Separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency left a deep impact on the national movement in Sind. It created the spirit of mistrust among the Hindus and Muslims. The Muslims supported it while the Hindus opposed it. The Hindus, who were leading in every sphere of life in Sind, opposed the demand fearing that in a province of Muslim majority their condition would become pitiable. The Muslims hoped that if Sind was constituted an independent province, they would have a fair share in Government services and the professions because of their numerical strength - which was more than 70%. The question got national important. The Muslim League stood for the separation while the Hindu Sabha opposed it. The Indian National Congress supported the separation of Sind on the basis of its resolution of creation of new provinces on linguistic basis. The provincial Congress leadership in Sind supported the separation move but later showed reluctance to support it as it became more communal than political.

The British conquered Sind in 1843. A separate province of Sind was formed under its conqueror Sir Charles Napier. On his departure, Sind was annexed to the Bombay Presidency in 1847. Sir Bertie Frere was appointed the first commissioner. He had larger powers than those of ordinary Divisional Commissioner. The union of Sind with Bombay was accidental. It was difficult to keep Sind as an independent province due to its

1. The Bombay chronicle, April 2, 1936.
backwardness and poverty. Its annexation with Bengal or Madras was impracticable as both were at a long distance and there was lack of communication. Punjab was yet to be conquered. Feeling Bombay nearer to Sind and its connection with Karachi through sea, it was annexed to Bombay.  

After the annexation of the Punjab by the Britishers in 1849, the question of the transfer of Sind from Bombay to the Punjab remained for long in a state of discussion. Right from the time of Dalhousie who in a Minute of February 20, 1856, suggested the merger of Sind with the Punjab, down to 20th June, 1889, when the Governor General in Council determined to drop the proposal to separate it from Bombay, the measure was always urged on political and military, as distinct from purely military grounds. The object was to secure unity in political and military action along the entire stretch of what was then the north west frontier of India. Men like Lord North-brook, Lord Lytton, Sir Charles Aitchison, Lord Roberts and Sir Anthony Mac Donnel were all guided by considerations of 'one government, one policy and one command'. Lytton, in fact, proposed the creation of separate Frontier Province to achieve the political and military object. Several other arguments were advanced to justify the severence of Sind from Bombay. They were based on linguistic, religious, ethnic, commercial and popular grounds. But the main object was political and military. Sir John Peter (member of the Council) wrote that "all physical and political considerations combine to indicate that Sind and Punjab could be united".  

---
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The court of Directors did not accept Lord Dalhousie's proposal for the integration on financial and other grounds. The Plan was, however, shelved for sometime. Punjab was made Lieutenant Governorship province after the events of 1857. Sind was not incorporated with the Punjab. Lord Canning hailed the decision of the Secretary of State not to integrate Sind with the Punjab specially on account of the backward state of communication. Lord Lawarence and William Mensfield also opposed the Union. 6

In 1867, Sir Henry Durand strongly advocated the integration proposal. Mr. C.V. Aitchison the then officiating Secretary, favoured the plan. By the year 1876, the proposal was more or less accepted in principle. 7 It could not be carried out due to Bombay's opposition.

Bombay presented stiff opposition, and in an important letter of April 25, 1885, refuted all the arguments which the Government of India had advanced in its letter of April 17. The most convincing argument of Bombay was that if, in view of the geographical contiguity, Sind was to go to the Punjab, the central provinces on the same ground should be transferred to Bombay simultaneously. 8 Even the merchants of Karachi opposed the Union on account of Punjab's poverty. 9 The matter was responded under Lord Curzon in 1903. But in a Minute of 19th May of that year he also declined.10

7. Ibid., p.163.
the country. The subject was discussed in all the more important journals of India. The Tribune from Lahore on January 13, 1912, published "The attitude of the good people in Sind who object to the amalgamation of that province with the Punjab is like that of the damsel in distress tied up by some ruffian, or the suffragette who chains herself to a chair or a pillar and conceals the key of the lock about her person. When a good samaritan offers to set her at liberty, the unexpected reply is, "Leave me alone, I will not be improved," Sind was annexed before the Punjab, but can any one say that Sind has made the same progress as the Punjab?"  

The Times of India opposed the proposal. The Punjab looked upon Sind as a sister state, historically, politically, economically and ethnologically connected to it. The proposal could not be given practical shape due to opposition by the Sindhis arguing that Punjab was backward and the Punjabis were selfish.

The demand of amalgamation of Sind with Punjab died and a new demand of independent status as a province to Sind arose. Earlier in the All-India Congress Committee's session at Karachi in 1913 the demand of independent status to Sind was raised by Herchandra Vishandas. He continued to pursue his demand. He made a representation to Montague, S.O.S. that Sind be separated from Bombay when he led a deputation of Sind Provincial Conference to him in 1917-18.
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The Congress believed that the formation of British provinces was done on chronological basis not on logical and ethnological basis. The party supported the demand of separate independent status to Sind on the basis of language, geography and history. It gave Sind a provincial status in 1917 and number of five representatives were fixed in the All-India Congress Committee from Sind.  

The demand of separation got some strength when in the Government of India Act, 1919, the provision was made to bring territorial changes for constituting new provinces. According to this Act,

The Governor General in Council may, after obtaining an expression of opinion from the local Government and the local legislature affected, by notification, with the sanction of His Majesty previously signified by the Secretary of the State in Council, constitute a new Governor's province, under the administration of a Deputy Governor to be appointed by the Governor General, and may in any such case apply, with such notification as appear necessary or desirable all or any of the provisions of the Principal Act on this Act relating to Governor's province or provisions under a Lieutenant Governor or Chief Commissioner, or any such new province or part of the province.

The exacerbation of religious feelings during the non-cooperation movement was the revival of communalism. In 1921 the Khilafatist President of the Muslim League, Hesrat Mohanti advocated a federation with four Muslim majority provinces of Punjab, Sind, Bengal and Assam in it along with the Hindu majority provinces. The popular demand of Sind separation also got communal colour. It became the demand of Muslims onwards. The Hindus started opposing the demand, Jinnah demanded separation of Sind from Bombay along with other demands to abandon separate electorates in favour of joint electorate on 20th March, 1927 at Delhi presiding over a meeting of Muslim members of the Central legislature.

In the resolution by the working committee unanimously passed in the 41st session of the Indian National Congress held at Gauhati in article No. 3(B) resolved,

The proposal that Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency and constituted into a separate province is one which has already been adopted in the constitution of the Congress of the principal of the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis and the committee is of opinion that the proposal may be given effect to.

The Indian National Congress resolved in favour of joint electorate agreeing on many demand of the Muslim League, including the creation of Sind as an independent province in December, 1927 at Calcutta. The question of Sind became important in All parties Conference, there was no agreement between the representatives of the Muslim League and the Hindu Maha Sabha.

on the separation of Sind. Thereupon, on March 11th, 1928 the Conference appointed a sub-committee to report 'whether when separated the new province of Sind would be self supporting'. The committee consisted of Haji Abdulla Haroon, a leading Khilafat leader of Sind, Khan Bahadur Shah Nawaz Khan Rutto, Jairamdas Daultram, Jemshed Mehta, Bhai Ishelf Das and Professor Chablani. Pushotamdas Thakurdas was the Chairman of the Committee. The sub-committee could not work and report due to lack of facilities and also due to lack of cooperation from the supporters of separation.

The All Parties Conference resented the communal colour given to the demand of separation of Sind. It observed, "Sind has, by a strange succession of events, become a major problem in our politics. It is strange that those who were in favour of its separation from Bombay only a few years ago are now opposing it, and those who were against separation now vehemently desire it. The whole of India is exercised about this comparatively trivial matter. This sudden and somewhat inexplicable change of opinion demonstrates how communal considerations warp and twist our better judgement. For the last eight years, since the National Congress made Sind into a separate province, no voice was raised in protest."

The matter regarding separation of Sind was discussed thoroughly in the All Parties Conference. The two yard sticks to create new province i.e. linguistic and the wishes of the majority were found suitable for independent status to Sind.
needs, Sind stood for separation. The members - Messrs Aney and Pradhan demanded that an enquiry should be made into the financial and administrative aspects which was accepted.\textsuperscript{24} The conference approved the recommendations of the committee to the Indian States on 30th August, 1928 that 'Sind shall be separated from Bombay and constituted into a separate province provided', (1) after an enquiry it was found -

a. That Sind is financially self-supporting;

b. In the event of its being found that it is not financially self-supporting, on the schemes of separation being laid before the people of Sind with its financial and administrative aspects, the majority of the inhabitants favour the scheme and express their readiness to bear the financial responsibility of the new arrangement;

2) That the form of Government in Sind shall be the same as in the other provinces under the constitution.

3) That the non-Muslim minority in Sind shall be given the same privileges in the matter of representation in the provincial and Central Legislatures as the Muslim minorities are given under the Nehru committee report in areas where they are in a minority'.\textsuperscript{25}

The demand of separation was supported by AICC on the principles as well as to get the goodwill of the Muslim League. The attitude of the Sind Provincial Congress committee was not favourable to the separation move. It is supported the Hindu view, Dr. Choithram

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid.}, pp.66-69.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Ibid.}, p.162.
and Jairamdas along with Swami Krishannand and Chanshyam opposed the separation saying it was financially ruinous and politically retrograde and also involving other serious disadvantages to people in general.²⁶

The Sind Hindu Mahasabha and the Sind Hindu Association formed the anti-Sind separation conference which fought against the separation. Its important leaders were Virumal, Dialmal, Aritmal and Chablani. At all Indian level the Hindu Mahasabha supported the anti-separation view of the Sind Hindus. The Muslim League which supported the separation move, though not had roots in Sind yet its view on separation was backed by the Muslim majority of the province. The Sind Muslim Association under Shah Nawaz Bhutto and Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah advocated the separation. Sheikh Abdul Majid, the great leader of the Muslims, also led the separation movement.

The Nehru report which was adopted by the All Parties Conference on August 28 at Lucknow was rejected by the Muslims. On December 31, 1928 and January 1, 1929 they gathered at Delhi, probably the most representative Muslim meeting ever held; the Aga Khan presided. The meeting resolved that no constitution would be acceptable unless the Muslim demands including provincial status to Sind were not accepted.²⁷ Again, in March, 1929, Jinnah drafted his famous fourteen points and included the separation of Sind from Bombay.²⁸

---

²⁷ B.1b78; a seasoned politician of Sind; M.L.A., Bombay Presidency 1921-28; Member, Executive council of the of Bombay, 1928-34; Chief Minisiter of Sind 1937-38, 1942-47; Governor of Sind, 1947-48, d.1948.
²⁸ Moors, R.J. op.cit., p.38
The Simon Commission gave its due attention to the question of separation of Sind. The Bombay Committee attached to the commission concluded after hearing the views of pro-separation and anti-separation, "The administrative difficulties which have been pointed by the Bombay Government are real and cannot be ignored", and that, "for financial reasons alone the proposal is impracticable", and that Sind "must in order to secure this advantage (full provincial autonomy) continues as a part of Bombay presidency". The Commission found, "The demand has gathered strength not so much in the homes of people, or among Mohammadan cultivators of Sind, as among leaders of Mohammadan thought all over India, to whom the idea of a new Muslim province contiguous to the pre-dominantly Muslim areas of Baluchistan, the North-West Frontier Province and the Punjab, naturally appeals as offering a stronghold against the fear of Hindu domination".

The Commission suggested a deep enquiry in the matters of financial consequences before the decision of separation of Sind. It observed:

Sindhis are both racially and geographically completely separated from the rest of the Bombay Presidency, and the separatists of that area have pressed upon us the claim of sympathy with the claim, but there are grave administrative objections to isolating Sind and depriving it of the powerful backing of Bombay before the future of the Sukkur Barrage is assured and the major readjustments which will entail have been effected. Even it were held that the time is ripe for the separation of Sind to be seriously considered, there would have to be a close and detailed enquiry into the financial consequences which would follow from such a step before a decision could be taken".

31. Ibid., Vol.II p.25.
The Round Table Conference set up a sub-committee on Sind. The members of the sub-committee were Lord Russell (Chairman), Lord Zetland, Lord Reading (for whom Mr. Foot acted as substitute), H.H. The Aga Khan, Mr. Jinnah, Sir S.N. Bhutto, Sir C. Hussain Hidayatullah, Sir Abdul Qaiyam, Sir M. Shafi, Dr. Shafaat Ahmed Khan, Sardar Sampuran Singh, Dr. Moonje, Dr. Jayakar, Raja Narindra Nath, Mr. Chintamani, Mr. Jadhar, Sir P. Sethna, Mr. Mody and Sir H. Carr. The term of reference was to consider, "The question of constituting Sind as a separate province.\(^{32}\) There was no member from amongst the Hindus of Sind to oppose the idea of separation. The members had very little knowledge about the problem. They were impressed by the arguments of Mr. Bhutto and Ghulam Hussain in favour of separation.\(^{33}\) Jinnah also appearing before the sub-committee, strongly recommended the separation of Sind from Bombay.

The sub-committee submitted its report on the 16th January, 1931 with the recommendations for separation of Sind.

The racial and linguistic differences between the inhabitants of Sind and those of the presidency of Bombay proper, the geographical isolation of Sind from Bombay, the difficulties of communication between the two, and the insistency with which separation has been advocated, provide an impressive case for the division of Sind from the Bombay Presidency and the creation of a separate provincial Government there. The Government of Bombay have pointed out certain administrative difficulties in the way of the separation of Sind but they do not believe them to be insuperable. The sub-committee with two dissentients (Dr. Moonje and Raja Narendra Nath) are impressed by the strength of the arguments in favour of separation, and they have come to the conclusion that the principle of separation should be accepted. They, therefore, recommended that an expert committee in India should examine carefully the probable revenue and expenditure of a separated Sind and the security of the debt on the Sukkur Barrage, and should also recommend an equitable adjustment of the financial

\(^{32}\) Proceedings of Indian Round Table Conference, 12th November 1930-19th January, 1931), Calcutta, p.393.

\(^{33}\) Address by Mukhi Gobindram Pritamdas, at Anti Sind Separation Conference, op.cit., p.5.
commitments for which Sind may properly be considered liable. If the investigation shows that separation would have the new province with a deficit, the sub-committee thinks that the representatives of Sind should be asked to show satisfactorily how the deficit would be met before the new province is set up. 34

The Hindus of Sind opposed the recommendations made by the sub-committee in the Round Table Conference. On March 15, 1931, a meeting was organised at Sukkur by the Arya Samaj. The resolutions regarding anti-separation were passed, Government and the Congress party was asked not to support the move of separation. The communal disturbances at Larkana, Jacobabad and Sukkur districts were shown as a proof that if separation took place the condition of Hindus would become very pitiable. Again stress was laid not on separating Sind on financial ground. 35

Despite the opposition of various organisations of Hindus the work for separation of Sind went on unhindered. The sub-committee of the Round-Table Conference on Sind had recommended to appoint an expert committee to go through the financial matters of the Sind. The same was constituted through the Government of India Resolution No. F/12/V/31-R dated 9th July, 1931 with the terms of reference, "with reference to the report of sub-committee No. IX of the Indian Round Table Conference to examine carefully the probably revenue and expenditure of a separated Sind and the security of the debt on the Sukkar Barrage, and also to recommend on equitable adjustment of the financial commitments for which

34. Proceedings of Indian Round Table Conference, op.cit., pp. 393-394.
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Sind may properly considered liable.\textsuperscript{36} Sind Financial Enquiry Committee comprised Mr. Miles Irving, ICS, Chairman, Mr. D.G. Harris, CIE, Member and Mr. R.D. Balwally, Secretary.\textsuperscript{37} The Committee assembled on July 13, 1931. They met at Karachi from August 6th to August 19th and again from September 5th to 7th, and at Poona from August 24th to 29th; for the rest of time they were at Simla or in transit. The report was signed on September 23rd, 1931.\textsuperscript{38}

In its report the Financial Enquiry Committee upheld the view that the separated Sind would remain a deficit province for years to come. The projected date of separation was considered on the 1st April, 1933.\textsuperscript{39} It was estimated after consulting the various sources the total expenditure of Sind at the time of separation would be Rs. 279.82 lakhs and the total revenue got from the different heads would be Rs. 182.42 lakhs.\textsuperscript{40} The basic deficit would be thus Rs. 97.40 lakhs. The cost of separation was estimated at Rs. 11.05 lakhs with net cost of expansion Rs. 1.97 lakhs. Thus, the total deficit was considered at Rs. 110.42 lakhs.\textsuperscript{5} It was anticipated that Lloyd Barrage would produce net revenue in the year 1940-41 only Rs. 0.63 lakhs. With the increase of the cost of expansion the deficit excluding the revenue of Lloyd Barrage was considered to be Rs. 144.19 lakhs and including the Lloyd Barrage revenue of Rs. 120.55 lakhs in 1962-63. The Committee

\textsuperscript{36} Report of the Sind Financial Enquiry Committee, (Simla, September, 1931) p.1
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\textsuperscript{39} ibid., p.3
\textsuperscript{40} ibid., pp. 11-12
left two questions to be decided, first, the rate of the irrigation from Lloyd Barrage and the measures to be adopted to remove the deficit. 41

Soon after the Financial Expert Committee completed their investigation, the second Round Table Conference met in London. His Majesty's Government made an announcement at the conclusion of the second Round Table Conference that:

His Majesty's Government accept in principle the propositions endorsed at the previous conference that Sind should be constituted as a separate province, if satisfactory means of financing it can be found. The intention of His Majesty's Government was to ask the Government of India to arrange for a conference with the representatives of Sind for the purpose of trying to overcome the difficulties disclosed by the Report of the expert financial investigation made last summer. 42

The Sind Conference which was formed on the instructions of His Majesty's Government was opened at Karachi on the 25th April, 1932 and carried on an intensive study of its subjects until the 17th May. The conference comprised the Hon'ble Mr. A.F.L. Brayne, Chairman, Ali Bakshi Mohammad Hussain, Shah Nawaj Bhutto, Mr. Lal Chand Navalrai, Haji Abdulla Haroon, Mr. Bandeh Ali Khan, Mr. M.A.Khuhro, Mr. Allaha Baksh Mohammad Umar, Prof. H.R.K. Batheja, Prof. H.L. Chablani, Mr. Hoshang, N.E.Dinshaw, Mr. H. Dow, Mr. Murlidhar Jeramdas Panjabi, Mr. E.L.Price and Qazi Abdur Rehman as members. 43

The separatist and the anti-separatists gave their views regarding the difficulties in financial matters. The Hindu members who were anti-separation expressed that it was difficult to cover
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the deficit by retrenchment or by imposing taxes. But the Muslims and other members who were pro-separation put a very encouraging scheme to bring the deficit down. They suggested the following things to bring down the deficit of Rs. 108.45 shown by Expert Financial Committee.

1. Increase in basic figure of revenue Rs. 11.5 Lakhs
2. Decrease in basic figure of expenditure Rs. 7.5 Lakhs
3. Decrease due to retrenchment already made and to additional taxation already imposed. Rs. 14.0 Lakhs
4. Decrease in the estimate of the cost of separation. Rs. 4.5 Lakhs
5. Reduction of deficit by imposing a special case on land revenue Rs. 11.0 Lakhs
6. Other new measures of taxation Rs. 18.0 Lakhs
7. Continuation of temporary cut in pay of provincial and subordinate services Rs. 5.0 Lakhs
8. Additional retrenchment Rs. 6.5 Lakhs

Total Rs. 88.5 Lakhs

Net deficit ... Rs. 30.0 Lakhs(roundly)\(44\)

The estimate given by the pro-separation was very optimistic.

The Chairman suggested the following figures:

1. Increase of basic expenditure on actuals of 1930-31. Rs.(Lakhs) + 2.3
2. Anticipated decrease in basic revenue + 5.4
3. Decrease in deficit owing to net taxation and retrenchments already in effect 14.0
4. Reduction in provision for reduction of debt and for interest. 4.0
5. Reduction in estimate of pension liability 7.5
6. Improvement due to proposal for cess of land revenue. 11.0

\[44\] ibid., p.26
7. Increase in estimate of cost of separation owing to provision for accounts office counter balanced by economy in other directions. + 1.0

Thus the net deficit would remain at Rs. 80.65 lakhs. In conclusion, it was established that at the outset and for some years to come Sind would require assistance to the full extent of Rs. 80.00 lakhs if a separate province was constituted. 45

The Conference suggested, in order to cover the deficit to a special additional charge of one anna per rupee of land revenue assessment (including water charges) on whatever rates were in force at any time in future throughout Sind and without prejudice to the question of revision of the existing system. By doing this it was thought, "the basic deficit would, on this estimate be covered by the available Barrage surplus from 1944 onwards." These rates of assessment were stated to be based on recent prices. 46

The Conference opined to knock out Rs. 342.5 lakhs out of the accumulated interest on the Barrage debt and debting it to Bombay. Secondly, it reduced the pensionary liability to the new province. It was to be performed by the presidency. 47 The next device for reducing the deficit in the first years was to spread the repayment of the Barrage debt to 80 instead of 60 years, new taxation and subvention were other ways to reduce the deficit. 48

---
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The stage for separation of Sind was prepared by the Government throughout the Financial Enquiry Committee and the Sind conference. Both showed Sind as a deficit province but did not oppose the idea of separation. The ways suggested by the Sind Conference for covering the deficit were opposed by the Hindus of Sind. Twenty-eight village Panchayats and Zamindar Associations sent applications to the Commissioner against the separation of Sind.49 The Hindu Youth Conference under the presidency of Bhai Permanand at Karachi on May 9, 1932, passed a resolution against separation. Mr. Virunmal Begraj, Dr. Hingorani and Prof. Chablani spoke in the Conference.50 The Muslims supported the finds of the Sind Conference and agreed to pay per anna on per rupee on land for covering the deficit as suggested by the conference.51

The Anti Separation Conference was held at Hyderabad on 18th and 19th June, 1932. Prominent Hindus from Shikarpur, Sukkar and other places attended the conference. Sardar Sampuran Singh of Ambala, an Akali, a great supporter of minorities, MLC from Punjab, presided over the conference. The move of separation was opposed by Lal Chand Navalrai and Mukhi Gobind Ram Pritamdas, who were members of the Sind Hindu Association. Sardar Sampuran Singh warned the separatists that the separation would lead to maladministration. Mr. Lal Chand Navalrai said that the conditions laid down by Simon Commission were not fulfilled. Hindus were not taken in confidence, the subvention provision was not sufficient and Sind would not be able to pay heavy taxes.52

49. The Tribune, April 18, 1932
50. Ibid., May 11, 1932
51. Ibid., May 13, 1932
52. Ibid., June 23, 1932.
The Anti Sind Separation Conference criticised Brayne's report of the Sind Conference. It was alleged that "the report of the Sind Conference by the Hon'ble Mr. A.F.L. Brayne is a curious document. It is not a report on which the members of the conference had any hand; it is a report by its Chairman only. It is materially different from the brief summary of the results of discussions placed before the members at the last but one sitting of the conference; it does not even embody the corrections made by the members in that summary, and further that conference was so composed as to give one particular community a clear majority".  

The fear of separation from Bombay made the Panchayat of Nagar Parkar Taluka to demand, "If Sind was to be separated from Bombay then they should be attached with Ahmedabad district in Gujrat". The reasons behind being (1) Nagar Parkar so closed to Cutch and Gujrat (2) it was formerly administrated by the British political officers at Cutch (3) It had at present 90% of its trade with Cutch and Gujrat and (4) it used Gujrat more than any language.

In case of separation, the Hindus demanded 37% and the Sikhs 3% reservation for the Legislative Assembly seats in Sind on the basis of reservation provided for minorities in the other provinces. At Allahabad Unity Conference the Hindus agreed for the separation of Sind provided they were given reservation and one minister would be taken from among the Hindus. Abdul

54. * The Tribune, August 10, 1932. *
Majid, the Muslim leader from Sind suggested that a Hindu minister should be taken for ten years only. The Allahabad Unity Conference could not solve the problem regarding Sind as it failed to bring both Hindu and Muslims on the common front.

The Hindu opposition to the separation of Sind was the creation of fear of Muslim domination. They called it anti-national based upon the British theory of 'divide and rule'. It was a manical desire on the part of the British to placate the Muslims. They believed that the demand by any community for a separate province on the basis of their majority would encourage the other communities to have their own majority provinces which could lead to Balkanisation of India. The separation of Sind was compared with the partition of Bengal. Dr. Hingorani was of the view that the fate of Bengal was awaited.

The Hindus opposed the separation as they considered that the decision of the separation was exparte. The Hindus were being ignored. No Hindu leader from Sind was taken in any committee making the decision of separation. The reports of the Sind Financial Enquiry Committee and Sind Conference showed Sind as a deficit province for years to come. The subvention proposed was not fair method to cover the deficit. If Sind could not stand on its own legs then why to create it as an independent province?

55. Ibid., December 24, 1932.
56. Presidential Address delivered by Sardar Sampuran Singh MLC at Anti-separation Conference held at Hyderabad Sind (Pamphlet), (Layalpur, 1932), p.10.
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On administrative ground the separation was shown harmful to Sind. The executive committee of the Anti Sind Separation Conference in their Pamphlet on the True Facts regarding the separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency, brought out the benefit gained by Sind during its Union with the Bombay Presidency, it wrote.

Its population has increased by over 300 per cent, its cultivation has extended even more; its canal irrigation has transformed barren lands into smiling fields; its system of education and local government has been brought into line with that of advanced Bombay; its residents enjoy in association with the more advanced people of Gujarat, Bombay and Maharashatra the largest measure of self-government that any province has in India; its port of Karachi has risen from a fishing hamlet to a position of approaching equality with Madras, Bombay and Calcutta; Financially it has all along received considerable help from the Presidency; economically, one of the gigantic schemes of irrigation ever undertaken in the history of India has been initiated by the efforts of the Bombay Government and the guarantee of its tax payers, commercially, most of its leading commercial communities, European, Hindu, Parses, Khojas have close business and social connections with Bombay; and so strong has grown to be the tie between Sindhis and the people of other divisions of the Bombay Presidency that today the majority of the residents of Karachi, the seat of the Commissioner in Sind, speak languages other than Sindhi. And just at the time when the Sindhis were looking forward to a more rapid economic progress, owing to the Sukkur Barrage, and the heavy programme for construction of roads, feeder railways, and or new Barrage at Kotri, to which the Bombay Government had committed itself, an apple of discord was thrown among the people of Sind by outside politicians who dragged Sind as a pawn in so-called "balache of power" between Hindus and Muslims in India, the separation of Sind from Bombay Presidency and its constitution as a separate province.60.

Sardar Sampuram Singh speaking in Anti-Sind separation Conference at Hyderabad criticised the views of separatists that they would work without university, legislative council chamber and police

training school. He said, 'A provincial Government ill-equipped and under-staffed could not but be inefficient from top to bottom and would soon degenerate into a prototype of some of our most mismanaged big private estates'.

Prof. H.L. Chablani in his Financial Aspects of the Separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency argued against separation. He said, that Sind would be the smallest Governor's province. It would remain a deficit province. The present expenditure incurred on Sind by Bombay was larger than any province. The separation would leave Sind lonely, dependable and a backward province.

The opposition of separation could not succeed before the logical arguments of pro-separation. They said that the demand of separation was popular one. Sind differed from Bombay on historical, political, social and cultural grounds. The amalgamation of Sind with Bombay was accidental and it was to be ended sooner or later.

When the British Government was considering the matter on its merits and demerits, and was going to declare Sind as a separate province, His Highness the Aga Khan offered to purchase the province in lieu of the loyal services to the British Crown extending over a number of years, and to these he agreed to add a substantial amount drawn from his much accumulated cash and gold. The prospect of his becoming the Nawab of Sind was not unpleasant to a number of persons and the Aga Khan found a great...
deal of support for his proposition particularly in the die hard
element of the British peerage. Indian opinion was strongly opposed
to this retrograde step as it would have meant the creation of
a quite unnecessary autocracy, and when the Secretary of State
for India announced that the Aga Khan's petition had been rejected,
the news was received with great relief.  

The White Paper proposed eleven provinces instead of
nine under the British in India, the two new provinces which
were added, were Sind and Orissa. The White Paper, proposal
No. 70 pointed out:

We have reached the conclusion that Sind ought to become
a separate Governor's Province. In view of the very
special importance to the province of the continued
success of the Sukkur Barrage project and of the very large
financial issues involved, which will concern the Federal
Government as well as the province of Sind, it is proposed
that the Governor of Sind should have a special responsibil-
ity for the administration of the Barrage.  

The Joint Parliamentary committee discussed the question
of separation on a large scale. The Hindu view i.e. anti-separation
was put forward by Prof. Chablani and the Muslim point of view
of pro-separation was put forward by Khan Bahadur Khuhro MLC before
the committee. The Committee decided in favour of separation.
The fear of statutory commission that the future of Sukkur Barrage
would be dark due to financial problems was found ineffective
in such circumstances. "When this opinion was recorded the Barrage
was still under construction: but it is now completed and successfully
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in operation”.67 The initial yearly deficit was estimated at 3/4 crores, which would be gradually met in about 15 years, and after that period the Province should be able to dispense with assistance. The committee was of the opinion that "It is sufficient to say here that the difficulties do not appear to be of such magnitude as to form any insuperable bar to the establishment of a separate province."68

The Joint Committee found that the question of separation had aroused acute communal controversy. The case for separation was not raised by the Sindhi Mohammadens but also by Mohammadan leaders elsewhere in India. Separation was opposed strongly by the Hindu minority in Sind. Keeping in view this thing the committee proposed, "that the Hindus shall be allotted a considerable proportion of the seats in the legislature, and they will, of course, enjoy the protection of the special safeguard for minorities which will apply to the minorities on other provinces".69 The committee recommended "that a subvention should be given from federal revenues to Sind, of a prescribed but gradually diminishing amount".70

The Government of India appointed the Sind Administrative Committee on October 7, 1933, to investigate certain administrative questions. Mr. H. Dow, C.I.E., I.C.S., was appointed the Chairman of the Committee while Mr. R.B. Maclachlan; Mr. G. Kaula, C.I.E., Seth Haji Abdulla Heroon, M.L.A., Khan Bahadur M.A. Khuhro, M.L.C., Rao Bahadur Hiranand Khem Singh and Mr. E.L. Price, C.I.E., Q.B.E.
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were appointed as members. The Committee first met on November 20th at Karachi and submitted its report on 6th March, 1934.

The Sind Administrative Committee found it impracticable to separate Sind from Bombay without establishing a new administrative machinery. The new Government under Provincial autonomy would be on disadvantage compared to other States. For these reasons it was suggested "that an interval between a decision to separate Sind and the setting up of the new responsible Sind Government should be utilized as far as possible in bringing into working order the necessary administrative arrangements." 72

The Government of India Act, 1935 in Part XII under section 289 accepted the separation of Sind from Bombay from the date His Majesty may, by order in Council appoint, "Sind shall be separated from the Presidency of Bombay and shall from a Governor's Province to be known as the Province of Sind". 73

The provision of the separation of Sind in India Act, 1935 was followed by an order in Council issued in January, 1936 announcing that the new province would start its career on April 1, 1936 and creating transitional machinery for the conduct of Government till provincial autonomy was inaugurated in accordance with the provision of the Government of India Act, 1936. Of a permanent character were those provisions of the order in Council which sever Sind from Bombay and settled the liabilities of the parent and the infant in respect of development loans incurred
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during the joint family period. Lands, forests, buildings property etc. would pass to the province where they were situated. Arrears of taxes would belong to the province where the taxed property was situated or the taxed transactions took place. Of the outstanding Bombay irrigation debt incurred before April 1, 1921, Rs.2,76,96,384, including 73,687 of the debt on account of the Lloyd Barrage and canals system, would be borne by Sind and the rest by Bombay. Of the debt incurred on account of the Lloyd Barrage and canal system, all except the portion relating to the Nasirabad section (which was chargeable neither to Bombay nor to Sind) would be borne by Sind. The outstanding Bombay debt on account of the Bombay Development scheme was the debt of Bombay alone. Other loan works were chargeable to the province where the works located.

During transitional period, the Governor with the help of two advisors and a council, was to run the administration. The provisions suggested under the Act of 1919 were not applicable to Sind. The Centre accepted the formula of subvention. A financial Expert Committee which was framed under Sir Otto Nismeyer recommended subvention of 105 lakhs for the period of ten years. Again, he recommended for Sind 2% of the distributable portion of the income tax revenue after the five years of provincial autonomy. 74

Sind got independent status of a province on April 1, 1936 after breaking its long connection with Bombay Presidency of 89 years. His Excellency the Governor of Bombay published a farewell message to Sind expressing his good wishes for the new province; and by resolution expressing similar sentiments
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the Bombay Legislative Council bade farewell to their colleagues from Sind. Mr. Lancelot Graham was appointed as the first Governor of Sind. He was to be assisted by an Advisory Council of not more than 25 members during the transitory period. In his address the Governor laid stress on the Union of hearts for both the Hindus and the Muslims.

On the completion of separation of Sind from Bombay there was no sharp reaction by the Hindus. The Hindus, who as a community, were opposed to the separation of Sind expressed their readiness to work with the majority community for the advancement of the province. Message to this effect were issued by prominent leaders of the community at the time of inauguration. Conclusive evidence of this attitude on the part of the community was furnished by an address which the Sind Hindu Conference presented to His Excellency the Governor at a garden party attended by representatives of the community from all over the province and leading members of their community.

The various leaders representing different classes and communities urged the people of Sind to sink all the difference and to work for the prosperity and progress of the Province unitedly. Kazi Khuda Bux, the mayor of Karachi said, "Sind is on the eve of a great event. As a separate Governor's province, it will be open to the people of Sind for the opportunities of work for a greater degree of material and moral progress and happiness of the province. We will have from the day of the inauguration of
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the coming reforms a democratic form of Government which will throw greater responsibilities on the people and their chosen representatives. The people of the province will be on their trial. It is, therefore, of utmost importance that they should sink all differences of caste, creed and community and work in a spirit of harmony so as to deserve an early fulfilment of the object of full self-government in the province.\textsuperscript{78}

Mr. Hatim A. Alavi, a Corporator, who represented the Muslim view described the occasion a big one. He said, "The separation of Sind will usher in a tremendously big change. It is an evolutionary revolution, which has been achieved quietly and is a triumph of British political institutions. There is a feeling of jubilation everywhere at the happy event. The new Sind Government has the undoubted advantage of starting its autonomous existence after the fullest and most mature experience ranging over a century of political administration as conducted by the British in various other provinces of our motherland. It is necessary for us to return to the legislature men who will bring to their task all the wisdom and experience gained during the last century.\textsuperscript{79}

Mr. Tikamdas Wadhunmal, ex-Mayor, and President of the Sind Hindu Association commented on the separation: "Sind has been constituted a separate province. It will serve no useful purpose to decry separation. All right thinking people should direct their energies to get the best out of the situation. A serious responsibility has been put upon the shoulders of the people of Sind. The majority community, that is the Muslims.\textsuperscript{78}

\textit{The Tribune, April 2, 1936.}

\textit{Ibid}
and the important minority, the Hindus, have a common cause to pursue, namely, the development of the province of Sind and the advancement of the people of Sind. One, however, cannot lose sight of the fact that there is still lurking in the minds of a certain section of Hindus of Sind a fear that their very reasonable and legitimate rights might be ignored by the Muslims who will form a preponderating majority in the new separate province. I would appeal to the Hindus of the Sind to sink their differences and be united and to take concerted action and there would, then, be no cause of fear or apprehension of any kind. I would, the same time suggest to the Muslim leaders of the province to make a generous gesture by assuring the public of the province that they themselves should move forward the establishment of joint electorates at an early date, which fact will dispel much of the mis-understanding and create sympathy among the followers of different faiths.80

Jairamdas Daulatram, a prominent congress leader, said that, "I do not share the feeling of many Hindus and Muslims that April 1, 1936, the date on which Sind has been constituted into a separate province, will make any material change, in the event of the lives of most of the 39 lakhs of Hindus and Muslims living in the province. The event of separation will not bring any improvement in their lot. A few more jobs to Muslims, a few losses to the Hindus, a temporary set-back in the efficiency of the administration, a few attempts at educational and economic advance which will fail for want of funds, will be the features of the first few years of Sind's separate life. This need not worry anyone much". 80. Ibid
But what struck him as the dominant feature of separated Sind was the fact that it would still remain a part of a subject country, till the people of Sind, in conjunction with the rest of India, strove for the attainment of the national goal. He appealed to the Muslims leaders, if they wished to retain power in Sind, to win the goodwill and support of the Hindus. At the same time, his advice to the Hindu leaders was that their security and progress would best be safeguarded by a policy, not of hostility to, but adjustment with, the Muslims. "To Both" he concluded "My Joint request is not to forget their country in the midst of communal quarrels". 81

The gesture of goodwill shown at the time of separation and the pieces of advice given by the various leaders could not live long. The Hindus were not reconciled as the separation was not made on merits. The matter influenced the national politics. The demand of separation was backed with full strength by the Muslim leadership. It sowed the seeds of communalism and Sind became the centre of communal forces onwards. The Indian National Congress lost the Muslims of Sind after the Khilafat and now the Hindus. The movement for the separation of Sind from Bombay Presidency was a great setback to the national forces in India.
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