1956).
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constitute Haryana Prant; and (iii) merging the Pahari-speaking areas of Punjab and Pepsu with the Pahari-speaking areas of U.P. and Himachal Pradesh to form a Himachal State.¹

On August 7, 1955, a Haryana Prant Conference was convened at Sonepat. Sri Ram Sharma, an ex-Minister of Punjab and a great champion of the demand for the formation of Haryana, along with others, issued an appeal through a poster to attend the conference to urge the demand of Haryana Prant as a separate state. The conference held at Sonepat was presided over by Dr. H.M. Jessoria,² and was attended among others by S. Dhan Singh Burewala and Gian Karter Singh, M.L.C. (leader of the Pepsu Assembly United Front). It demanded the carving out of a new state consisting of the Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab, Pepsu Western UP, Rajasthan and Delhi State.² At the conference, a resolution was passed reiterating that any set up linking the Haryana population with the Punjabi-speaking people would be detrimental to the well-being and progress of the long neglected and backward people of this track.³

The States Reorganisation Commission in its report, however, rejected the demand for the formation of Haryana as a separate state with the following observations:

(1) The complaint from this area is one of inadequate representation in the Civil administration of the State and relative economic

backwardness. The Punjab Government placed before us some facts and figures in repudiation of the allegation of discriminatory treatment of this region. It has been argued that schemes have recently been formulated or implemented for extending the irrigation system of Gurgaon Canal Project now under consideration is a major project intended to benefit Haryana. The Bhakra-Nangal project will materially benefit this area and the contention that the original plan has been varied to the disadvantage of the area has no basis in fact.¹

(ii) The separation of Haryana areas of Punjab which are deficit areas will be no remedy for any ills, real or imaginary from which this area at present suffers.²

As regards Alwar and Bharatpur, the commission held that there had been no appreciable change in the state of opinion since the Shankar Rao Des Committee went into the question in 1949, which may justify the disturbance of the status-quo.³ They further opine that the separation of 16 district of western U.P. as proposed by the protagonists of Vishal Haryana was bound to lead to the disintegration of administration besides creating financial difficulties for one or more units. They observed that a vast majority of the people were likely to view with great disfavour and concern the partitioning of the state which had remained a unit by itself for a long period.

After considering all the important proposals regarding the future of Punjab-Punjab Suba, Haryana, Maha Punjab, Pepsu etc., th
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Commission recommended "the merger of existing state of Punjab (except the Loharu sub- tehsil of Hissar district), Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh in a single integrated unit",¹ as the most satisfactory solution. It reported that there was no real language problem in the State of Punjab, for Punjabi and Hindi as spoken in that state are not only akin to one another but are also well understood by all Punjabis.

**Reactions to States Reorganisation Commission Report.**

The report of the States Reorganisation Commission had a mixed reaction. Although the report was approved by the Punjab Pradesh Congress at Amritsar,² the Chief Minister of Punjab, Bhim Sain Sachar, failed to persuade State Congress Legislators to be unanimous in their approach to the States Reorganisation Commission proposals regarding Punjab³ while some members wanted the exclusion of Himachal Pradesh from the proposed enlarged state, those representing Haryana area were critical of the rejection of their demand for a separate state. Prof. Sher Singh asserted that nearly 90 percent of the people of Haryana Prant were of the opinion that they should have no connection whatsoever with the Punjab and wanted that they should be "linked with the area, with the people of which they have everything in common, tongue (language), dress, habits, customs (and) with whom they were united before the Great Revolt of 1857, to form a separate

---

Pt. Sri Ram Sharma also reiterated the demand for the formation of Haryana Prant and pointed out that the Hindu Urban exploiting class of Jullundur division wanted to sabotage the movement for a separate Haryana State. He ridiculed the concern shown by the supporters of the 'Maha Punjab' by saying "If you are so much obsessed with the idea of defence, why do not you change India into one unit—(If you want) that there should be one unit near the border, then merge Rajasthan also and let this state extend to the sea." He told the Akali leader, Master Tara Singh, that the merger of any portion of Haryana Prant with any other state would be highly resented by the people of Haryana.

Speaking in the Punjab Legislative Council on 26th November, 1966, Mr. Sohan Singh Josh (Communist) said that the only solution which would satisfy the people of this region would be the readjustment of the boundaries of the State on democratic principles. Pleading for the rights of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh people Mr. Josh said that those areas could not be merged forcibly with the Punjab. "Such solution will not be lasting," he said Ch. Ahib Ram (Congress) said that the people

of Haryana continued to be exploited and neglected and were not in favour of remaining in the new state of Punjab.¹

Speaking in Lok Sabha on the S.R.C. (States Reorganisation Commission) report, Bahadur Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana-Reserved Scheduled Castes) said that "as far as Northern India is concerned, the recommendations of the Commission are totally incorrect, contradictory and unconvincing".² The people demanded a Punjabi-speaking state, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh, but the Commission has recommended the formation of a 'Maha Punjab' with the integration of the Punjab, Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh. He said:

At page 25, paragraph 93 of the report, certain principles are laid down for the guidance of the Commission in the reorganisation of states. The first is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Then comes the linguistic and cultural homogeneity. Then comes the linguistic and cultural homogeneity. Then come the financial, economic and administrative considerations. Lastly comes the successful working of a national plan.

I most humbly submit that as far as northern India is concerned, not a single principle out of these four has been adhered to. So far as the preservation of the unity and security of India is concerned, by recommending the Greater Punjab the Commission has not done any service to the country and to the people of that province because security depends on the unity of the people who live there and it also depends on the contentment, happiness and satisfaction of the people who live in that area. As far as the formation of the Greater Punjab is concerned, the people of Himachal Pradesh, Haryana and a substantial population of the Punjab are not in favour and have rejected it. I do not know how the Commission thinks that the integration of all these parts will strengthen the security of the country. They are unwilling partners and the Commission has tried to tag them together against the wishes and sentiments of the people of these different areas.

1. The Times of India, Bombay, November 25, 1955.
He further said "I must say that the people of these different states do not want to unite; they want to have separate state on the basis of cultural and linguistic homogeneity. It is not incorrect to say that the people of Haryana have got a distinct culture". To prove that, he said "In the Punjab legislative Assembly a member, Devi Lal, started speaking on this report in the language of the Haryana people. Most of the members there could not understand and even the Speaker could not understand. They suggested to him to speak in a language which they could understand. He said "this is my expression; people in that area speak this language; it establishes that the people of Haryana have got a distinct culture and language". Moreover there are financial and economic considerations and consideration of the successful working of the plan. He wondered why the commission had skipped over these.

He added that Himachal Pradesh was backward and Haryana also was backward. People of Haryana fought against British in 1857 and the British imperialists just to give them punishment tagged them on to the Punjab where they were in a minority. The people of Jullundur division had always been exploiting them and their progress had always been impeded by the commercial class - the urban people, who lived in Jullundur division. Haryana is backward and Punjab itself is depending on the centre for aid. I do not understand when these deficit areas are attached to a little progressive area, how the economic or the financial position of the area is going to be improved. Let us assume that the centre will give aid to the Punjab. That aid will not be spent for the development of that area. I do not understand the
principle which the commission has taken into account while proposing the formation of a Greater Punjab. Thus, I say that unilingual states should be formed in the North also.

Criticising the recommendation of State Reorganisation Commission regarding Punjab, Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta-south-east) said that "the claim for a linguistic state is not a claim for a separate existence outside India but one for a state in which the people speaking a particular language will have the opportunity of carrying on the work of administration in their own language and to receive education up to the highest stage through the medium of that language. This can never happen unless states are constituted on a linguistic basis."¹

Regarding Punjab, he asserted that: The people of the Hindi-speaking areas of Pepsu as well as Haryana areas of Punjab do not wish to remain in Pepsu or the Punjab and to join the adjoining Hindi-speaking people in a common state. Therefore, there is no other alternative left than to reorganise the Punjab and Pepsu by merging them on a linguistic basis. The fact that a section of the people of Punjab does not wish such a reorganisation cannot justify any compulsion on the people of the Haryana area and of the Hindi speaking areas of Pepsu to remain with the Punjab."²

Some other reactions:

Executive Committee of the Punjab Pardesh Congress Committee.
The proposal regarding the formation of a new Punjab State are welcome.³
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Working Committee of Punjab, Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh
Jan Sangh.

The recommendation for the formation of the new Punjab is welcome.¹

All parties Schedule Castes convention, Jullundur.
The proposal for the merger of Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh, with Punjab is welcome.²

Maha-Punjab Sambh.
The proposed merger of Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh with Punjab is welcome.³

Convention of Shrimandir Akali Dal.
The "just and reasonable" demand for a Punjabi speaking state has been callously rejected by the commission which has gone out of the way to create a Maha Punjab. The formation of a Punjabi-speaking state is essential, as the dominant group in Punjab is aggressively hostile to Sikh community and no safeguards could be sufficient for the latter. The demand of the people of Himachal Pradesh and Haryana should also be met.⁴

Executive of the Punjab Hindu Maha Sabha.
The proposed merger of Himachal Pradesh and Pepsu with Punjab is to be welcomed.⁵

1. The Statesman, New Delhi, October 18,1955.
4. The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, October 17,1955.
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Haryana Prant Convention.

The rejection of the demand for Haryana Prant (Greater Delhi) by the Commission is deplorable.¹

The 'Naya Zamana' (Urdu).

The Commission has excluded the communist party's demand for the creation of a linguistic state in the Punjab and has refused to recognise Punjabi as a distinct language and accept it as a basis for a Punjabi-speaking state. The proposal to merge Punjab, Pepsu and Himachal Pradesh will help in administrative matters, but in this, the Commission has adopted a communal line and has thus further complicated the communal situation in the Punjab.²

The Payam-e-Watan (Urdu).

The rejection of the demand for a Punjabi Suba would strengthen the foundation of secularism.³

The recommendations that Himachal Pradesh should be merged with Punjab, that there should be no separate Haryana Prant and that certain Government Offices should be located in Patiala are commendable.

The proposal to unite Punjab, PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh into one unit is good.

The merger of PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh with Punjab is welcome.

The proposal for the new Punjab is to be supported, as in view of its strategic situation, it is not desirable to have a small state on the border.

The Commission has not acted with justice. From the viewpoint of the Sikhs, there could be no other report worse than this.

The security of India does not allow a chain of small states along its strategic borders and hence the proposal regarding Punjab is good.
The Akalis alleged that it was a conspiracy to destroy the Sikh nation and that the States Reorganisation Commission had delivered "Sikhs bound hand and foot to the slavery of of an aggressively communal group". On 11th October, 1955, Tara Singh declared at 'Manji Sahib' that they had already announced their no-confidence in the Commission and, there, they were not bound by its recommendations. Giani Kartar Singh said that out of 14 recognised languages in the Indian Constitution, 13 states had been formed on linguistic basis. Only Punjabi Suba had not been formed on linguistic basis. Only Punjabi Suba had not been formed because Sikh loyalty was suspected. Even the Congress sikhs in a convention on November 5, disapproved of the States Reorganisation Commission report on Punjab and stated that justice had not been done to the minority community. The report met with severe criticism at the hands of the Sikh legislators, both Akalis and non-Akalies. Bhai Jodh Singh speaking on the subject said that if Punjabi suba had been formed, the communal parties would have vanished and the parties would have been formed on political rather than communal basis.

A five member Akali delegation, headed by Master Tara Singh, met the Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru, Maulana Azad and Pandit C.B.Pant on November 23, 1955 to represent their point of view. As a result of the negotiations a compromise formula known

as the "Regional formula" was evolved.

In the Punjab Legislative Assembly, M.L.As from Haryana, Sri Chand, Sri Ram Sharma, Prof. Sher Singh and others reiterated their demand for a separate Hindi-speaking State known as "Haryana Prant". Differences in the Congress Party over the future pattern of Punjab came to surface when Punjab Vidhan Sabha resumed discussion on the recommendation on States Reorganisation Commission. Congress and Opposition members from Haryana took a united stand in demanding the formation of Haryana Prant.

Pt. Sri Ram Sharma, a former minister of Punjab, strongly denounced the commissions recommendations and said that an average person in the state was surprised as to why the Punjab was not being organised on a linguistic basis. He asserted that a vast majority of the people of Haryana were against the proposed Greater Punjab. He thought that the formation of Naha Punjab would mean nothing else than playing into the hands of urban Hindus of Punjab. At a one-day political conference held at V. Mahouti (Tehsil Panipat) in the first week of January, 1955 and presided over by Pt. Sri Ram Sharma the demand for the formation of Haryana Prant, comprising Delhi, Western U.P. and Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab, Pepsu and Rajasthan was reiterated.

The conference protested against what it described as the stepmotherly treatment being meted out to the people of Haryana in services and the administration. The conference criticised the language policy of the Punjab Government and asked the latter

not to thrust Punjabi on the inhabitants of this area. The money spent by the government in Haryana areas for development schemes was insignificant as compared with the amount spent in Jullundur division.

Speaking in Lok Sabha on States Reorganisation Commission Report, G.L. Bansal (Congress) said that he himself had been toying with the idea of a Haryana Prant. But unless some neighbouring areas like the former states of Bharatpur and Alwar and some other areas were tagged to it, Haryana Prant would not be a viable unit. Mr. Bansal said that it was the people of Haryana who had suffered most under successive Punjab Governments.

Financial and economic considerations have always been regarded as relevant to any scheme of redistribution of territories. The term "viable" is generally understood to mean "capable of living or existing or developing". Translated into financial terms, it would imply that a State should have adequate financial resources to maintain itself and to develop its economy. In other words, financial viability has two aspects: the short-term aspect is the ability of the state to balance its budget over a period of time, not necessarily within each financial year; the long-term aspect is the capacity of the state to increase its economic resources in such a way that it is possible for it to balance its budget at a higher level of development, unless it chooses, on grounds of economic policy, to have a deficit budget. In a federation, a unit to be regarded as financially

self-supporting should be able to meet the following broad tests:

1) On an average, and over a reasonably short period, a State's revenue and expenditure should be in a balance unless a deficit is being deliberately planned as a part of wider economic policy for the country as a whole; this balanced budget standard is to be attained after providing in full for servicing the State's public debt, including all the loans obtained from the centre.

ii) The State should be able to afford such increases as are necessary in the expenditure on productive and nation building services which are legitimately within the State sphere e.g. the extension of community projects; and

iii) No state should be dependent on the centre to such an extent as to cause any embarrassment either to itself or to the centre. To the extent that a State fails in raising sufficient revenue to meet the expenditure which is legitimately to be borne by itself, a further burden is necessarily thrown on the centre, and this is bound to prevent the utilisation of central resources for other purposes including grants or loan to other states.

The States Reorganisation Commission was also of the opinion that financial liability should be regarded as an important criterion bearing on the reorganisation of the states. Financial considerations, however, have to be weighed with other
important factors, and decisions have to be taken on a balance of arguments and advantages and in accordance with the larger national interests.

All these reactions were, however, ignored by the Government of India. The states Reorganisation Act, 1976 was passed by the Parliament which provided for the merger of the Punjab (except the Loharu Sub-Tehsil of Hissar district), Pepsu and Himachal Pardesh into a single integrated unit—Punjab.