CHAPTER VI

THE REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION: AN ANALYSIS

After giving careful thought to the procedure to be followed, the Reorganisation Commission issued a press Note on 23rd February, 1954, inviting written memorandum from the republic as well as associations interested in the problems of the reorganisation of States.

The total number of such documents received by Commission reached the figure of 1,52,250. However the number of well considered memoranda did not exceed 200.¹

Side by side with the study of these memoranda, the Commission commenced interviewing people from all walks of life. Commission while interviewing the people due care was taken by the interviewees to express their views freely and frankly. The interview started in New Delhi from 1st March, 1954, and continued till the end of July, 1955. Commission started tour on 8th April, 1954. They covered virtually the entire country and visited 104 places which involved traveling over 38 thousand miles. They interviewed over nine thousand persons².

². Ibid Report, para 6, P.ii.
The Members of the Commission made every effort to get a public opinion of a cross-section of people. Care was taken to see that all those who represented public opinion were heard. The people interviewed including numbers of political parties, associations, social workers, journalists, municipal and district representatives and other people representing cultural, educational, linguistic and local interests. The purpose of all India tour was not only to ascertain public opinion but also to make on-the-spot-studies at different places and to understand the background of the problem and the people's sentiments on various aspects of reorganisation.

In examination of the various proposals for reorganisation, the Members of the Commission relied on statistical figures as given in the Censuses of various years. The Census figures for 1951 were complete according to what are known as "Census Tracts". It had therefore been difficult to estimate the mother-tongue figures on a "taluk" or "tehsil"-wise basis. They were given to understand that it might be possible to make estimates of taluk or tehsil-wise figures on the basis of certain statistical assumptions. Having regard, however, to the controversies which surrounded such assumptions, they took into consideration only the

figures as printed in different Census reports in reaching their conclusions.⁴


The Commission formulated their proposals were thus summed up them in the following words: "It is the Union of India that is the basis of our nationality. It is in that Union that our hope for the future are centered. The States are but the limps of the union and while we recognise that the limps must be healthy and strong, any element of weakness in them should be eradicated, it is the strength and the stability of the Union and it capacity to develop and evolve that should be the governing consideration of all changes in the country."⁵

In framing its recommendations, the Commission was guided by certain broad principles contained in its terms of references. They were:

(i) The representation and strengthen-
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The Commission examined all the relevant factors and came to the conclusion that it was neither possible nor desirable to organise States on the basis of a single test of either language or culture. Linguistic homogeneity, in the opinion of the Commission, was an important factor conductive to administrative efficiency but it must not be considered an exclusive and binding principle overriding all other considerations, administrative and financial or political. The Commission emphatically rejected the theory of "one language one state". The idea of a unilingual State breeds a particularist feeling and encourage exclusivism which may tend to blur, if not to obliterate, the feeling of national unity which is yet to develop into a positive concept. Similarly, the Commission repudiated the "homeland" concept which as the outcome of the linguistic unity, strongly emphasised, "the dangerous character of this doctrine especially from the point of view of our national

To begin with Parliamentary Legislation in terms of Article 3 and 4 of the Constitution, in order to give effect to any scheme of reorganisation, must itself entail a great deal of effort and time. If one were to judge by existing tension, the proceeding in States Assemblies, proceedings of Parliamentary Legislation, may be protected and may give rise to strong feelings. Reorganisation of States on a rational basis may also necessitate a number of constitutional amendments which will add considerably to the burden of piloting legislation concerning reorganisation proposals.

A preliminary but essential consideration to bear in mind, therefore, is that no change should be made unless it is a distinct improvement in the existing position and unless the advantages which result from it, in terms of the promotion of "the welfare of the people of each constituent unit, as well as the nation as a whole" - the objectives set before the Commission by the Government of India - are such as to compensate for the heavy burden on the administration.
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trative-financial resources of the country which reorganisation of the existing units must entail. The reorganisation of the States has to be regarded as a means to an end and an end in itself; that being the case, it is quite legitimate to consider whether there is on the whole a balance of advantage in any change.

The Commission considered each individual case on its merits and the conclusions arrived at were based on the totality of circumstances. It, accordingly, recommended that the constitutional disparity between the constituent units of the Indian Union should disappear, because in any scheme of rational reorganisation the regrouping of territories cannot be undertaken by categories. This means the equation of Part-B States with part-A States and the abolition of the institution of the Rajpramukh. Part-C States should be merged with the adjoining States and such of those could not be merged for security and other imperative considerations should be centrally administered territories. The component units of the Indian Union should, therefore, comprise:

(i) "States" forming the federating units of the Indian Union; and
(ii) "Territories" which were to be centrally administered.

Proposed Reorganised Units: The States proposed by the Commission were Andhra, Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Vidharva and West Bengal. The three territories proposed for Central administration were Delhi, Manipur and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The Chairman recommended that Himachal Pradesh should also be Centrally-administered Territory, while Sardar Panikar favoured the creation of a new State to be called the State of Agra, comprising the parts of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Bharat and Vindhya Pradesh\(^{11}\).

The Commission rejected the theory of "one language, one state" and recognised that there were certain obvious limitations to the realisation of unilinguism at the State level. This fact also the need for cementing the unity of India and combating parochial sentiments lead to the Commission to lay stress on adequate safeguards to the linguistic minorities. Among the safeguards recommended for consideration were:

(i) Constitutional recognition of the minorities right to the instruction in their mother-tongue, at the primary school stage and the laying down

of clean policy in regard to secondary education;
(ii) the formulation of clear policy in respect of the use of different languages at different levels of State administration's and its effective implementation;
(iii) the simplification and liberalisation of domiciliary rules;
(iv) option to elect a language, under certain conditions, as the medium of examinations for entry into States services;
(v) Public Service Commission to serve more than one State and appointment it the Commission to be made by the President; and
(vi) utilisation of the services of the Governors for enforcing this safeguards.12.

Study of Recommendation of States Reorganisation Commission on North-East: The States Reorganisation Commission also collected memoranda during his tour in the North-East from the various political and social organisations. The commission studied all the memoranda and prepared a concrete report as proposals based on specific terms of references.
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The major proposals regarding the Eastern and Southern boundaries of Assam need to be considered in this perspective. These, as presented to the Commission can broadly be summarised as follows:

The Assam Pradesh Congress Committee, the local unit of the Communist Party of India, The Tripura State Congress Committee and the Government of Assam were strongly in favour of the Status-quo, Assam, however, welcomed the merger, if possible, of Coochbehar, Manipur and Tripura and the closer connection with the administration of the North-East frontier agency, which was constitutionally part of Assam. The Hill Districts passed for a formation of a "Hill State". This demand, reiterated at the Tura (Garo Hills) Conference of tribal leaders in October, 1954, contemplates the unification of all the Hill Districts mentioned in part-A of the table appended to the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution, including also the Naga Hill District. The Naga National Council seeks independence from Assam and India and to remain aloof from the proposed Hill State. As a compromise between these extreme positions, but for entirely different reasons the formation of a "Kamatapur State" consisting of Goalpara, Garo Hills, Cooch Behar, Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri, or a "Purbhachal State" consisting of the area round Cachar had also been suggested. 13

About Separate Hill State: The demand for creation of a Hill State consisting of all the Hill Districts of the North-East was not considered by the States Reorganisation Commission. The demand was not unanimous. Generally speaking, the United Mikir and North Cachar Hills and the Mizo Hills (Lusai) were not in favour of a separate hill State and the District Council in the Lusai Hills and the Karbia Durbar (Mikir Hills National Council) were infavour of the status-quo. The agitation in favour of a Hill State is, therefore confined to the Garo and Khasi and Jaintia Hills. Owing to their geographical position, there two District and necessarily a closer association with the adjoining plains Districts than the rest of the Hill or tribal areas; even in these two Districts, therefore, as influential section of opinion views with disfavour the formation of a Separate Hill State.

Taking all these factors into consideration the Commission had come to the conclusion that the formation of a Hill State in this region was neither feasible nor in the interest of tribal people themselves. The Hill Districts, therefore, should continue to form part of Assam and no major changes should be made in their present constitutional pattern.  

On Purbanchal State: The proposal for formation of a "Purbanchal State", ------- provides for constitution of Cachar, Tripura, the Mizo Hills (Lusai) Hills, the Naga Hills, Manipur and the NEFA into a new State; it, therefore, reproduces to some extent the proposal for the separation of the Hill Districts from the Assam (Brahmaputra) Valley. The States Reorganisation Commission raised some to the proposal to create a Hill State. Moreover, the Cachar States Reorganisation Committee, itself recognises that this new State would financially in deficit, for quite some time to come. The proposed "Purbanchal State" under any of the schemes that had been suggested would neither the resources nor stability to provide for the security of the Indian Border in this part of the country. It is also obvious that substantial minorities speaking languages other than Bengali would be found in it, with the result that it would provide no real solution of existing difficulties. On the same ground, the Commission also unable to entertain the demand for the creation of Kamatapur State-North-West of Purbachal consisting of Goalpara, Garo Hills, Jalpaiguri, Cooch Behar and Darjeeling.15


On Tripura State: As a small part C State, Tripura could not stand by itself. The west Bengal Government, moreover, had not claimed this area; and its merger in Assam in Com-
mission's opinion, can not be supported among other reasons on the ground that it would be desirable to bring the entire border between India and Pakistan in this region under one single control, namely that of the Assam Government.......

The suggestion made by the Assam Government for the early integration of this frontier area was not feasible and the existing arrangement regarding the North-East Frontier Agency should continue.\(^16\)

The Naga Hill's District owing to the activities of the extremist elements, the law and order situation in this area had been unstable. The States Reorganisation Commission had come to the conclusion that it would not be desirable to suggest any change in regard to the Naga Hills District at present juncture.\(^17\)

On Manipur State: Manipur was a part C State, situated on the India's Eastern border with a population of about 0.6 million. A unit such as this could not be considered administratively viable. Manipur it had also been claimed, had been independent for centuries and its connection with the neighbouring States and indeed with India itself - very recent. (merge Manipur with Indian Union on October 15, 1949) - The State was then receiving substantial aid from


\(^17\) Ibid, para - 717, p. 193.
the centre. Its economic development would be retarded if it was merged either in Assam or in West Bengal or in the Hill Districts. This was because the States Reorganisation Commission recommended that Manipur should for the then continue to be Centrally administered.18

The Study of the Recommendation of States Reorganisation Commission on Goalpara District: West Bengal Congress Committee and other social organisations submitted memoranda claiming Goalpara District of Assam to be transferred and merged with the State of West Bengal before the States Reorganisation Commission. The basis of the claims indicated in all the memoranda was mainly language and culture. They argued that the majority of the people of Goalpara District speaks Bengali. The 1931 Census also indicated and established the Bengali majority. In addition to this once, Goalpara was under Coochbehar Commissionership. Prior to that, Goalpara was within the Rangpur Division. Historically Goalpara was closed to Bengal.

Inspite of this, the Partition had created many problems for West Bengal. Apart from the influx of refugees from Pakistan up to 1953, which might be estimated at about three and half millions. To rehabilitate the refugees, there necessitated more lands. The entire communication system of

Bengal was disrupted since 1947. The Northern Districts of the Presidency Division become less easily accessible from Calcutta; and West Bengal only part A Sate which has geographically not a compact and integrated unit.¹⁹

The claims of West Bengal on Goalpara vividly studied and examined by States Reorganisation Commission. According to States Reorganisation Commission, "There is no evidence, according to 1951 Census, that the Goalpara District is predominantly Bengali speaking. Although the figures have been challenged and reference have been made to the considerable Muslim population in Goalpara which is claimed to be Bengali-speaking, Commission do not have enough evidence on the basis of which the mother-tongue data of 1951 can be disregard. It is true that the latest Census figures show, as compared to the figures of 1931, very striking variations which can not be satisfactory explained. But we find it difficult to admit on that ground alone any claim by West Bengal to Goalpara or any part of it. Such historical connection as there has been between Goalpara and West Bengal has been intermittent and tenuous. The District has now been part of Assam for such a long time that there is no justification for disturbing this position."²⁰

The border dispute between Bengal and Assam was another important issue. The Commission decided that the existing Bengal-Assam boundaries would be continued. The Government of India, accepted the Commission's decision with minor change.

During the tour of the members of the Commission in Dhubri and Assam as whole, the various State and District level political and social organisations submitted memoranda in favour of retaining Goalpara District with Assam. The Assam Pradesh Congress Committee wanted that the District of Coochbehar should be merged with Assam but did not press more to the State Reorganisation Commission and to the Central Government. On the contrary, the Pradesh Congress Committee gave up the decision on the wishes of the people of Coochbehar and would take decision by referendum. But both the Central and State Government of West Bengal did not give any scope of vindicating opinion, by any means of the people of Coochbehar. Assam Sahitya Sabha demanded that language and culture of the district of Coochbehar, Jalpanguri and Darjeeling is Goalpara (Rajbonshi) a rich dialect of the Assamese language and culture. Once the Districts were also the part of Old Kamrup or Kamata Kingdom. On that ground, these area (Districts) must be transferred and merged with Assam. So, the language and culture of Assam would be prevented and compact. But Reorganisation Commission, did not consider the demand. The other state level
organisation also submitted memoranda before the Commission, but did not come to references of States Reorganisation Commission due to the existing law and order situation of that time.

The States Reorganisation Commission was unable to consider the demand of the Goalpara District Zamindar's Association. The demand of the Association was that a "Kamatapur State" should be created including the District - Goalpara, Coochbehar, Garo Hills, Jalpaiguri and a part of Darjeeling. They argued that the District of Goalpara once was under the part of Bengal and some time before the part of Assam. Actually Kamatapur was the original State and most of the people of Goalpara, Coochbehar and Jalpaiguri were Koch-Rajbonshi. Historically, it is proved. But for fulfilling the demand, the Zamindars of the District did not get people's support in favour of creating a Kamatapur State. The demand confined, only within the Zamindars of the Districts and their very limited supporters. During the tour of the Members of the Commission at Dhubri they did not give any factual data in support of Kamatapur. The creation of Kamatapur State, was not a popular demand of the local people there was no genuine ground. So, the Commission, did not recommend for creating Kamatapur State; North-West of Purbachal consisting of Goalpara, Garo Hills, Jalpaiguri, Coochbehar and Darjeeling.21

The memorandum of Dhubri Unit of All Assam Bangla Parishad, continued the demand of separation and inclusion of Goalpara District or if not the entire District to be included, at least a part of Goalpara with West Bengal which was also the demand of the West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee. Virtually, the Dhubri unit of All Assam Bangla Parishad supported the claim of West Bengal. The States Reorganisation Commission carefully examined the demand of Dhubri Unit of All Assam Bangla Parishad and ultimately decided that the District of Goalpara should not be disturbed, i.e., Goalpara District to be remained with Assam.

The memorandum submitted by the various political and social organisations against separation of the District at Dhubri was numerous. Of them, the memorandum of Goalpara District Immigrant Association was the most accountable and interesting. The memorandum was very careful of its historical accounts, geographical contiguity, administrative convenience, language and cultural problem, national unity and integrity. But they also emphasised on the language and cultural unity in the District. It was the most important factor on which the people of the District started spontaneous Movement. Soon, the Movement turned into a popular Movement. The Commission declared all the terms of references assigned to them. The cut off the District from Assam means the division of the language and culture of Assam for the sake of unity and integrity of the people of Goalpara.
District and Assam, the Honourable Members of the Commission, did not think any other way.

Shillong made the administrative headquarter of Assam since 1874, and the people became habitual and acquainted to communicate with Shillong. On the contrast, Calcutta was made the capital of West Bengal State and was very far from Goalpara District. Shillong was nearer than Calcutta. Administratively it was inconvenience and costly, if Goalpara was transferred to West Bengal. The immigrant Bengali Muslims, in their memorandum, demanded that they accepted the Assamese language and culture. In the District immigrant Bengali Muslims formed about 41 percent. By accepting Assamese language, the percentage of Assamese speaking people increased up to 62 percent. The Commission made the decision based on 1951 Census figures. The public opinion against separation of the District also vindicated during People’s Movement. The communication link with Calcutta was not sufficient. There would be needed more financial grant to increase the new communication between Goalpara District and Calcutta. The financial burden would also be another problem for the Central Government.

---

The then Chief Minister of Bishnu Ram Medhi made a statement in Assam Legislative Assembly on the recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission, on 16 November, 1955, that "in the interest of security and solidarity of India, the States Reorganisation Commission has rightly rejected the claim of West Bengal as it did not seem sound and also did not accept any of the claims for disintegration of the present State of Assam. I have already emphasised that in the interest of security and unity of India, it is essential that the entire North-Eastern region of India should ultimately be integrated into one administrative unit, and that this process of integration should be encouraged and steps to be taken to speed up the process to bring about a feeling of unity amongst all sections of the people inhabiting this region including the North-East Frontier Agency.

Government welcome the recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission, for merger of Tripura in Assam. Administration, in the national interest provided the people of Tripura are generally in favour of such a merger.23

The proposal made by States Reorganisation Commission regarding North-East are summarised below:

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

The demand for creation of a Hill State in Assam is impracticable and there is no reason, having regard to the peculiar features and circumstances in 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 be undertaken.

The Tripura should be merged with Assam. The present arrangement with regard to the North-East Frontier Agency should continue.24

It is obvious that West Bengal's claim on the part of Assam, i.e., on the Goalpara District also did not recommend to transfer and merge with West Bengal.

Unity of India

The real unity and the basis of Indian nationhood, the Commission observed, was the Indian Union rather than the constituent States. In this context they made a number of recommendations to promote the unity and integrity of Indian Union and to curb particularist trends in the States. The more important of these were:

(i) the setting up of a permanent body to examine grievances regarding the alleged neglect of the development need of certain areas;

(ii) the formation of an industrial location policy which will ensure equitable distribution of development expenditure;

(iii) 50% of the allocations to the State cadres of the All-India services to be new entrants not belonging to the State concerned;

(iv) the Constitution of All-India Services like, the Indian Service of Engineers, the Indian Forest Service and the Indian Medical and Public Health Service;

(v) regular transfer of All-India Service
personnel from the Centre to the States and vice-versa;

(vi) introduction in the curricula of All-India Services entrants of basic subjects pertaining to the History and Culture of the land;

(vii) encouragement of the study of regional languages for All-India and other services examinations;

(viii) appointment of one third of the Judges of High Court from outside the State; and

(ix) continuance of English as an important subject in educational institutions even after it ceases to be the Official Language.25

States Reorganisation Act, 1956

The Report of the Commission was released on 10 October, 1955. Since the issues involved in the recommendations of the Commission had created widespread discontent
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often swayed by sentiments, the Government of India, before formulating their discussions, desired the fullest scope being given to a thoroughgoing discussion of the report and opportunities being afforded to every interest concerned to express its views. The eliciting to the public opinion process inundated the Government of India with 1,22,150 memoranda and representations. Besides, the report was referred, although it was not legally binding to do so, to the Legislature of all the component units of the Union of India, including electoral college of some part-C States, like Kutch, Manipur and Tripura, and discussed by them at length. Parliament gave its fullest and most comprehensive consideration to the report exceeding 55 hours debate in Lok Sabha and 41 hours in Rajya Sabha in the course of which 224 Members participated. After a marathon endeavor of discussion, consultation and persuasion, the Government of India was able to present a complete scheme for the reorganisation of the States, incorporated in the three Draft/Bills, which were placed on the table of both Houses of Parliament on 16 March, 1956. These Bills were passed in August and September of the same year. The reorganisation scheme which came into operation on November 1, 1956, was embodied in "the States Reorganisation Act, 1956"; "Bihar and West Bengal Transfer of Territories Act, 1956" and "the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956".26
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The Reorganised Set-up of Indian States and Union Territories:

As a result of reorganisation, the Union of India was to consist of 14 States and 6 Territories. The States were Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Mysore (Karnataka), Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir. The 6 Territories were: Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, the Andaman and Nicobar Island and the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Island (Lakshadeep). Two sets of Map of India, one before reorganised and another one after reorganised enclosed in Appendix E-I and E-II.

No territorial change was made in case of Assam, Uttar Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Kerala was new name, although it represented substantially the Old State of Travancore-Cochin. The Kanada speaking areas which had been brought together, retained the name of Mysore. Andhra Pradesh was the combination of the States of Hydarabad and Andhra. The case of an enlarged Andhra State was forcefully stated by the Reorganisation Commission, though they favoured the formation of such a State five years then. The formation of new Bombay State was based on a formula.

Reorganisation Act, 1956; AIR Manual
suggested by the Commission, though its territorial had to be altered to some extent by Parliament so as to consolidate in one State all the Marathi and Gujrati speaking people. The exclusion of Himachal Pradesh and Tripura from the States of Punjab and Assam respectively was decided after taking into consideration and wishes of the people and the immediate need of those areas regarding their economic development.27

The political map of India redrawn on 1956 had to be changed on May 1, 1960, when the State of Bombay was bifurcated into Maharastra and Gujrat. The Union of India, then, consisted 15 States and 6 Territories, it was again changed on August 1, 1960, when the Prime Minister announced in Parliament and the decision of the Government for the creation of Nagaland as a new State - the 16th in the Republic. This decision followed an agreement reached between the Prime Minister of India and the 19 Members Naga delegation headed by Dr. Imkongliha Ao, President of the Naga People's Convention.28
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Analytical Study of the Report of the Commission on Goalpara District:

Over and above, it is seen that the Commission was guided by some specific guide-lines which was assigned by the Government of India. The Members of the States Reorganisation Commission, during their study of the demands of the various linguistic and ethnic groups of our country were decided on the basis of linguistic and cultural composition of the respective State, Districts or an area that accounted in the "Census Tracts", particularly in the 1951 Census and of the unity and integrity of our country. The other terms of references, such as administrative convenience, geographical, communication, economic and financial also considered.

The most of the North-East region, virtually surrounded by international boundaries and having probability of encroaching at any moment of its any part by the neighbouring country. So, the NEFA, Nagaland, Tripura, Manipur and the Hills States did not consider by separating from Assam and constituted separate States, with the strong reason of maintaining unity and integrity of India. But for the perseverance of the people of Manipur and Tripura, both the region separated from Assam and constituted Union Territories.

On the contrary, the case of people of Goalpara District, the Commission considered on its linguistic and
cultural composition, wishes of the majority of people of Goalpara and Unity and Integrity of Assam as well as of India. At length, the recommendation of the Commission was in favour of the people of the District, and decided that the District Goalpara should not be disturbed and would remained as a part and parcel of Assam.

To be resisted and against its Angoshed the indigenous people of the District launched a popular Movement, until and unless the District be retained with Assam. The Angoshed demanded by West Bengal and the platform of Bengali Community in this District called "Bangla Parishad" a unit of "All Assam Bangla Parishad". Virtually, the Movement started from the controversy between the supporters of the Assamese language and the supporters of Bengali Language. The Movement launched to be resisted the Angoshed of Assam. So, ultimately, the resistance of the District would also be resisted the mother-tongue the Assamese language and culture.

All the memoranda submitted before the Commission except the Dhubri Unit of All Assam Bangla Parishad, vindicated the linguistic and cultural composition of the entire District and proved having majority of Assamese speaking people with the Census figures of 1951 (it was the first Census of India after Independence). The immigrant Muslim community in the District formed a major part of the total population also demanded, infavour of the indigenous people
and embraced local language and culture. It enhanced more and more, the reason of retaining the District with Assam.

The State Reorganisation Commission prepared its Report on the basis of linguistic and cultural composition of the District and also accounted the report of 1951 Census. This Census showed the clear picture of having majority (62%) of the Assamese speaking people of Goalpara District. Inspite of these, the Commission duly considered the people's urges for mother-tongue demanded through the Movement launched in the District.

If it had been not considered infavour of the local indigenous people, it would be made unjust, illegal and be treated as the violation of peace and the integrity of the people of the District as well as of the Assamese community of Assam as a whole. Instead of these, the District bordered with East-Pakistan (now Bangladesh) an international border. So it has sufficient probability of threatening to the unity and integrity of India.

Some State-level social and political organisations also supported the People's Movement of the District and submitted memoranda for due consideration. That, the Commission rightly considered the dis-separate of the District and recognised it as part and parcel of Assam.

Dhubri Unit of All Assam Bangla Parishad and West
Bengal was persistent for separation of the District. If it would not possible, at least the Dhubri Sub-Division of Goalpara District, must be separated and merged with West Bengal State. Their basis of claim was that the dominant position of the Bengali language and culture in the District. They had submitted various old documents and Census report of 1931 Census. This Census vindicated only 17.4% Assamese speaking people, instead of 1951 which was vindicated 62% of Assamese speaking people in the District in favour of establishing their demand. They also strongly argued that the immigrant Muslims were originally Bengali by mother-tongue. By fifty to hundred years, one community could not become Assamese or have another mother-tongue. So, it would be right to separated the District and merged with Bengal.

Another important memorandum submitted by Sarat Chandra Sinha and Sayed Ahmed Ali, President and Secretary of District Congress Committee before the Commission during its visit at Dhubri demanded with strong argument for retaining the Goalpara District with Assam. This memorandum ventilated factual argument to refute the claims of West Bengal and Bangla Parishad of Dhubri. West Bengal Government's problem of rehabilitation of refugees, security of border of India, communication and commerce was very critical. Once Goalpara was part of Bengal and again, it should be transferred to West Bengal had not within the term of references of reorganisation of States. The District Con-
gress by memorandum refuted all the claims with factual figures of the transfer and separation Goalpara from Assam. The claims of West Bengal and Bangla Parishad of Dhubri, based on dictatorial, emotional and unreasonable. So, that the States Reorganisation Commission vividly studied all the memorandum and ultimately recommended infavour of the People's Movement of Goalpara. A letter relating to the memorandum of the District Congress Committee submitted before the States Reorganisation Commission is enclosed in Appendix - F.