

THE UNION AND ITS TERRITORY

Article 1: Name and territory of the Union

1. India, that is Bharat, shall be a Union of States.
2. The States and the territories thereof shall be as specified in the First Schedule.
3. The territory of India shall comprise:
 - I. The territories of the States
 - II. The Union territories specified in the First Schedule; and such other territories as may be acquired.

The expression 'Union of India' should be distinguished from the expression 'territory of India'. While the Union of India consists of the 28 States which enjoy a Constitutional relationship with the Centre, the 'territory of India' includes the entire over which the sovereignty of India extends.

The Indian Union is not a result of an agreement among the units. The Union has been created because of administrative convenience. Hence, the units do not enjoy the right to secede from the Union. Speaking in the Constituent Assembly Dr. Ambedkar said: "*The Americans had to wage a civil war to establish that the states have no right of secession and that their federation was indestructible. The Drafting Committee thought it was better to make it clear at the outset rather than to leave to speculation or to dispute.*"

Thus, we can conclude that the Indian Union is indestructible.

Article 2: Admission or establishment of new States

Parliament may by law admit into the Union, or establish, new States on such terms and conditions as it thinks fit.

Article 3: Formation of new States and alteration of areas, boundaries or names of existing States

Parliament may by law

1. Form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State
2. Increase the area of any State
3. Diminish the area of any State
4. Alter the boundaries of any State
5. Alter the name of any State [Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States, the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference or within such further period as the President may allow and the period so specified or allowed has expired.]

PROCESS OF FORMATION OF A NEW STATE

Article 3 deals with the power of a Parliament to change the name, area and boundary of a State. For such a change a bill must be introduced in either house of the Parliament. Such a bill can only be introduced with the recommendation of the President. Before, its introduction in the Parliament, the President has to refer the same to the concerned state legislature which has to express its opinion within the time frame set by the President. The opinion of the state is not binding on the Parliament. After the expiry of the time limit set by the President it is presumed that the State has given its views. After introduction in the Parliament, even if the bill undergoes a large change in content it need not be referred again to the state legislature. The bill has to be passed by a simple majority in the Parliament. Then after getting President's assent a new state is formed.



Thus, the states are destructible.

It has been aptly said that *India is an indestructible union with destructible states*.

Andhra was the first state to be created on the basis of language in 1953.

The States Reorganization Commission

In December 1953, Prime Minister **Jawaharlal Nehru** appointed the States Reorganisation Commission to prepare for the creation of states on linguistic lines. This was headed by Justice **Fazal Ali** and the commission itself was also known as the *Fazal Ali Commission*. The efforts of this commission were overseen by **Govind Ballabh Pant**, who served as *Home Minister* from December 1954. The commission created a report in 1955 recommending the reorganisation of India's states.

The States Reorganization Act

The States Reorganization Act of 1956 was a major reform of the boundaries and governance of *India's states and territories*. The act reorganized the boundaries of India's states along linguistic lines, and amended the *Indian Constitution* to replace the three types of states, known as Parts A, B, and C states, with a single type of state.

Although additional changes to India's state boundaries have been made since 1956, the States Reorganization Act of 1956 remains the single most extensive change in state boundaries since the independence of India in 1947.

Changes to states and union territories

On *November 1, 1956*, India was divided into the following states and union territories:

States

- ☐ **Andhra Pradesh:** Andhra was renamed Andhra Pradesh, and enlarged by the addition of the *Telangana* region of erstwhile *Hyderabad State*.
- ☐ *Assam*
- ☐ *Bihar*
- ☐ **Bombay State:** The state was enlarged by the addition of Saurashtra and Kutch, the Marathi-speaking districts of *Nagpur Division* of Madhya Pradesh, and the *Marathwada* region of Hyderabad. The southernmost

districts of Bombay were transferred to Mysore State. (In 1960, the state was split into the modern states of *Maharashtra and Gujarat*.)

- ☐ *Jammu and Kashmir*
- ☐ **Kerala:** formed by the merger of Travancore-Cochin state with the *Malabar District* of Madras State.
- ☐ **Madhya Pradesh:** Madhya Bharat, Vindhya Pradesh, and *Bhopal* were merged into Madhya Pradesh, and the Marathi-speaking districts of *Nagpur Division* were transferred to Bombay State.
- ☐ **Madras State:** the state was reduced to its present boundaries by the transfer of *Malabar District* to the new state of Kerala. (The state was renamed *Tamil Nadu* in 1969.)
- ☐ **Mysore State:** Enlarged by the addition of Coorg state and the *Kannada* speaking districts from southern Bombay state and western *Hyderabad state*. (The state was renamed *Karnataka* in 1973.)
- ☐ Orissa
- ☐ **Punjab:** the Patiala and East Punjab States Union (PEPSU) was merged into Punjab.
- ☐ **Rajasthan:** Rajputana was renamed Rajasthan, and enlarged by the addition of Ajmer-Merwara state.
- ☐ *Uttar Pradesh*
- ☐ *West Bengal*

Union territories

- ☐ *Andaman and Nicobar Islands*
- ☐ Delhi
- ☐ *Himachal Pradesh*
- ☐ *Lakshadweep*
- ☐ *Pondicherry*
- ☐ *Tripura*
- ☐ *Manipur*

The question of linguistic states and its historical setting

The language question in India goes back at least to the last decade of 19th century when people agitated against the Act of 1894 and a viceroy's notification curtailing the freedom of expression via vernacular languages. Forerunners of freedom movement, inspired by the role of language played



in the emergence of nationalism in European countries, grasped the efficiency of Indian languages as means of mass communication in the early phase of freedom movement. Lokmanya Tilak may perhaps the first national figure to appreciate the diversity of languages and boasted Congress to commence work in vernacular languages and also advocated reorganization of the provinces on a linguistic basis. He wrote as early as in 1891 in *Kesari*, "the present administrative division of India is the result of certain historical process and in some cases purely result of accident...if they are replaced by units formed on a linguistic basis, each of them will have some measure of homogeneity and will provide encouragement to the people and languages of the respective regions."

The genesis of the movement of linguistic statehood can be traced to the movement against the partition of Bengal in 1905. Curzon divided Bengal which was linguistically homogenous unit into religiously heterogeneous units to stem the militant freedom movement. This colonial administrative action helped the Bengali speaking people to learn to think in terms of linguistic unity. The movement for reunification of Bengal basically turned out to be a large scale movement to reorganize the provinces based on language in the eastern region of India. Reflecting this popular sentiment Indian National Congress in 1905 at its Calcutta sessions opposed Curzon's decision. The resolution also stated, "This congress recommends the adoption of some arrangement which would be consistent with administrative efficiency and would place the entire Bengali speaking community under undivided administration." Finally colonial administration was forced to undo the bifurcation of Bengal on religion basis but at the same time carved out Assam and Bihar as separate provinces in 1911 on linguistic basis. However, the acceptance of federalism by the Indian National Congress in 1916 at the Lucknow Congress inspired the demands for such several states. This was reinforced on April 8, 1917, when the AICC proposed to carve out a Telugu-speaking state from the Madras Presidency on the basis of the recommendation of the Lucknow Congress. Similarly Home Rule movement also emphasized the need for creation of linguistic provinces. Home Rule movement served as an important milestone

in recognizing linguistically homogenous areas. Mrs. Besant in her presidential address in Calcutta sessions in 1917 said, "Sooner or later, preferably sooner, provinces will have to be redelimited on a linguistic basis." Subsequently, the Congress in its 1920 Nagpur Session accepted in principle the creation of linguistic states.

Followed by all these developments, in 1928, in the Report of the Nehru Committee (consisting of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir Ali Imam, Subhash Chandra Bose etc., under Motilal Nehru's Chairmanship), for the first time incorporated a demand for linguistic re-organisation of provinces. The report also provided an elaborated justification as, "Partly geographical and partly economic and financial, but the main considerations must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned...Hence, it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis." Emerging federalism in India forced the colonial administration to appoint Indian Statutory Commission on linguistic reorganisation of provinces. Diverse claims were put forward before the Commission to redistribute the provincial territories on linguistic basis. But the commission observed, "in no case the linguistic or racial principle can be accepted as the sole test". Meanwhile at the ground level, the aspirations for such independent states within the territory of India caught the imagination of people. "This principle was subsequently officially adopted by the Congress and included in its election manifesto. On November 27, 1947, in the Constituent Assembly Prime Minister Nehru on behalf of the Government of India accepted the principle underlying the demand for linguistic provinces.

Andhra as a separate state always turned out to be a political issue. Even in Constituent Assembly, government of India made a statement that Andhra could be mentioned as a separate unit in the new constitution prompting the Drafting Committee to constitute a separate committee to inquire in to demands of linguistic regions. Thus the Dhar Commission came in to existence with a mandate of examine and report on the formation of new provinces of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala, and Maharashtra. The commission submitted its report on December 10th, 1948. The Committee



stated in its recommendations, "The formation of provinces on exclusively or even mainly linguistic considerations is not in the larger interests of the Indian nation and should not be taken in hand." The commission went on to say, " bilingual districts in border areas, which have developed an economic and organic life of their own, should not be broken up and should be disposed of on considerations of their own special needs." Dhar commission asked government of India to reorganize the states on the basis of geographical continuity, financial self sufficiency, administrative convenience, capacity for future's development. At the same time Nehru, Vallabhai, Pattabhi committee appointed by Congress shifted the emphasis from language as basis to security, unity and economic prosperity, thus backtracking its own election manifesto. This was perhaps influenced by the prevailing situation immediately after the partition. The three member committee of Congress felt that supporting "such federal demands will come in the way of growth of India as a nation" in Patel's words.

That was the time when the then Communist Party of India was mobilizing the masses against the Nizam rule in the name of Andhra Mahasabha. Formation of separate state Vishalandhra, consisting of all Telugu speaking people scattered across the regions was one of the slogan of Andhra Mahasabha. As the movement progressed, this slogan caught the imagination of people. People like Ramananda Teertha supported the demand for Vishalandhra. Thus, the notion, Telangana was always separate and was unified with Andhra against the will of people is a misnomer and false propaganda. Majority of land lords and razakars opposed Vishalandhra and supported Hyderabad commissioner as it protects their proprietary interests. The Telangana struggle brought back the key issues of land reform and linguistic states in to the national agenda which finally the central government had to reckon with. In 1952, July 16th, Sundarayya proposed a private member's bill seeking the formation of linguistic Andhra state. In this speech Sundarayya said, " Rather than with these kind of multi-lingual states, the country will be more united once the linguistic reorganization of states is done...If these demands are not met, the situation will be more volatile...Even for the time being, the central

government accepted the demand of Andhra State, that is not the end of the matter. As my friend Kotamraju Rama Rao said, we won't relent until and unless Vishalandhra is formed with Hyderabad as its capital." Nehru was on record refusing the demand.

On the other side dissatisfied by Congress inaction on linguistic states demand, prominent Congress leader from Andhra region, Potti Sri Ramulu died after 58 days in to his fast. Sri Ramulu death engulfed entire Andhra in chaos. The spontaneous protests were so wide spread and intense that the central government was forced to give to the demand. To this effect a bill was introduced in parliament on 2nd September, 1953. The government at that time took enough caution not to use the word " linguistic state" for known reasons. Speaking in Rajya Sabha on that occasion, Sundarayya criticized Nehru government severely. He told parliament, " even after 30 years of experience, the government is trying to negate the principle of linguistic states by merely refuting it. People will succeed in getting the linguistic states formed....Government announced that they will be appointing another commission on this issue. Now the issue is whether the government will announce the formation of Andhra state on 1st of October or not ? Nothing short will solve the problem." Thus on October 1, 1953, new state of Andhra came in to being by bifurcating Madras state.

In line with these arguments, the Communist Party of India in its fourth conference in 1956 April 19-29th at Palghat passed a resolution demanding linguistic reorganization of states calling, "the struggle for linguistic states is an integral part for better life and democracy." The resolution warned, "under no circumstances, therefore, can the masses be allowed to be divided by such disruptive activities. Such disruptive activities not only weaken the cause of linguistic reorganization of states, but disrupt the unity of our people so essential of democratic and economic advance." Yielding to all these pressures and mass mobilizations, Nehru government set up States Reorganisation Commission, popularly known as Fazal Ali Commission. The commission went into the details of various demands pertaining to the clubbing of Telangana and Andhra into a single unit. In Paragraphs numbered 369-389,



commission dealt about the problems and advantages of both Andhra, Telangana as independent states as well as united state.

The advantages of Vishalandhra, in the own words of the SRC, are as follows. In para 371 commission felt, "The advantages of a larger Andhra state including Telangana are that it will bring into existence a State about 32 millions with a considerable hinterland, with large water and power resources, adequate mineral wealth and valuable raw materials. This will also solve the difficulty and vexing problem of finding a permanent capital for Andhra, the twin cities of Hyderabad and Secundarabad are very well suited to be the capital of Vishalandhra." And also the commission went on saying, "The creation of Vishalandhra is an ideal to which numerous individuals and public bodies, both in Andhra and Telangana, have been passionately attached over a long period of times and unless there are strong reasons to the contrary, this sentiment is entitled to consideration." The commission also said, "The advantages of the formation of Vishalandhra are obvious. The desirability of bringing the Krishna and Godavari rivers basin under unified control, the trade affiliations between Telangana and Andhra and the suitability of Hyderabad as the capital for the entire region are, in brief, the arguments." (para 381) At the same time. Fazal Ali commission's recommendations in favor of Vishalandhra are not without a word of caution. The report in its observations in a chapter titled "The case for Telangana" dealt in details the probable apprehensions that may become a hurdle. The report said, "What ever the explanation may be, some Telangana leaders seem to fear that the result of unification will be to exchange some settled sources of revenue, out of which development schemes may be financed, for financial uncertainty similar to that which Andhra is now faced." (Para 376) "Telangana does not wish to lose its present independent rights in relation to the utilization of the waters of Krishna and Godavari" (para 377) "One of the principle causes of opposition of Vishalandhra also seems to be the apprehension felt by the educationally backward people of Telangana" (para 378) At the same time, they warned central government saying, "anything short of supervision by the Central government over the measures intended to meet

the special needs of Telangana will be found ineffective, and we are not disposed to suggest any such arrangement in regard to Telangana." The commission also suggested way out in favor of Vishalandhra by recommending, "we have come to conclusion that it will be in the interest of Andhra and Telangana, if for the present, the Telangana area is to constitute in to a separate State, which may be known as the Hyderabad State with a provision for its unification with Andhra after the general elections likely to be held in or about 1961, if by a two third majority the legislature of the residency of Hyderabad State expresses itself in favor of such unification." It also explained the advantages of this arrangement, "while the objective of the unification of the Andhras will neither be blurred nor impeded during a period of five or six years, the two governments may have stabilized their administrative machinery and, if possible, also reviewed their land revenue systems, etc, the object in view being the attainment of uniformity. The intervening period may incidentally provide an opportunity for allaying apprehensions and achieving the consensus of opinion necessary for a real union between the two States." Thus neither commission disposed completely in favor of separate Andhra or separate Telangana. It favored Vishalandhra with necessary caution and care. Thus, Andhra Pradesh came in to existence with effect from November 1st 1956.

Linguistic Reorganization: Merits and demerits

It was by the *State Reorganization Act, 1956* that the states were reorganized on linguistic basis. It has given political uniformity to the state. Cultural integration has led to a positive feeling in the minds of people, that they are the masters of their own destiny. The linguistic reorganization has enabled the state to have a language for administration which is understood by majority of people of the State. Before 1956, English was considered the language of administration in the states which kept majority of the people away from and ignorant of the functioning of the state administration. Thus, it has given strength to democratic form of governance by ensuring people participation in administration. It has also helped in promotion of vernacular languages or regional languages.



On the other side linguistic reorganization of states has led to the growth of regionalism in the country which has, in the recent times, proved to be a major hindrance in the path of national integration in the country. The linguistic reorganization of States may also slow down the development of a single national language of the country.

NEED FOR SMALL STATES

The demand for separate states of Telangana and Vidarbha has been under consideration of successive governments for some decades. Since the demand for smaller states has been raised by many groups, the central government should seriously consider appointing a State Reorganization Commission to go into the merits of the respective claims. Needless to say, whenever the demands for new States are pressed by the people of the region, the opponents of the creation of small states come up with a variety of arguments. Mainly, that the formation of linguistic States in the 1950s was itself a mistake as it seriously harmed the process of national integration. This may prove to be a fallacious argument for two reasons. One that formation of new States in the 50s was not entirely on the basis of language, linguistic identity was only one of the many criteria followed in creating them. Two, experience has shown that linguistic States have in no way been a hindrance to national integration, they have only made administration smooth and better. It is also argued that if linguistic identity was the only criterion, there should have been only one state for all Hindi speaking people. This of course, would have been an administrative monstrosity.

Importantly, the framers of the Constitution were fully conscious that there would be need for changing the boundaries of a State which were primarily created for the convenience of the colonial rulers. The reason why very liberal provisions were incorporated under Article 3 of the Constitution, giving the union cabinet and Parliament adequate powers to form new states by separation of territories from existing States or uniting two or more States, or parts of some States or altering the name of a State.

The most important justification for the creation of new States is that this would help the cause of better governance. Those familiar with the

administration of development programmes know that one of the reasons for their unsatisfactory progress has been the inadequate supervision by the responsible persons.

Under the Parliamentary system of Government, the formulation of policies is the responsibility of the political leadership with the assistance of senior civil servants, while the implementation is mainly the responsibility of the bureaucrats at the field level. Senior officers are expected to maintain a close watch on programme implementation through field visits. But in the case of States with a very large population, this important responsibility is not adequately attended to.

Therefore, reducing the size of the states has become an absolute necessity if the people are to get full benefits of development programmes. Out of the 28 States in the Indian Union, 10 have a population above fifty millions and five, namely Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh have a population of 75 million each. The demand for the division of States has arisen most forcefully from the people of these States as they have been experiencing the disadvantages of having a large size of population.

Uttar Pradesh, with a population of nearly 166 million, is a chronic case of under-development. The need for its division is obvious. In the past, some senior politicians had resisted the idea of carving smaller States out of UP as they feared that such a step would reduce its importance in the national politics. But now most political parties are in favour of carving three or four new States out of UP, notwithstanding the creation of Uttaranchal.

Besides, there have been experiments, through Constitutional amendments, to provide for preferential treatment to certain regions within a State in matters such as education and employment. The boldest attempt in this direction was the provision for the establishment of Development Boards for backward regions like Vidarbha and Marathwada in Maharashtra. Article 371(2) of the Constitution provides for vesting the Governor of the state the power for ensuring equitable allocation of funds to the backward regions. It may be recalled that when Dr. P.C. Alexander was the Governor of Maharashtra, he held the view that the special powers for the



Governor diluted the responsibility of the Chief Minister and his ministerial colleagues who were always to remain accountable to the legislature.

In the ultimate analysis, if a separate State is what the overwhelming majority of the people of a region wish to have on grounds of better administrative convenience and efficiency, conceding such a demand will be in keeping with the spirit of Article 3 of the Constitution and with the principles of democracy.

Telangana corresponds to the Telugu speaking part of the erstwhile princely state of Hyderabad. The region lies to the west of the Eastern ghats range. Telangana came under Muslim rule in 14th century. Strangely, it was never under direct British rule. The central government established unified Andhra Pradesh on November 1, 1956 on linguistic lines.

The first battle for separation of Telangana from Andhra Pradesh erupted in 1969 under the leadership of Marri Chenna Reddy. The movement was suppressed. This disturbed the lives of hundreds of thousands of people one way or the other. It was a big blow to the generation of the times.

In 2004, the Congress party and the TRS had an electoral alliance in the Telangana region with the promise of a separate Telangana state. TRS joined the coalition government in 2004 and was successful in making a separate Telangana state a part of the common minimum program (CMP). In September 2006, TRS withdrew support from the Congress-led coalition government. However, once again, it was felt that the Congress party did not fulfill the promise made to the people of Telangana.

In December 2009, the demand for a separate Telangana state was being raised by all the four crore people of Telangana in unison. The TRS chief's fast-unto-death mission to free his land pressurised the Central government.

On the night of December 9, 2009, the Congress Party decided to accept the demand for Telangana and promised to initiate a process for it.

Telangana Rashtra Samithi's leader K Chandrasekhar Rao, who pressurised the Centre government to set a deadline for the formation of a separate Telangana state, thus ended his 11 day fast, saying from his hospital bed that this was a

"true victory of the people of Telangana."

By the 16th of December, at least 147 legislators (including Praja Rajyam Party Founder Chiranjeevi) and many Members of Parliament had resigned in protest of the Government's decision to begin discussions on forming a new state of Telangana.

On December 23, 2009 the Government of India announced that no action on Telangana will be taken until a consensus is reached by all parties. On February 3, 2010 the government announced the 5 member-Srikrishna committee with a deadline of December 31, 2010. Srikrishna committee submitted its report on December 31, 2010.

SriKrishna Committee Report on Telangana

The report of the five-member committee headed by the former Supreme Court judge, Justice SriKrishna, gave its recommendations after nearly 11 months of consultations in the state on December 31, 2010. The two-volume 461-page report has also suggested maintaining status quo with a rider that it is the least favoured option. Following are the options and explanation given by the committee:

1. **Maintaining Status Quo:** The committee said it is of the unanimous view that it would not be a practical approach to simply maintain the status quo in respect of the situation. "Some intervention is definitely required and though maintaining the existing status quo is an option it is favoured the least," the panel says.
2. **Bifurcation of the state into Seemandhra and Telangana:** With Hyderabad as a union territory and the two states developing their own capitals in due course: "There is a definite likelihood of serious backlashes in Telangana region and on overall consideration, the Committee found this option was also not practicable."
3. **Bifurcation of the state into Rayala-Telangana and Coastal Andhra Regions: With Hyderabad being an integral part of Rayala-Telangana:** "This scenario is not likely to be accepted either by the pro-Telangana or by the pro-United Andhra protagonists. While this option may have



economic justification, the committee believes that this option may not offer a resolution which would be acceptable to people of all three regions," it says.

4. Bifurcation of Andhra Pradesh into Seemandhra and Telangana with enlarged Hyderabad Metropolis as a separate Union Territory. This Union Territory will have geographical linkage and contiguity via Nalgonda district in the south-east to Guntur district in coastal Andhra and via Mahaboobnagar district in the south to Kurnool district in Rayalaseema: "This is likely to receive stiff opposition from Telangana protagonists and it may be difficult to reach a political consensus in making this solution acceptable to all," it says.

5. Bifurcation of the state into Telangana and Seemandhra as per existing boundaries with Hyderabad as the capital of Telangana and Seemandhra to have a new capital: "The committee feels that this option has to be given consideration. The continuing demand for a separate Telangana has some merit and is not entirely justified. In case this option is exercised, the apprehensions of the coastal Andhra and the Rayalaseema people and others who were settled in Hyderabad and other districts of Telangana with regard to their investments, properties, livelihood and employment would need to be adequately addressed." Considering all aspects, the Committee felt that while creation of separate Telangana would satisfy a large majority of the people from the region, it will also throw up several serious problems. Therefore, after taking into account of the pros and cons the committee did not think it to be most preferred, but the second best option. Separation is recommended only in case it is unavoidable and if decision can be reached amicably amongst all the three regions."

6. Keeping the state united by simultaneously providing certain definite constitutional/statutory measures for socio-economic development and political

empowerment of Telangana region — creation of a statutorily-empowered Telangana Regional Council: "In this option, it is proposed to keep the state united and provide constitutional/statutory measures to address the core socio-economic concerns about the development of the Telangana region. This can be done through the establishment of a statutorily-empowered Telangana Regional Council with adequate transfer of funds, functions and functionaries. The regional council will provide a legislative consultative mechanism for the subjects to be dealt with by the Council." The united Andhra option is being suggested for continuing the development momentum of the three regions and keeping in mind the national perspective. With firm political and administrative management it should be possible to convey conviction to the people that this option would be in the best interest of all and would provide satisfaction to the maximum number of the people in the state." It would also take care of the uncertainty over the future of Hyderabad as a bustling, educational, industrial and IT hub/destination. For management of water and irrigation resources on an equitable basis, a technical body, i.e., Water Management Board and an Irrigation Project Development Corporation in expanded role have been recommended. The above course of action should meet all the issues raised by Telangana people satisfactorily." The committee discussed all aspects of this option and while it acknowledges that there will be certain difficulties in its implementation, on balance, it found it the most workable option in the given circumstances and in the best interest of the social and economic welfare of the people of all the three regions. The core issue being one of the socio-economic development and good governance, the committee keeping the national perspective in mind, is of the considered view that this option stands out as the best way forward," it says.

■■■

