

CHAPTER XIII

UTTAR PRADESH

595. We shall now consider the future of the Uttar Pradesh. The proposals made in the preceding Chapters leave the western and southern boundaries of the Uttar Pradesh unaffected. No major proposals regarding the eastern boundary have been made to us, except for certain claims on behalf of a Vishal Vindhya Pradesh, which we have already disposed of in Chapter IX of this part. The recommendations which we have made so far, therefore, do not affect the territorial limits of the existing State of Uttar Pradesh. But an important question which still remains to be decided is whether Uttar Pradesh itself should be divided.

596. The case for division was presented to this Commission by an *ad hoc* body described as the Western U.P. M.L.As.' Central Committee for the Reorganisation of the Uttar Pradesh. A memorandum urging the division was originally signed by ninety-seven members of the local legislative assembly representing sixteen western districts. But about seventy members subsequently dissociated themselves from this memorandum. The State Government moreover has strongly expressed the view that a division of the State will be both unwarranted and undesirable.

597. The arguments in favour of dividing the State are mainly three or four. It is claimed that physically and geographically, the hill and plateau regions of the Uttar Pradesh have little in common with the Gangetic valley. The present size of the State is also unwieldy. The inevitable result is that the administration is, generally speaking, not too efficient. It has also been urged by those representatives of the western districts, who continue to press their claim, that their areas have been neglected, and that the financial surplus which accrues to the State from its western half is now mostly being spent on the development of the eastern areas. Finally, they have expressed sympathy with a point of view which has sometimes been presented to this Commission, namely, that the States of the Union should be roughly equal in size and importance, so that no one unit is in a position to exercise a dominant influence in all-India affairs.

598. We have carefully considered these arguments, and we have also reviewed at length the information which has been placed before

us bearing on this subject. Our conclusion is that on the whole the size of the State has not affected the standard of administration; and that the allegations of neglect of the west or, indeed, for that matter of any other portion of the State cannot be sustained.

599. The existing State of Madhya Pradesh has, and the proposed States of Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan will have after reorganisation, a much bigger area than that of Uttar Pradesh. Undivided Bengal before the partition of the country, and the composite State of Madras before the separation of Andhra, had each a population which was not far short of that of the Uttar Pradesh at the present time. The circumstances under which Bengal and Madras, which were nearly as large in size and population as the Uttar Pradesh, were broken up are well-known. No similar circumstances exist in the Uttar Pradesh and, knowing the repercussions of the partition of Bengal we have to adopt a cautious approach and to refrain from doing anything which may lead to unnecessary agitation or create problems which do not exist at present. We are satisfied that in the State itself there is no demand on any large scale for its being broken up. On the other hand, we think that the vast majority of the people are likely to view with very great disfavour and concern the partitioning of a State which has remained as a unit by itself for a very long period.

600. It cannot well be claimed that mere size as such is undesirable and there is in fact no clear or necessary connection between the size of a State and the quality of its administration. This conclusion is also borne out by the facts. The law and order situation in Uttar Pradesh, particularly in Bundelkhand, is generally supposed to be very unsatisfactory, but official statistics of crime in the various States, recently published for the first time, do not by any means indicate that Uttar Pradesh has a particularly bad record in this respect. Literacy in this State is, no doubt, low. But the *per capita* figures of expenditure on security and social services, which are usually produced in support of the argument that the administration of the State is not very efficient, are now somewhat out of date. The rate at which expenditure on the nation-building departments has been stepped up in recent years is impressive; since 1950-51, for example, expenditure on education has gone up by a little less than fifty per cent. With the relatively greater increase in the size of the State's revenue budget, the expenditure on the overheads of administration, considered as a proportion of the total expenditure of the State is already fairly low, and is likely to be reduced even further. Uttar Pradesh has been a pioneer in certain

respects, for example, in the abolition of zamindari. On the whole therefore, there is little, if any, justification for the partition of the State on the ground of mere administrative necessity.

601. Statistics over a period of ten years furnished by the Uttar Pradesh Government indicate that the distribution of expenditure has been more or less in the ratio of the population of the sixteen western districts and this disposes of the allegation that the Meerut, Agra and Rohilkhand divisions have been neglected. We only wish to add that a case such as that which some of the members of the State legislature from the western districts have sought to make out, of intentional and deliberate neglect justifying the partition of the State, can hardly be made to rest on stray instances like the reduction in the number of Commissionerships at one stage or delay in the formulation of certain costly and controversial projects.

602. The political objection to the continuance of Uttar Pradesh is in a way extraneous, because it is in no way related to the internal administration of the State. Nevertheless, it is of considerable importance because it reflects a sentiment which is fairly widely shared in some non-Hindi-speaking areas. The contention is that a fair balance between its constituent units is an essential condition for the working of a federal union; it has further been argued that the present commanding position of the Uttar Pradesh, with its representation in both the Houses of Parliament broadly reflecting its numerical strength, violates this important principle.

603. We readily concede that in the interests of national unity, it is of the utmost importance that no unit should nurse a sense of grievance that its point of view is not adequately represented in Parliament or properly reflected in the Central Government's policies or programmes. The feeling, therefore, that the Uttar Pradesh today exercises a powerful influence in all-India affairs, whether justifiable or not, should not be lightly brushed aside. If, however, we examine the question in the light of the current political trends in certain important federal unions, it will be seen that the influence of any particular State in national affairs under a federal system of government, is not determined by its size. We feel, therefore, that the case for the division of the Uttar Pradesh on the ground of its position in all-India affairs is somewhat overstated.

604. In all the federal constitutions the representatives of the Lower House are elected on a population basis, but in most of them there is equality of representation in the Upper House. It must, however, be remembered that in India, the Union is not a federation of sovereign states and the Rajya Sabha does not enjoy the same powers as the Lok Sabha. This is an important distinction between the Indian Union and some other democratic federations where the federating units existed before the formation of the federal unions as sovereign independent units and could, therefore, insist on coming into these federations on their own terms. In our Union, representation on the existing basis in the Upper House is due to the considered decision of the Constituent Assembly in which all the States were represented. If there is any merit in the contention that there should be equality of representation in the Upper House, the mere breaking up of the Uttar Pradesh will not solve the problem. The disparity in the size and population of the various states will continue. If, therefore, there is any remedy at all, it lies in the amendment of the Constitution. Besides in view of the limited powers enjoyed by the Rajya Sabha, equality of representation will not do any good to the smaller states.

605. After a great deal of thought we have come to the conclusion that it is not possible to form only such states as are equal to one another in size and population. In fact, there is no country in the world where one can find mathematical uniformity in regard to size and population among the component states; and some disparity is unavoidable in this country also. Some states will be large and some comparatively smaller. The mere size of the Uttar Pradesh, therefore, should not necessarily drive us to the extreme measure of breaking it up.

606. Considering the restricted powers that this House exercises as compared to the powers enjoyed by the Lok Sabha, unequal representation of the States in the Rajya Sabha, it may be stated again, has no particular significance. In other countries also, where the Upper Houses enjoy relatively wide powers, political forces have so operated that the old concept of states as such being represented in the Upper House has undergone a radical change. Finer, on a close study of the working of the principle of equal representation of States in the United States of America, has come to the conclusion that "if America, as it is today, were to give itself a new Constitution, it is very doubtful whether it would adopt equality in the Senate"¹. According to him, the Senate of the United States

¹ Herman Finer: *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, Vol. I, London 1932, p. 304.

has been converted into "a forum where the States may be very much talked of, but where the preservation of the identity of the States has become forgotten or a fictitious thing,....."¹. The factors which explain this development include the following:

- (a) "in the actual evolution of the Federation the small states have never been allied against the large states or *vice versa*";
- (b) "owing to the growth of party the country has been divided, not into states, but into opposed political organisations which have reconciled the states within their fold to each other and to the Union"; and
- (c) "owing to the industrial and commercial evolution of the nation the rival interests have been and are, Sections rather than states,....."².

607. In Australia also party divisions, in Professor Wheare's words, "have usually proved stronger among Senators than state divisions. Votes in the Senate are cast more on strict party lines than upon a regional basis"³. In fact, the control of the Senate by Labour for many years has had the result of converting the Upper House in Australia into an instrument for weakening the power of the States and for promoting party programmes as against States rights.

608. The constitutional and political structure of the U.S.S.R. exhibits certain special features. The conditions in that country are, therefore, not comparable to those of this country.

608. The main objection seems to be that the Uttar Pradesh being a very large state, all its representatives are apt to combine in pressing their point of view in Parliament. There is no guarantee, however, that even if the Uttar Pradesh is split up the representatives of the newly-created units, who have been associated together for a long time, will not vote on the same side. We should not also forget that, sometimes, the complaint is that most of the representatives of the Hindi-speaking areas vote on the same side.

610. It will be unrealistic to think that any State *qua* State is, or will be, able to influence the Centre to any considerable extent under a system of Cabinet government under which party loyalties must override state loyalties. We are, therefore, not disposed to attach

¹ Herman Finer: *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, Vol. 1 London, 1932, p. 300

² *Ibid.*, p. 299.

³ K. C. Wheare : *Federal Government*, London, 1953, p. 94.

much importance to the view that either the present size of the Uttar Pradesh or its representation in the Upper House, by itself, secures for this State any dominating influence in the Union Parliament or executive.

611. Whatever the historical origin of the Uttar Pradesh and the justification for the formation of this State might have been, the State has now been administered as a single unit for a long period. There is considerable force in the State Government's contention that the economy of the whole region has, in consequence, become integrated. Thus, the two main irrigation or power projects in the State, namely, the Ganga and Sarda Canal systems cover both the eastern and the western parts of Uttar Pradesh. The Yamuna hydel project is to be located in Dehra Dun, and the Ramganga Canal is intended mainly for the west; but even in these cases, a considerable area in central and eastern Uttar Pradesh, as far eastwards as Fatehpur, will be served by the projects which are now under consideration. It will not be desirable, therefore, in the absence of any strong or compelling reason, to create a situation in which the headworks of all the three or four major projects will be left in the west, though some of these have also to serve the benefit areas in the eastern districts.

612. The existing State has been able to avoid a great deal of expenditure which might otherwise have been necessary, if two or more States had been created. We see no reason for imposing this unnecessary expenditure on this area. Besides, we must bear in mind the facts that the State has now committed all its resources to its economic development, and that the scope which may exist for increasing the revenue in the immediate future seems to be limited. The State has, for example, entered into a contractual obligation with the bhumidars not to revise land revenue settlements for a period of forty years. Partition of the State in these circumstances is bound to lead to the dislocation of the administration, besides creating financial difficulties for one or more of the new units.

613. In view of what we have said above it is not possible for us to recommend that the dislocation and disturbance which will inevitably be caused by the division of the Uttar Pradesh must be faced as incidental to a major reform which is independently justified. The existing unit should, therefore, continue.

614. Our colleague Shri K. M. Panikkar does not subscribe to the recommendation contained in this Chapter regarding the future of the Uttar Pradesh. His views on this subject are contained in a separate note which is appended.