

## SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

### I. States of the Indian Union.

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. (Paragraph 14).

2. The formation of British Indian provinces in the eighteenth and nineteenth 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 nineteenth century the policy of balance and counterpoise began to override purely administrative considerations in making territorial changes. (Paragraphs 15 to 27).

3. At the time of their integration the former princely states were in different stages of development. Some transitional 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. (Paragraphs 28 to 40).

4. No State of the Indian Union represents a pre-existing sovereign unit. A special feature of the Indian Constitution is that it empowers Parliament to admit or establish new States, to increase or diminish the area of an existing State or to alter its boundaries. (Paragraphs 41 to 43).

### II. Rationale of Reorganisation

5. The British gave only qualified support to the linguistic principle in making territorial adjustments between administrative units. (Paragraphs 46 to 50).

6. The Indian National Congress accepted in 1920 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. (Paragraphs 51 to 66).

7. Andhra was formed by the separation of the 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. (Paragraphs 68 to 71).

### III. Time for Reorganisation.

8. The problem of the reorganisation of States is urgent as with large-scale planning the country has to think in terms of enduring political units. The integration of States has removed the main hurdle in the way of rationalisation of the existing units. Further deferment of a general reorganisation will cause dissatisfaction and disappointment. (Paragraphs 72 to 91).

### IV. Factors bearing on Reorganisation

9. In proposing any changes in the existing structure, due consideration should be given to the unsettling consequences of reorganisation. The changes proposed should be such as would compensate, in terms of the welfare of the people, for the administrative dislocation and the heavy burden on the administrative and financial resources of the country which they entail. (Paragraphs 92 to 106).

10. In the interests of national unity, it is necessary that the administrative and political structure of the country should be based on the primacy of the nation. (Paragraphs 107 to 112).

11. 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. (Paragraphs 113 to 116).

12. It is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of a single test of either language or culture; a balanced approach, which takes all relevant factors into account, is necessary. (Paragraphs 117 to 169).

13. Financial viability has an important bearing on reorganisation proposals, but it has to be considered along with other relevant factors. (Paragraphs 170 to 184).

14. Some degree of dislocation in the working of the next plan is likely to be caused by any scheme of reorganisation; this dislocation, however, should be considered along with the possible advantages of reorganisation. Steps should also be taken to minimise the unsettling effects of reorganisation. (Paragraphs 185 to 196).

15. 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 it would be desirable to avoid as far as possible wide disparities in resources between the various States. (Paragraphs 197 to 210).

16. The units should be large enough to ensure administrative efficiency and the co-ordination of economic development and welfare activities. (Paragraphs 211 to 220).

17. 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. (Paragraphs 221 to 228).

18. 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. (Paragraphs 229 to 231).

19. Geographical contiguity of the units is important from the point of view of administrative convenience. Other geographical factors have to be regarded as secondary. (Paragraphs 232 and 233).

20. No proposals for reorganisation should be determined by a single test.\* Conclusions have to be reached after taking into consideration the totality of circumstances in each case. (Paragraph 235).

#### V. Basic pattern of the component units

21. The existing constitutional disparity between the different constituent units of the Indian Union should disappear as a necessary consequence of reorganisation. (Paragraphs 236 to 239).

22. Part B States can be equated with Part A States by omitting Article 371 of the Constitution and by abolishing the institution of the Rajpramukh. (Paragraphs 240 to 245).

23. The existing Part C States which provide no adequate recompense for all the constitutional, administrative and financial problems which they pose should, to the extent practicable, be merged in the adjoining larger States. (Paragraphs 246 to 268).

24. In respect of three of the Part C States, namely, Himachal Pradesh, Kutch and Tripura, the Central Government should retain

supervisory power for a specified period to maintain their present pace of development. (Paragraphs 269 to 275).

25. Such of the existing Part C States as cannot be merged in the adjoining areas for security and other imperative considerations should be administered by the Centre as "territories". (Paragraphs 276 to 284).

26. The component units of the Indian Union should thus consist of two categories:

- (a) "States" forming primary federating units of the Indian Union; and
- (b) "territories" which are centrally-administered. (Paragraphs 285 to 287).

## VI. Proposals for Reorganisation

27. According to the scheme of reorganisation which is dealt with in Chapters II to XIX of Part III of this report, there should be sixteen constituent units, to be called States, and three administered territories. The proposals regarding these units are summarised below.

### STATES

28. 1. *Madras*.—This State should include the existing territories subject to the following adjustments, namely,

- (i) the five taluks of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam, Vilavancode 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. (Paragraphs 289 to 301).

2. *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 Amindive Islands. (Paragraphs 302 to 318).

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

- (a) the present State of Mysore, excluding the Siruguppa taluk, the Bellary taluk, the Hospet taluk and a small portion of the Mallapuram sub-taluk of the Bellary district;
- (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. (Paragraphs 319 to 358).

4. *Hyderabad*.—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, Mahbubnagar, Nalgonda, Warangal (including Khammam), Karimnagar, Adilabad, 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.

The future of the remaining areas of Hyderabad, consisting of the districts known as Marathwada, is dealt with later on under Bombay. (Paragraphs 359 to 393).

5. *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. (Paragraphs 394 to 401).

6. *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. (Paragraphs 402 to 439).

7. *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. (Paragraphs 440 to 457).

8. *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. (Paragraphs 458 to 493).

9. *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 and the Loharu sub-tehsil of the Hissar district of the Punjab. (Paragraphs 494 to 513).

10. *The Punjab*.—There is no case for dividing the present Punjab State. PEPSU and the Himachal Pradesh should, however, be merged in the Punjab. (Paragraphs 514 to 579).\*

The Loharu sub-tehsil of the Hissar district, as already stated, should be transferred to Rajasthan. (Paragraph 506).

Apart from the safeguards referred to in paragraph 24 of this summary, Himachal Pradesh should be represented in the Punjab cabinet by at least one member. (Paragraph 564).

---

\*Subject to Chairman's note on Himachal Pradesh,

11. *Uttar Pradesh*.—There is no case for dividing the Uttar Pradesh, and this State should continue in its existing form. (Paragraphs 595 to 614).\*

12. *Bihar*.—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. (Paragraphs 615 to 630).\*\*

13. *West Bengal*.—A portion of the Purnea district east of the river Mahananda and the Purulia sub-district of the Manbhum district minus the Chas thana should be transferred from Bihar to West Bengal. (Paragraphs 631 to 676).\*\*

Subject to the recommendations summarised in the immediately preceding paragraph, no boundary adjustments seem to be called for in order to satisfy claims and counter-claims in respect of the border areas of Bihar, West Bengal, Assam and Orissa.

14. *Assam*.—Assam should continue as it is subject to the changes mentioned below.

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; special attention should, however, be paid to the development of the hill districts and an enquiry into the working of the autonomous bodies created under the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution should be undertaken.

Tripura should be merged in Assam.

The present arrangements with regard to the North East Frontier Agency should continue. (Paragraphs 677 to 722).

15. *Orissa*.—No changes are called for in the boundaries of Orissa which were fixed in 1936 after prolonged and detailed examination. (Paragraphs 733 to 749).\*\*

16. *Jammu and Kashmir*.—No recommendations are made in regard to Jammu and Kashmir. (Paragraph 751).

#### TERRITORIES.

29. 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.

---

\* Subject to Shri K. M. Panikkar's note on Uttar Pradesh.

\*\* Chairman has not associated himself with investigating and deciding the territory disputes to which Bihar is a party.

1. *Delhi*.—Delhi should be constituted into such a centrally-administered territory; the question of creating a municipal Corporation with substantial powers should be considered. (Paragraphs 580 to 594).

2. *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. (Paragraphs 723 to 732).

3. *Andaman and Nicobar Islands*.—The *status quo* in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands should continue. (Paragraph 753).

30. 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 clarified. (Paragraph 753).

### VII. Safeguards for linguistic groups

31. Constitutional recognition should be given to the right of linguistic minorities to have instruction in their mother-tongues at the primary school stage subject to a sufficient number of students being available. The Central Government should acquire power to enforce this right on the lines of the provisions contained in Article 347 of the Constitution. (Paragraphs 757 to 776).

32. The Government of India should adopt, in consultation with the State Governments, a clear code to govern the use of different languages at different levels of State administrations and take steps, under Article 347, to ensure that this code is followed. (Paragraphs 778 to 785).

33. The domicile tests in force in certain States operate to the disadvantage of minority groups. The Government of India should, therefore, undertake legislation under Article 16(3) of the Constitution in order to simplify and liberalise the requirements as to residence. (Paragraphs 786 to 788).

34. In examinations regulating entry into the public services of the states, a candidate should have the option to elect as the medium, apart from the main language of the State, the Union language, namely, English or Hindi, or the language of a minority constituting about fifteen to twenty per cent or more of the population of the State. (Paragraphs 789 and 790).

35. As far as possible, Public Service Commissions should be constituted to serve more than one State. (Paragraph 791).

36. Appointments to Public Service Commissions serving even single states should be made by President as in the case of appointments to joint Public Service Commissions. (Paragraph 791).



37. The services of the Governors should be utilised for enforcing the safeguards for linguistic minorities. (Paragraphs 792 to 800).

### VIII. Administrative and other matters

38. The reconstitution of the sanctioned state cadres and the integration of services should be accorded very high priority, and must be decided on the basis of certain general principles, due regard being paid to the options of the employees, the need for a mixed element in the services, *inter se* seniority in the State of origin, etc., and also the needs of the new States. (Paragraphs 802 to 810).

39. The body constituted to integrate the service personnel of different States should be one that inspires confidence, and only one appeal against decisions regarding integration should be permitted. (Paragraph 810).

40. After the scheme of reorganisation has been given effect to, it may be necessary for some of the new administrations to review the number and territorial extent of the existing districts as well as Commissioners' charges and the rationalisation of the administrative structure. (Paragraph 813).

41. Decisions on the reorganisation proposals should, if possible, be taken before the next Finance Commission commences its enquiries. (Paragraph 815).

42. It may be necessary to grant ways and means advances to newly-constituted units in order to help them to tide over temporary difficulties. (Paragraph 818).

43. Pending a comprehensive review, grants-in-aid on revenue or capital account as well as long-term loans should be made available to the new units as nearly as possible on the existing basis. The Government of India should refix the existing statutory and development grants and long-term loans with reference to the principles on which such grants or loans have been sanctioned. (Paragraphs 819 to 821).

44. Payments under Article 278 of the Constitution may be continued and apportioned population-wise among new units until such time as the position is reviewed by the Finance Commission. (Paragraph 822).

45. Pending the amendment of Article 264(b) of the Constitution, appropriate portions of the divisible pools pertaining to the Part C States, which are now retained by the Centre, may be distributed among the new units, where necessary, in proportion to their population. (Paragraph 823).

46. Assets and liabilities should be divided on the basis of principles which should as far as practicable be of general application. (Paragraphs 824 to 826).

47. Financial settlements in the case of Part C States need not be elaborate, but may be based on a review of the position as it exists today and the needs of these areas. (Paragraph 827).

48. The question of setting up some special machinery to expedite the final settlements regarding assets and liabilities should be considered. (Paragraphs 828 and 829).

✓ 49. It will be necessary to adapt current inter-state agreements regarding water rights, etc., with due regard to the broad basis on which they may have been drawn up, and this question should be taken up as soon as possible after decisions regarding reorganisation have been reached. (Paragraph 830).

50. The creation of special development boards for certain areas which are under-developed should be considered. (Paragraph 839).

51. A permanent body, in which members of the Planning Commission may be included, should be set up in order to examine the grievances, if any, on the score of the alleged neglect of certain areas. (Paragraph 841).

52. The Government of India should consider the question of formulating an industrial location policy for the whole of India, in order to ensure the equitable distribution of development expenditure. (Paragraphs 842 to 844).

53. As a general rule, fifty per cent. of the new entrants in the All-India Services should be from outside the State concerned, this computation being made after deducting the number of posts in any State which are to be filled by promotion. (Paragraph 855).

54. Certain All-India Services, namely, the Indian Service of Engineers, the Indian Forest Service and the Indian Medical and Health Service should be constituted. (Paragraphs 856 and 857).

55. Regular transfers to and from the Centre and the States in respect of personnel belonging to the All-India Services should, as far as possible, be arranged. (Paragraph 858).

56. The curriculum of studies for the new entrants to the All-India and Central Services should include such basic and essential subjects as Indian history, geography, religions, customs and manners. (Paragraph 859).

57. In formulating a policy regarding the recognition of Hindi in competitive examinations for the All-India and other services, the need for encouraging the study of other Indian languages, and particularly of the South Indian languages, should be kept in view. (Paragraph 860).

58. At least one-third of the number of Judges in the High Court of a State should consist of persons who are recruited from outside that State. (Paragraph 861).

59. For some time to come, English should continue to occupy an important place in our universities and institutions of higher learning even after the adoption of Hindi and the regional languages for official and educational purposes. (Paragraphs 862 to 867).

60. The Osmania University should be placed under the Central Government and the medium of instruction in this university should be Hindi. One more central university should be established further South and arrangements must be made for the study of South Indian languages in the north. (Paragraphs 868 and 869).

61. Reorganisation has a legitimate place in this country, but its merits are not only in the political but also in the economic thinking of the country. The limitations must be recognised. If the supremacy of the Union over the States is fully realised, the issues arising out of the reorganisation of States should not assume the proportions of major political controversies. (Paragraphs 871 to 879).