

Parliamentary representation and reorganization of States: Need to Rethink

Dr. Pravin S. Bhagdikar

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Annasaheb Gundewar College, Nagpur, Maharashtra

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 14 December 2020

Keywords

Asymmetrical, Federalism, Reorganization of states, Census, Loksabha, Parliament.

Corresponding Author

Email: [bhagdikar.pravin\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:bhagdikar.pravin[at]gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

With the creation of Telangana state, demand of reorganization of states once again came from the various corners of states. In states like Maharashtra demand of separate Vidarbha, in Uttar Pradesh Harit Pradesh, in West Bengal separate Gorkhaland and from other states also the demand of separate states rock the political elites. In similar ways the asymmetrical representation of states in compare to population in Loksabha also pave the way of debate of whether the strength of the Loksabha should be increased compare to rise in population specially, when the process new parliament (new building of parliament) is in progress. The study has done on the two major aspects of political system which is important as far as good governance and administration is concerned. The first aspect is increasing number of states and second is Loksabha seats. Both aspects are related to the increasing trends of population and the representation of states and people according the trends of census.

1. Introduction

From our inception, the criteria for state-building have been a political convenience. According to the administrative and economic norms, our political mind has never been ready to accept that the creation of states is useful in terms of development. Representation and differentiation of the states in the legislature on a numerical and logical basis will lead to the development of smaller states. The creation of smaller states gives rise to regionalism, which is an administrative inevitability, depending on the opportunities and achievements of the states. The creation of new States like Uttarakhand, Chhattisgarh & Telangana proves how they motivating the development in their states.

In Article One of the Indian Constitution, India was declared a union of states. It is characteristic that the federal structure of India is not a compromise between the Union and the State or that any agreement has been made. Second, states do not have the right to voluntarily disassociate from such a structure. By the time the Indian Independence Act-1947 came into force in 1947, the then provinces or institutions were allowed to join India or Pakistan. With the efforts of Sardar Patel, VP Menon and Lord Mountbatten, the provinces and institutions were united and federalized. The demand for the creation of provinces on the basis of language was the question of creation of provinces after independence. The Congress itself supported this demand on the basis of the Nagpur proposal of 1920. In this regard, the Chairman of the Constitution Committee, Shri Rajendra Prasad formed a four-member commission chaired by NSK Dar. The Commission conducts a study on whether the province's redistribution is appropriate on the basis of language. The Commission opposed the creation of provinces on the basis of language and emphasized the creation of provinces as per the

administrative requirement. As expected, the Commission's report was opposed and the Congress Working Committee formed a JVP1 committee at the Jaipur Convention to examine the report of the Commission. The JVP committee approved the creation of the province on the basis of language under the rule of the people as a whole and as a political convenience for the creation of the province.

2. Discussion

2.1 Reorganization of States for stronger Federal setup

If you look at the above brief history of province formation, then there was opposition to the province's construction on the basis of language. The overall trend of the creation of states in administrative terms was behind the restructuring of the state. But due to the prevailing situation and public interest, the rulers were forced to make state-based decisions on the basis of language and language was the main basis of state-building. On the practical side, it is easy to see in today's context that the decisions taken by the rulers were right. The linguistic formulae of state-building changed over time. In 1954, the French Government handed over the colonies of Pondicherry, Yanam, Mahi, Chandra agar and Karakul to the Government of India. Pondicherry, therefore, joined the Indian Union. That is, changing political conditions became the second cornerstone of state-building. Goa, Daman and Diu were finally liberated by the Portuguese in 1961 and included in the Union. Political intervention became the third base of state-building. In 1960, the state of Maharashtra and Gujarat was created due to conflict between Marathi and Gujarati speakers. The linguistic struggle became the cornerstone of state-building. But two states - Punjab and Haryana - were created in the same language. The struggle between languages became the cornerstone of state-building.

S.N.	States	Representation in Loksabha (States representing 20 or more seats in Loksabha)	S.N.	States	Representation in Loksabha (States representing less than 20 seats in Loksabha)
01	Uttarpradesh	80	01	Himachal Pradesh	04
02	Maharashtra	48	02	Haryana	10
03	Madhyapradesh	29	03	Manipur	02
04	Karnataka	28	04	Nagaland	01
05	Rajasthan	25	05	Mizoram	01
06	Keral	20	06	Goa	02
07	West Bengal	42	07	Chattisgarh	11
08	Bihar	40	08	Jharkhand	14
09	Andhrapradesh	25	09	Assam	14
10	Tamilnadu	39	10	Jammu & Kashmir	06
11	Gurjat	26	11	Tripura	02
12	Orisa	21	12	Punjab	13
13	Telangana	17	13	Meghalaya	02
			14	Sikkim	01
			15	Arunachal Pradesh	02
			16	Uttaranchal	05
			17	Delhi	07
			18	Chandigarh, Andaman Nickobar, Lakshdwp, Punduchery, Dadara Nagar Haveli, Daman & Div.	06
	Total Representation (13 States)	440		Total Representation (16 States & 07 Union Territories)	103

Most of the states that have been created over time have been created on the backdrop of a secessionist and agitation. These include Tripura, Manipur, Nagaland, Mizoram etc. The Chhattisgarh, Uttaranchal and Jharkhand created in the year 2000. However, Vidarbha was not a separate state despite the approval of all the relevant commissions and committees. Therefore, it is important to look at the operation of the system to see whether smaller states are compatible with our federal system or not.

2.2 Asymmetrical Federalism

Looking at the overall size and area of the Indian federal states, there are many inconsistencies. On the one hand, Uttar Pradesh with a population of 16 crores and on the other hand only Sikkim state with five lakh. States that are politically influential such as Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and West Bengal, on the other hand are politically adept states like Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Jharkhand, Manipur, Mizoram, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura. When opposed to the creation of a small state, it is usually evidence of natural resources, economy and geographical conditions has been given. But the above discrepancies, regardless of how dangerous they are to our federal operations, are ignored. Oppose to Hindi by southern states was not primarily because of Hindi language. They were opposed to the dominance and participation of the Hindi-speaking states in the central power. Because of language is

our state-building criteria, it has not been specifically studied what effect these states have on the political system. The demand for the creation of a small state started for many years as we followed the political understanding that the Indian state system is the monopoly of some big states. Most of the states created after 1960 were created by political unrest and limited political participation and importance. Taking into account the issue of parliamentary representation, the influence of big states on the political process is readily apparent. It is easy to see from the representation of the states in Parliament that the creation of smaller states is necessary to provide equal quality and development opportunities to the states.

From the above table there is a great deal of variation in the representation of the state, especially in the representation of the Parliament. Only twelve states together account for 81 per cent of the total number of Lok Sabha constituencies and 23 states account for only 19 per cent. Therefore, dividing the above 12 states and creating smaller states will not create a feeling of injustice to the political process and participation. The danger to the Indian Union is not from the creation of smaller states, but from the political system prevailing and the political leadership that manages them. This difference in the existing federal structure is a major challenge for the federal government.

2.3 Creation of more States: Pre-requisite for better federalism

It is necessary to create more states by dividing the large states established in the federal states. Many people have the misconception that the creation of smaller states can weaken the federal concept. But this is not the fact. The above table

have total of 23 states. The federalism has not weakened because of them. On the contrary, the development of smaller states shows the rapid development of the three states - Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand and Jharkhand.

Table No. 2.3.1 : Projection of required states				
States having potential of more states	Population of states having more than five crore according to 2011 Census	Expected number of more states.	Population of states/UT having less than Ten lakhs according to 2011 Census	Population according to 2011 Census
Uttarpradesh	19,98,12,341	03	Panduchery	12,47,953
Maharashtra	11,23,74,333	01	Chandigarh	10,55,450
Bihar	10,40,99,452	01	Mizoram	10,97,206
West Bengal	9,12,76,115	01	Sikkim	6,10,577
Tamilnadu	7,21,47,030	02	Andaman & Nicobar	3,80,581
Madhyapradesh	7,26,26,809	01	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	3,43,709
Rajashtan	6,85,48,437	01	Daman & Diu	2,43,247
Karnataka	6,10,95,297	No need	Lakshadwip	64,473
Gujarat	6,04,39,692	No need		
Rest of the States has less than five crore population, so no need for separate states.		10 More states needed for the better function of federalism.	It is recommended that the above UT should be merge with the nearest state while maintain their status of UT	

Except for the example of Jharkhand, both states are found to be more advanced in development than their original states. Apart from the above three states, the rest of the smaller states are praiseworthy in comparison to the larger states. As with the smaller states, there are some dangers as well. After the creation of such states, it is necessary to see whether the people benefited from them. After the creation of Chhattisgarh, it is pertinent to see exactly who benefited from the creation of such states as the way in which the land prices increased. If this threat is avoided by the political leadership, the creation of smaller states will not be opposed. Another issue that is being discussed in relation to smaller states is security and order. The fact that small states are dangerous in terms of security is contradictory to reality. In terms of communal riots, law and order, the status of smaller states is better than that of large states. Most of the smaller states in the northeast are near international borders. The secessionist movement in the respective states is part of the war against India. Naturally, this affects the internal system. It is not compatible with smaller states to blame for this problem as it is national. Naxalism is an inter-state political question in Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand. The end of Naxalism depends on the role that Indian government plays in Naxalism and how strong political leadership is in resolving the problem. The question of security and law and order of small states is not about size and area but about how the leadership who manages the political system is able to handle such issues. If the state of Jharkhand is seen as a good example of not having it, then it is necessary to look at how the states like Himachal, Uttaranchal and Haryana govern the political system if they have the capability.

In view of the large and small states of India, why not create more states for the purpose of good governance and administration? After seventy years, is the language remains the base of states creation? In a global and contemporary situation language formula now becomes an outdated. If that were the case, there would have been no demand that Vidarbha would be different from Maharashtra, Telangana different from Andhra, Gorkhaland separate from Pandal Bengal and Green Pradesh from Uttar Pradesh and Bundelkhand. Because the regions demanded by all the above states were created on the basis of one language. Why not single state of Hindi speakers like Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar has been created? This means not only the language but also the administrative, geographical and cultural factors that have been taken into account when making the state. On the basis of this, it is unlikely that the division of large states established and the creation of smaller states will hinder the development of the Union. It is easily possible if the political mind is strong and has a tendency to understand the masses. India currently has 29 states and seven union territories. In this regard, the major states should be divided according to the norms of three to five crore population, and small states with a population of less than one lakh should be combined to form only one state or state should be merged with the nearerest state. While doing this cultural and social identity of the respective group or community should be protected and preserve. The following table can estimate the exact situation in this regard.

As per the above table we require the creation of at least 10 states based on the 2011 census population. Also, states with a population of one million and less should be merged into

administratively adjacent states. The population of Uttarpradesh, Maharashtra, Bihar, West Bengal, Tamilnadu Madhya, Rajasthan and Madhya should divided and separate states should be create as shown in above table. There is no need to split up the states whose population is around five to six crore. In this regard, considering all parties in the context of smaller states, not only their own interests and party benefits, but also from the point of view of development and integration of the federalism, it will not create too many issues of opinion. After all, democracy is superior in democracy. If the referendum on Telangana and Vidarbha is favorable, then politicians have to think about it. If politicians are aware that party or individual opinion is not considered to be democratic, then it will be more convenient for the operation of federalism. At the same time, it is important to be careful not to become a monopoly of the states when creating small states. In the case of big states, the majority of the people seem to be dominated by wealthy, neo-feudalists. It should not be repeated. It is also important to take care that in the name of development for small states; there will be no displacement of the natives, tribals, the disadvantaged, the exploited and the victims.

In essence, it is detrimental to the unity of the mind to think that it is detrimental to federalism while creating smaller states. It is important to note that any state is not an independent country or nation; it is the administrative part of an entity called our own nation. Our independence has been around for over sixty years. During this time there were many disasters and changes. We digested and transformed it with our fairy tale and wit. So if more states are created, nothing is worse. Fifty states exist in a country like the United States. It should estimate the number of states in a country like India. If change is the law of creation, then change is necessary as needed. Needless to say, this does not often tell us that the separatist and separatist movements are born. Therefore, when considering the stateless, administrative convenience and geographical convenience of state building, the debate about whether the creation of small states is complementary to the federal government is futile.

2.4 Asymmetrical States representation in Parliament

Delivering the second Atal Bihari Vajpayee memorial lecture organized by India Foundation in New Delhi, Former president Pranab Mukherjee favour the increasing number of parliamentary seats from the existing 543 to 1,000 and for a corresponding increase in Raja Sabha's strength. While arguing in favour of his statement he said, "The last time the strength of Lok Sabha was revised was in 1977 which, he noted, was based on the 1971 census that put the total population at 55 crore. The population since then has more than doubled, and there is a "strong case" to remove the freeze in the delimitation exercise. It should be ideally increased to 1,000", he added.¹

Further he said that, "Noting that 16-18 lakh people are represented by one Lok Sabha member, he wondered how he or she be expected to be in touch with the electors." Further elaborating his point he said, "We need to think innovatively and not just resort to excuses without any basis. If the British Parliament can have 650 members, the Canadian Parliament can have 443 members and the US Congress can accommodate 535 members, why can't the Indian Parliament do so,"² Former presidents has raised the question that every Indian asking from every quarter of life.

In the constitution of India Clause (2) of article 81 of the Constitution lays down that for the purposes of sub-clause (a) of clause (1), there shall be allotted to each State a number of seats in the House of the People in such manner that the ratio between that number and the population of the State is, so far as practicable, the same for all States and that each State shall be divided into territorial constituencies in such manner that the ratio between the population of each constituency and the number of seats allotted to it is, so far as practicable, the same throughout the State. Under clause (3) of article 81, the expression "population" means the population as ascertained in the last preceding census of which the relevant figures have been published.³

Table No.2.4.1 : Current Status of Parliament*

S.N.		Census 2001 Population	Census 2011 Population	Increase in Population (Lacs)	Increasing trend 2001 to 2011 %	Current Seats Status
	India	102,70,15,247	121,08,54,977	18,38,39,730	17.90%	543
1	Uttar Pradesh	16,60,52,859	19,98,12,341	33,759,482	20.33%	80
2	Maharashtra	9,67,52,247	11,23,74,333	15,622,086	16.15%	48
3	Bihar	8,28,78,796	10,40,99,452	21,220,656	25.60%	40
4	West Bengal	8,02,21,171	9,12,76,115	11,054,944	13.78%	42
5	Andhra Pradesh+Telangana	7,57,27,541	8,45,80,777	8,853,236	11.69%	42
6	Madhya Pradesh	6,03,85,118	7,26,26,809	12,241,691	20.27%	29
7	Tamil Nadu	6,21,10,839	7,21,47,030	10,036,191	16.16%	39
8	Rajasthan	5,64,73,122	6,85,48,437	12,075,315	21.38%	25
9	Karnataka	5,27,33,958	6,10,95,297	8,361,339	15.86%	28
10	Gujarat	5,05,96,992	6,04,39,692	9,842,700	19.45%	26
11	Orissa	3,67,06,920	4,19,74,218	5,267,298	14.35%	21
12	Kerala	3,18,38,619	3,34,06,061	1,567,442	4.92%	20
13	Jharkhand	2,69,09,428	3,29,88,134	6,078,706	22.59%	14

14	Assam	2,66,38,407	3,12,05,576	4,567,169	17.15%	14
15	Punjab	2,42,89,296	2,77,43,338	3,454,042	14.22%	13
16	Chhattisgarh	2,07,95,956	2,55,45,198	4,749,242	22.84%	11
17	Haryana	2,10,82,989	2,53,51,462	4,268,473	20.25%	10
18	Delhi	1,37,82,976	1,67,87,941	3,004,965	21.80%	07
19	Jammu and Kashmir	1,00,69,917	1,25,41,302	2,471,385	24.54%	06
20	Uttarakhand	84,79,562	1,00,86,292	1,606,730	18.95%	05
21	Himachal Pradesh	60,77,248	68,64,602	787,354	12.96%	04
22	Tripura	31,91,168	36,73,917	482,749	15.13%	02
23	Meghalaya	23,06,069	29,66,889	660,820	28.66%	02
24	Manipur	23,88,634	28,55,794	467,160	19.56%	02
25	Nagaland	19,88,636	19,78,502	-10,134	-0.51%	01
26	Goa	13,43,998	14,58,545	114,547	8.52%	01
27	Arunachal Pradesh	10,91,117	13,83,727	292,610	26.82%	02
28	Puducherry	9,73,829	12,47,953	274,124	28.15%	01
29	Mizoram	8,91,058	10,97,206	206,148	23.14%	01
30	Chandigarh	9,00,914	10,55,450	154,536	17.15%	01
31	Sikkim	5,40,493	6,10,577	70,084	12.97%	01
32	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	3,56,265	3,80,581	24,316	6.83%	01
33	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	2,20,451	3,43,709	123,258	55.91%	01
34	Daman and Diu	1,58,059	2,43,247	85,188	53.90%	01
35	Lakshadweep	60,595	64,473	3,878	6.40%	01

* Source: Website of Election Commission of India

As result of this mandate, States which took a lead in population control faced the prospect of their number of seats getting reduced and States which had higher population figures stood to gain by increase in the number of seats in Lok Sabha. To allay this apprehension, Section 15 of the Constitution (Forty-second Amendment) Act, 1976 effected a freeze on the population figure with reference to the 1971 Census (which

was 54.81 crore with a registered electorate of 27.4 crore) for the purposes of proviso to Article 81(3) (i) until the relevant figures for the first Census taken after the year 2000 have been published. Section 3 of the Constitution (Eighty-fourth Amendment), Act 2001 extended the deadline from 2000 to 2026.

Table No. 2.4.3 : Classification of Lok Sabha seats-present and projected

S.N.		Increasing 2001 to 2011 %	Current Seats Status	Expected increase in Lok Sabha seats By considering population as per census 2011.	Projection of statewise seats of Lok Sabha after considering population size as per census 2011
	India	17.90%	543	99	642
1	Uttar Pradesh	20.33%	80	16	96
2	Maharashtra	16.15%	48	8	56
3	Bihar	25.60%	40	10	50
4	West Bengal	13.78%	42	6	48
5	Andhra Pradesh+Telangana	11.69%	42	5	47
6	Madhya Pradesh	20.27%	29	6	35
7	Tamil Nadu	16.16%	39	6	45
8	Rajasthan	21.38%	25	5	30
9	Karnataka	15.86%	28	4	32
10	Gujarat	19.45%	26	5	31
11	Orissa	14.35%	21	3	24
12	Kerala	4.92%	20	1	21
13	Jharkhand	22.59%	14	3	17
14	Assam	17.15%	14	2	16
15	Punjab	14.22%	13	2	15

16	Chhattisgarh	22.84%	11	3	14
17	Haryana	20.25%	10	2	12
18	Delhi	21.80%	07	2	09
19	Jammu and Kashmir & Ladakh	24.54%	06	1	07
20	Uttarakhand	18.95%	05	1	06
21	Himachal Pradesh	12.96%	04	1	05
22	Tripura**	15.13%	02	1	03
23	Meghalaya	28.66%	02	1	03
24	Manipur	19.56%	02	1	03
25	Nagaland	-0.51%	01	1	02
26	Goa**	8.52%	02	0	02
27	Arunachal Pradesh**	26.82%	02	0	02
28	Puducherry	28.15%	01	1	02
29	Mizoram	23.14%	01	1	02
30	Chandigarh	17.15%	01	1	02
31	Sikkim **	12.97%	01	0	01
32	Andaman and Nicobar Islands **	6.83%	01	0	01
33	Dadra and Nagar Haveli **	55.91%	01	0	01
34	Daman and Diu **	53.90%	01	0	01
35	Lakshadweep **	6.40%	01	0	01
Source: * Election commission of India & Author's own projection ** No need to increase in present status.					

As a result of the freezing of the allocation of seats, the allocation done on the basis of the 1971 Census continues hold good for the present population figures. According to the 2011 Census, the population of our country stands at 121 crore with a registered electorate of 83.41 crore. Basing the 1971 Census figure of 54.81 crore to represent today's population presents a distorted version of our democratic polity and is contrary to what is mandated under Article 81 of the Constitution. So when the first Census figure will be available after 2026 — that is, in 2031 — a fresh delimitation will have to be done which will dramatically alter the present arrangement of seat allocation to the States in Parliament.⁴

The above table shows how the ratio of population and parliamentary seats unjustified the parliamentary democracy and the expectation people where the one Member of

Parliament cannot do enough for their people due over burden of constituency size. While number of voters has increased with population, Lok Sabha seats have not gone up since 1977, giving India the highest ration of voters per MP in the world 84 crore (registered to vote in 2014) will elect 543 MP, meaning every MP represents 15.5 lakh voters. If the the Member of parliament represent the population of averagely 15 to 20 lacs people, how he or she pay the attention towards the welfare of the people of their respective constituency. Former president Shri Pranav Mukherji has correctly point out the need of expansion of Loksabha compare to Population. But by considering the increasing trends of population from the 2001 census to 2011, the study suggests the following increase in the Loksabha seats by considering increasing trends of population of each state respectively.

Table No. 2.4.3 : Classification of Loksabha seats-present and projected

Big states		Medium States		Tiny States		Union Territories	
Present Status (No.of Seats)	Projected Status (No.of Seats)	Present Status (No.of Seats)	Projected Status (No.of Seats)	Present Status (No.of Seats)	Projected Status (No.of Seats)	Present Status (No.of Seats)	Projected Status (No.of Seats)
399	470	120	139	11	16	13	17

Though the big state like Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Bihar, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan, Karnataka and Gujrat have dominance on parliament and after increased in seats it will continue. Currently all this states have 399 seats in Loksabha which occupied nearly 73.48% space of the Loksabha. If the seats increased, 71 seats out of 99 will be alone from the above states. The percentage will be 72%. The Loksabha seats will be increased from their current status of 543 to 642 as per increasing trend of census 2011. In that case 470 seats out of 642 will be from above 10 states. The percentage of the big states in parliament will be 73% of the total space in

Parliament. Representation of the states whether it may be big or small will be increased but the pattern of the dominance will be same. The small state particularly North East states will get better representation than earlier. If we look the above projection the trend of population in the census 2011 recorded decreasing in the case of Nagaland. The population of Nagaland is decreased by -0.51% than previous census. But apart from this the population of Nagaland is reaching towards 20 lakhs. The geographical and strategic location of the North East states and their importance in the main stream and security of the Nations, we wish more representation in Loksabha. In present Loksabha only eleven seats represented

by North East States. The percentage is 2.02% of the total strength of Lok Sabha. In new Lok Sabha five seats will be added as per the increasing trends of population.

3. Conclusion

India is entering a new era of parliamentary development-based politics. It is a considerable fact that the aspiration and expectation of the citizen of India must be represented through their elected representative. Increasing the number of seats in the Lok Sabha will help for strengthening the democracy which is currently seen as an unequal democracy. This also justifies the regional aspiration for both the voters and their representatives. In the era of modern global complexity

enhancing the capacity of Lok Sabha leads the better role of parliament in context of public participation.

As far as creation of more states is concerned, it is not just a numerical demand but it is a nationalization of regional aspirations and ambitions. The question is not that whether the breaking up of large states is good for the nation in the long run? But the question is that in seventy years do the larger states have done well for the nation. Let there be a nationwide debate on whether the smaller states are good for the larger context of national interest. Let all the pros and cons of creating small states be discussed at both the micro and macro level before any decision is taken.

References

- [1]. Business Today, 17, December, 2019
- [2]. Business Today, 17, December, 2019
- [3]. The Constitution of India (Thirty-First Amendment) Act, 1973
- [4]. The Hindu 31, July, 2017