

Reorganisation of States

The Approach and Arrangements

THE Historic Report of the States

Reorganisation Commission which was released early this week will Obviously be the subject of considerable discussion throughout the country. The principal recommendations of the Commission, which consisted of Shri Saiyid Fazl Ali (Chairman), Shri Hriday Nath Kunzru and Shri K M Pannikar, are summarised below. The Commission has recommended the establishment of 16 states without any distinction instead of the 27 existing Part A, Part B and Part C States. In addition, there will be three centrally administered areas to be called territories.

The Commission has insisted that no change should be made unless the advantages which result from it in terms of "the welfare of the people of each constituent unit, as well as the nation as a whole" are such as to compensate for the heavy burden on the administrative and financial resources of the country, which reorganisation must entail.

In view of the controversy over linguistic States, the Commission has affirmed that "it is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of a single test of either language or culture". They have postulated a balanced approach, which would:

(i) recognise linguistic homogeneity as an important factor conducive to administrative convenience and efficiency, but not to consider it as an exclusive and binding principle, over-riding all other considerations, administrative, financial or political;

(ii) ensure that communicational, educational and cultural needs of the different language groups, whether resident in predominantly unilingual or composite administrative units, are adequately met;

iii) where satisfactory conditions exist, and the balance of economic, political and administrative considerations favour composite States, continue them with the necessary safeguards to ensure that all sections enjoy equal rights and opportunities;

(iv) repudiate the "home land" concept, which negates one of the fundamental principles of the Indian Constitution, namely, equal opportunities and equal rights for all citizens throughout the length and breadth of the Union;

(v) reject the theory of "one lan-

guage homogeneity, because there can be more than one state speaking the same language without offending the linguistic principle, nor practicable, since different language groups, including the vast Hindi-speaking population of the Indian Union, cannot always be consolidated to form distinct linguistic units; and

(vi) finally, to the extent that the realisation of unilinguism at state level would tend to breed a particularist feeling, counter-balance that feeling by positive measures calculated to give a deeper content to Indian nationalism.

Financial viability has an important bearing on reorganisation proposals, but it has to be considered along with other relevant factors. The units should, as far as possible, be self-supporting. They should be so constituted that they have an incentive to raise and are able to raise, on their own initiative, at least a part of the resources needed for their development. The States cannot be so reorganised as to conform to economic regions. Nor can the principle of economic self-sufficiency within an administrative unit be regarded as a clear criterion. Consistently with these principles, however, it would be desirable to avoid as far as possible wide disparities in resources between the various States. The units should be large enough to ensure administrative efficiency and the co-ordination of economic development and welfare activities.

The wishes of the people should be regarded as an important factor bearing on reorganisation, but they have to be considered along with other relevant factors. The facts of the existing situation are more important than the previous historical associations of different areas. Undue importance cannot be attached, therefore, to historical arguments. Geographical contiguity of the units is important from the point of view of administrative convenience. Other geographical factors have to be regarded as secondary.

STATES

Madras:—This State should include the existing territories subject to the following adjustments, namely,

(i) the five taluks of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam, Vilaahcode and Shencotta, now forming part of Travancore cochin, should

be transferred to the State of Madras, and

(ii) the districts of Malabar and South Kanara and the Kollegal taluk of the Coimbatore district should be detached from Madras.

The addition to Madras of the five taluks which have been mentioned will be justified by reason of geographical contiguity and linguistic and cultural affinity. It will also meet a clearly-expressed local demand.

Kerala:—The State of Kerala should be formed, which should consist of the following areas;

(a) the State of Travancore-Cochin minus the five taluks proposed to be transferred to Madras;

(b) the Malabar district (including Fort Cochin and the Laccadive Islands), the Kasaragod taluk of the South Kanara district and the Amin-dive Islands.

Karnataka:—The State of Karnataka should be created consisting of the following areas:—

(a) the present State of Mysore, excluding the following portions of the Bellary district, namely, the Siruguppa taluk, the Bellary taluk, the Hospet taluk and a small area of the Mallapuram sub-taluk in which the dam and headworks of the Tungabhadra project are situated;

(b) the four Kannada-speaking districts of Bombay, namely, Dharwar, Bijapur, North Kanara and Belgaum, (except the Chandgad taluk of Belgaum district);

(c) the districts of Raichur and Gulbarga from Hyderabad;

(d) the South Kanara district of Madras minus the Kasaragod taluk;

(e) the Kollegal taluk of the Coimbatore district of Madras; and

(f) Coorg.

Hyderabad: Hyderabad should be reconstituted on the following lines:

Apart from the districts of Raichur and Gulbarga, the Marathwada districts should also be detached from the Hyderabad State. The residuary State which should continue to be known as Hyderabad should consist of the Telugu-speaking districts of the present State of Hyderabad, namely Mahbhubnagar, Nalgonda, Warangal (including Khammam), Kariminagar, Adtlabad, Nizamabad, Hyderabad and Medak, along with Bidar district, and the Munagala enclave in the Nalgonda district belonging to the Krishna district of Andhra.

The residuary State of Hyderabad might unite with Andhra after the general elections likely to be held in or about 1961, if by a two-thirds majority the legislature of the Hyderabad State expresses itself in favour of such unification.

Andhra:—The Andhra State should for the time being continue as it is, subject to certain minor adjustments which are mentioned below.

The taluks of Siruguppa, Bellary and Hospet and a portion of the Mallapuram sub-taluk of the Bellary district should be transferred to Andhra.

The Munagala enclave of the Krishna district, as has already been stated, should be transferred to Hyderabad.

There should be no change in the present position regarding Madras City and its future should be regarded as finally settled.

Bombay:—Bombay should continue to be treated as a composite rather than a unilingual unit. This arrangement will also provide the right solution of the problem of the future of the City of Bombay.

The State of Bombay should be reconstituted so as to include the existing Bombay State minus the Abu Road taluk of the Banaskantha district and the Kannada-speaking districts of Dharwar, Bijapur, North Kanara and Belgaum (excluding the Chandgad taluk), plus the following areas:

(a) the Marathi-speaking districts of Hyderabad, namely, Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani and Nanded;

(b) Saurashtra; and

(c) Kutch.

Vidarbha:—A new State to be known as Vidarbha should be created, consisting of the following Marathi-speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh, namely, Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda.

Madhya Pradesh:—After the separation of Vidarbha, a new State, which may be known as Madhya Pradesh, should be created consisting of:

(i) the 14 districts of the residuary Madhya Pradesh;

(ii) the whole of Bhopal and the whole of Vindhya Pradesh;

(iii) Madhya Bharat except the Sunel enclave of the Mandsaur district; and

(iv) the Sironj sub-division of the Kotah district of Rajasthan.

Rajasthan:—After the proposed merger of Sironj in the new Madhya

Pradesh State, Rajasthan should continue in its present form subject to the addition of territories mentioned below;

(i) Ajmer, and

(ii) the Abu Road taluk of the Banaskantha district of Bombay, the Sunel enclave of the Mandsaur district and the Lohara sub-tehsil of the Hissar district of the Punjab.

The Punjab:—P E P S U and the Himachal Pradesh are too small to continue by themselves and as there already are economic and administrative links between them and the present Punjab State, the merger of these two States in the Punjab will be justified.

Uttar Pradesh:—There is no case for dividing the Uttar Pradesh, and this State should continue in its existing form.

Rihar:—It does not seem to be either necessary or desirable to create a Jharkhand State in South Bihar; the special needs of this area should, however, be recognised. Seraikella and Kharsawan should continue to be part of Bihar. Some adjustments in two eastern districts belonging to Bihar are indicated under West Bengal.

West Bengal:—Geographical contiguity between the disconnected northern portion of West Bengal and the rest of the State is necessary, and this will have to be provided for. A portion of the Purnea district east of the river Mahananda, being the minimum area necessary for this purpose, will, therefore, have to be transferred from Bihar to West Bengal. The Purulia sub-district of the Manbhum district in the south minus Char Thana should also be transferred from Bihar to West Bengal.

Assam: Assam has been and must of necessity continue to be a composite State, having regard to its geographical position and ethnological and cultural history.

The demand for the creation of a hill State in Assam is impracticable and there is also no reason, having regard to the peculiar features and circumstances of Assam, why a separate hill State should be created. Tripura should be merged in Assam. The present arrangements with regard to the North East Frontier Agency should continue.

Ortega:—No changes are called for in the boundaries of Orissa which were fixed in 1936 after prolonged and detailed examination.

Jammu and Kashmir:—No recommendations are made in regard to Jammu and Kashmir.

TERRITORIES

The units or areas which have not been dealt with so far will be directly administered by the Centre and will be known as territories.

Delhi:—If Delhi is to continue to be the seat of the Central Government, it must adopt a model which is sound in principle and administratively workable in practice. The people belonging to centrally-administered territories in India are more advantageously placed than those of centrally-administered areas in other important federal countries, in that full representation in the Union Parliament has been provided for under the Indian Constitution.

Delhi should be constituted into such a centrally-administered territory; the question of creating a municipal corporation with substantial powers should be considered.

Manipur:—Manipur should be a centrally-administered territory for the time being. The ultimate merger of this State in Assam should be kept in view.

Andaman and Nicobar Islands

The STATUS quo in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands should continue.

The arrangements in regard to areas which have been or may be brought under Central administration in future, either before or after becoming de jure part of the territory of India, must be flexible, until the position is finally charmed.

AREA AND POPULATION OF REORGANISED STATES

	Area (In sq. miles)	Population (In millions)
Madras	50,170	30.0
Kerala	14,980	13.6
Karnataka	72,730	19.0
Hyderabad	45,300	11.3
Andhra	64,950	20.9
Bombay	151,360	40.2
Vidarbha	36,880	7.6
Madhya Pradesh	171,200	26.1
Rajasthan	132,300	16.0
Punjab	58,140	17.2
Uttar Pradesh	113,410	63.2
Bihar	66,520	38.5
West Bengal	34,590	26.5
Assam	89,040	9.7
Orissa	60,140	14.6
Jammu and Kashmir	92,780	4.4
Territories		
	Area	(Actual numbers)
Delhi	578	1,744,072
Manipur	8,628	577,635
Andamans & Nicobars	3,215	30,971

Map showing States of India as Proposed by the States Reorganisation Commission

