Thus the State of Karnataka had to face several administrative problems of varied nature after reorganisation of the State in 1976. But here in this study, only the eight administrative problems faced by Reorganised Karnataka have been thoroughly discussed, examined and analysed. The administrative problems faced by Karnataka were quite complex and complicated. Because the new State of Karnataka is made up of five slices of administrative areas known as Ex-Bombay-Karnataka area, Ex-Hyderabad-Karnataka area, Ex-Madras-Karnataka area, Ex-Coorg area and Old Mysore area. No other reorganised State in India did face such heterogeneous administrative problems except Karnataka. The achievement of progress already mentioned in the previous chapters by the Government of Karnataka in tackling these problems is quite commendable. But still there are certain issues connected with these eight administrative problems which have not yet been solved even after the lapse of two decades of States' Reorganisation. They have posed the challenges
for the leadership of the State. A strong, sincere
and dynamic political leadership is all that is essential.

When the Unification of Karnataka was about to be
brought about, the Fact-Finding Committee headed by
Shri M. Sheshadri and the Legislators of Old Mysore
expressed the views that the integrating areas of Bombay-
Karnataka, Hyderabad-Karnataka, Madras-Karnataka and
Ex-Coorg were backward when compared to Old Mysore. They
stated their apprehensions to the effect that Old Mysore
would be neglected after the merger of the proposed
integrating areas. (Vide Economic Aspect of Unification
in Chapter 1). However, Unification of Karnataka was
brought about with effect from 1st November 1956. The
new State Government, in order to allay these fears and
to achieve the integrated development of the different
regions, took steps to develop the State properly.

The following statement indicates the region-wise
expenditure incurred under different heads for the fiscal
years 1956 to 1969.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Old Mysore</th>
<th>Bombay-Karnataka</th>
<th>Hyderabad-Karnataka</th>
<th>Madras-Karnataka</th>
<th>Coorg-Karnataka</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Minor Irrigation</td>
<td>1,952.18</td>
<td>704.53</td>
<td>323.44</td>
<td>101.58</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>3,115.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4,560.08</td>
<td>2,825.84</td>
<td>1,309.92</td>
<td>1,358.16</td>
<td>309.79</td>
<td>10,363.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Major and Medium Irrigation</td>
<td>4,430.90</td>
<td>2,524.88</td>
<td>1,851.20</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>8,831.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>3,142.08</td>
<td>868.16</td>
<td>576.56</td>
<td>288.17</td>
<td>156.75</td>
<td>5,031.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>K.S.R.T.C.</td>
<td>1,337.01</td>
<td>353.85</td>
<td>139.67</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>1,704.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Housing Board</td>
<td>1,604.40</td>
<td>160.75</td>
<td>76.55</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1,845.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) a)</td>
<td>Amount paid to Panchayat Raj bodies</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>89.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>National Rural Water Supply</td>
<td>111.52</td>
<td>74.18</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>245.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Irrigation Works Under Community Development Programme</td>
<td>229.93</td>
<td>147.31</td>
<td>71.47</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>468.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>1,460.87</td>
<td>1,235.37</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>489.76</td>
<td>226.47</td>
<td>3,447.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Karnataka State Financial Corporation - Loans sanctioned</td>
<td>596.65</td>
<td>134.30</td>
<td>69.32</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>837.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Old Mysore</td>
<td>Bombay-Karnataka</td>
<td>Hyderabad-Karnataka</td>
<td>Madras-Karnataka</td>
<td>Coorg-Area</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>Co-operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment in Share Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>1,202.38</td>
<td>233.82</td>
<td>89.58</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>1,573.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Non-Plan</td>
<td>453.61</td>
<td>115.60</td>
<td>96.89</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>703.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Agricultural Refinance Corporation</td>
<td>856.00</td>
<td>277.50</td>
<td>587.50</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>2,017.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>70.64</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>109.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Non-Plan</td>
<td>107.90</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>118.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>K.E.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>339.04</td>
<td>330.08</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>765.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>447.00</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>554.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Sub-Station</td>
<td>193.39</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>261.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>Public Housing Scheme</td>
<td>374.28</td>
<td>89.07</td>
<td>96.35</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>588.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Animal Husbandry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Non-Plan Schemes</td>
<td>363.35</td>
<td>139.98</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>51.93</td>
<td>55.62</td>
<td>638.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Plan Schemes</td>
<td>267.35</td>
<td>53.61</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>369.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Old Mysore</td>
<td>Bombay-Karnataka</td>
<td>Hyderabad-Karnataka</td>
<td>Madras-Karnataka</td>
<td>Coorg-Area</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>139.92</td>
<td>154.70</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>250.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>556.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Plan</td>
<td>319.73</td>
<td>261.86</td>
<td>73.43</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>705.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Non-Plan</td>
<td>69.37</td>
<td>63.34</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>151.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Non-Plan</td>
<td>1,488.35</td>
<td>214.03</td>
<td>44.72</td>
<td>109.76</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>1,906.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Plan</td>
<td>863.90</td>
<td>313.28</td>
<td>126.11</td>
<td>70.20</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>1,399.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>Urban and Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Scheme</td>
<td>602.21</td>
<td>415.83</td>
<td>149.10</td>
<td>305.31</td>
<td>36.69</td>
<td>1,509.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>Rural Electrification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Pump-sets</td>
<td>1,305.89</td>
<td>292.50</td>
<td>159.59</td>
<td>247.07</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,005.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Rural Electrification</td>
<td>416.46</td>
<td>307.31</td>
<td>172.81</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>932.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>Department of Industries and Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Khadi and Village Industries</td>
<td>299.16</td>
<td>234.91</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>609.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Old Mysore</td>
<td>Bombay- Karnataka</td>
<td>Hyderabad- Karnataka</td>
<td>Madras- Karnataka</td>
<td>Coorg- Area</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 35-Head Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Plan</td>
<td>181.79</td>
<td>100.37</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>335.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Non-Plan</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>131.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Capital Investment in Private Sector</td>
<td>7,821.70</td>
<td>1,353.40</td>
<td>717.96</td>
<td>242.90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10,145.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Capital Investment in Public Sector</td>
<td>13,558.96</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>499.18</td>
<td>34.69</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>14,098.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Loans to Individual and Industrial concerns</td>
<td>2,076.95</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>192.05</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2,271.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) 95 Capital Outlay</td>
<td>Industrial and Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Plan</td>
<td>91.21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>91.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Plan</td>
<td>785.06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>785.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 to 1969</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>53.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Working Capital &amp; Share Capital</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Loans given by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Karnataka State Cooperative Apex Bank Ltd.</td>
<td>216.21</td>
<td>131.48</td>
<td>68.16</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>37.12</td>
<td>466.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) (Short Term)</td>
<td>5,177.37</td>
<td>4,796.58</td>
<td>1,618.64</td>
<td>728.23</td>
<td>787.19</td>
<td>13,108.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Old Mysore</th>
<th>Bombay-Karnataka</th>
<th>Hyderabad-Karnataka</th>
<th>Madras-Karnataka</th>
<th>Coorg-Karnataka</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20)</td>
<td>Loans sanctioned by the State Land Development Bank</td>
<td>2,196.92</td>
<td>450.56</td>
<td>433.19</td>
<td>112.42</td>
<td>65.96</td>
<td>3,259.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21)</td>
<td>Soil Conservation</td>
<td>259.60</td>
<td>116.99</td>
<td>42.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>418.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21)</td>
<td>64 Famine Relief</td>
<td>512.77</td>
<td>158.19</td>
<td>108.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1,851.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one looks to the development of Karnataka in all its aspects, we find that the efforts made by all the successive Governments since the formation of United Karnataka in 1975 are quite commendable. The State could have been much more developed and the people and the civil servants could have been much more happy had it solved some of the administrative problems of Reorganised Karnataka. In this conclusion, attention has been focussed on the problems which have not yet been solved even after two decades of States' Reorganisation. These have been dealt with chapterwise and suggestions have been made for the solution of those problems. These suggestions may be useful to other State Governments if these States are faced by some of these problems due to States' Reorganisation. They may be useful to the Government of Karnataka to tackle these problems.

Regarding bringing about uniformity in Acts, Rules and Regulations, it has been mentioned that uniformity has been brought about in respect of several Acts, Rules and Regulations. The achievement registered by the Government in this field is quite satisfactory. The sense of separateness is fast fading away. All this is a good augury for the future and will pave the way for the complete unification of the people.
On perusal of U.O. Note No. POL 27 VM 73 dated 14th August 1973 of the File No. Law 9 IAQ 73 maintained at the Department of Law and Parliamentary Affairs of the Karnataka Government Secretariat and the steps taken by the State Government to bring about uniformity in Acts, Rules and Regulations, one can see that the uniformity in respect of the following Acts has not yet been brought about. Consequently different laws are prevailing in different areas within the State. That disparity is still continuing according to the latest information, in the different integrated areas of the State in respect of the following subjects.

A) Ferries

1) The Bombay Ferries Act, 1866.
2) The North Indian Ferries Act 1878 prevailing in Ex-Coorg area.
3) The Hyderabad Ferries Act, 1314 Basli.
4) The Madras Canals and Public Ferries Act, 1890.

B) Fisheries

1) The Indian Fisheries Act, 1897, prevailing in the Ex-Bombay-Karnataka area.
2) The Indian Fisheries Act 1697 prevailing in the Ex-Coorg Area.
3) The Hyderabad Fisheries Act 1356 Fasli.
4) The Fisheries (Madras Amendment) Act, 1927.
5) The Mysore Game and Fish Preservation Act 1901.

C) Public Health

1) Coorg Public Health Act, 1943.
2) a) The Hyderabad Vaccination Act 1951.
   b) The Hyderabad Infectious Diseases Act, 1950.
4) The Mysore Public Health Act, 1944.

D) Religious and Charitable Endowments

2) Coorg Temple Funds Management Act, 1956.

E) Prisoners

1) The Identification of Prisoners Act 1920 prevailing in Ex-Bombay-Karnatak area.
2) The Identification of Prisoners Act 1920 prevailing in Ex-Madras Karnataka area.
3) The Identification of Prisoners Act 1920 prevailing in Ex-Coorg area.
4) The Identification of Prisoners Act 1922 prevailing in Old Mysore area.

But the following bills have been prepared in order to bring about uniformity and they are under consideration of the State Legislature at different stages.

1) The Karnataka Canals, Ferries and Inland Vessels Bill.
2) The Karnataka Fisheries Conservation, Development and Regulation Bill.
3) As regards Public Health, a model bill from the Government of India is awaited.
4) The Karnataka Religious and Charitable Institutions Bill

The State Government should take steps to bring about uniformity in the remaining laws pertaining to the above department in the interest of good and efficient administration.
Similarly, the Cadres and Recruitment Rules for the following ten departments have not been finalised.

1) Special Commissioner's Office, New Delhi;
2) Karnataka Bhavan, New Delhi;
3) Directorate of Indo-Danish Project;
4) Film Unit;
5) Home-Guards and Civil Defence;
6) Drug Control;
7) Directorate of Text-Books;
8) Board of Pre-University Education (Recently the P.U.C. Board was abolished but subsequently on public agitation, a 13-Member Committee has been formed by the Government to go into the question of continuance or otherwise of the P.U.C. Board).
9) Marketing Department;
10) Department of Weights and Measures.

Different Cadres and Recruitment Rules in different areas are prevailing within the State. This has affected recruitment. The vacancies in these departments are filled up by deputation or on a temporary basis subject to review after the issue of Cadres and Recruitment Rules.

In this connection, some observations may be made. The
exorbitant delay in the formulation of the Cadres and Recruitment Rules has led to a lot of complications in the administration of the State. It has generated dissatisfaction among the civil servants of the State. Because the power to make temporary appointment pending issue of Cadres and Recruitment Rules was misused by the Government. It would not be out of place here if a reference is made to certain instances of misuse of power in the absence of Cadres and Recruitment Rules.

A) A Class III employee of the Department of Mines and Geology was appointed as Officiating Principal of the school of Mines, Oorgaon K.G.F. which is a Class I post with effect from February 15, 1958 pending issue of Cadres and Recruitment Rules. By a modified Government Notification dated April 3, 1959, his temporary appointment as Officiating Principal was continued until further orders. Subsequently, by virtue of the Education Department Services (Special Recruitment) Rules, 1967 made under Article 309 of the Constitution, his services were regularised with retrospective effect from February 15, 1958. Assailing the legality of the regularisation of his services, Principal, Jayachamarajendra Technical College, Bangalore and four others filed a writ petition
in the Karnataka High Court. Dismissing their writ petition, the High Court held the view that his temporary appointment as Officiating Principal was valid and the Government had the power to regularise an appointment if it thought fit with effect from any particular date. But the Principal, Jayachamarajedra Technical College, filed an appeal to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court declared that the Special Rules made by the Governor of Karnataka under Article 309 of the Constitution to regularise the appointment were illegal and ultra vires the Constitution. Reversing the High Court findings, the Supreme Court further held that the appointment of the Principal of the School of Mines, Gorgeum could not be construed as that of a temporary Officiating candidate. Hence, the regularisation of his appointment to a Class I post was held invalid and he was reverted to his original post of Class III.

B) The second instance of temporary appointment pending issue of Cadres and Recruitment Rules is still agonising. The Department of Public Libraries was started in 1965. Since then, regular appointment to the post of the State Librarian has not yet been made, even after the lapse of twelve years of the establishment of the
department. The post of the State Librarian is now held by a Class III employee of the Education Department on temporary basis. Though the cadres and Recruitment Rules for this department have been framed recently, the post has yet been advertised and filled up regularly as per rules of recruitment.

On the basis of these instances of temporary appointments pending issue of Cadres and Recruitment Rules, a few suggestions may be made here.

1) The practice of making temporary appointments and continuing them as such for a long time and then regularising their services is a practice that could seldom be countenanced. It is only under exceptional circumstances that the regularisation could be resorted to and even that could be done only if the temporary appointment is not made discriminately.

2) It is the utmost duty of the Government to frame the Cadres and Recruitment Rules for those departments which are not having them without any loss of time and enable the Appointing Authorities to fill up the posts as per rules and reduce to the least the necessity of making temporary appointments.
As regards rationalisation of administrative structure, it has already been mentioned in Chapter III that rationalisation has been brought about in respect of Secretariat and Departments, Divisional Administration, Administrative Units like Divisions, Districts and Talukas, Village Administration and Panchayati Raj institutions. But overhauling of the administrative machinery is quite necessary in order to bring about whole-scale reforms in the administrative structure. Hence the following suggestions have been made in connection with all the five aspects of Administrative Structure.

1) Secretariat and Departments

All the Departments of the Secretariat are concerned with the formulation of policies and programmes. Hence they are known as Administrative Departments. But all the Departments which carry out the policies and programmes of the Government at the field level are known as Executive Departments. Reshuffling is called for in respect of allotment of subjects to some administrative departments of the Secretariat. Grouping of subjects under administrative departments will have to be re-examined. Because the subjects assigned to the Administrative Departments of the Secretariat should be closely inter-related. A few
changes in the allotment of subjects in the process of rationalisation are called for. Some examples have been given below:

a) At present, the Health and Municipal Administration subjects have been combined under a single Department. Municipal Administration deals with the local bodies at the urban level. There is no direct relationship between the two subjects. Hence Municipal Administration should be separated from the Health Department.

b) The subjects pertaining to Development, Housing, Panchayati Raj and Co-operation are combined together under a single Department at present. But Panchayati Raj institutions have no direct relationship with the subjects of Housing, Development and Co-operation. Hence Panchayati Raj Institutions should be kept apart from the Development Department.

c) The separated subjects pertaining to Municipal Administration and Panchayati Raj Institutions should be assigned to a single Department. Because both the subjects deal with the local bodies at the urban level and the rural level respectively. If they are brought together under a single Department, there will be a proper co-ordination between the two agencies of local bodies.
d) At present, the Labour subject is managed by the Department of Food and Civil Supplies. Issues pertaining to the subject of labour are constantly being referred to the Law Department for legal advice. Hence it is better to separate the subject of labour from the Department of Food and Civil Supplies and attach it to the Department of Law and Parliamentary Affairs.

e) Ministers should not have their portfolios located in different Administrative Departments. Otherwise co-ordination becomes extremely difficult.

f) The activities performed by the Administrative Departments should be so arranged so as to establish close relationship with the activities of the executive Departments over which they exercise control.

g) In the process of rationalisation, there is a long-standing controversy as to whether the Technocrats should head the Departments or the Generalists should head the Departments. In this connection, it may be stated here that all the Administrative Departments should be headed by Generalists who are the senior members of I.A.S. But to deal with technical and specialised matters at the Secretariat level, there is an urgent necessity of specialists. Special Secretaries will have to be appointed.
The I.A.S. Secretaries are quite efficient to deal with routine administrative matters. It is desirable to fill up the posts of Special Secretaries by picking up the top-level officers of the Executive Departments. Some examples might be given here. Education is a highly specialised subject. Similarly, Public Works and Electricity, Agriculture, Horticulture, Sericulture, Food and Civil Supplies, Industries and Commerce are all highly technical. In fact, it is very difficult to make a distinction between what is technical and what is non-technical in the complex administrative set-up of the present time. Because almost all the subjects dealt by the administrative Departments of the Secretariat have become complex and specialised in character. Hence all the Administrative Departments of the Secretariat should have two Secretaries — one must be a Generalist belonging to the I.A.S. cadre and another should be a Technocrat belonging to the Specialist cadre. Then only the Technocrats would have closer proximity to the decision-making level and could make their impact on the administration. There must be a clear demarcation of duties and responsibilities between the two Secretaries so as to avoid the possibility of friction between the two Secretaries. Similarly all the Executive Departments should be headed by the Technocrats. Some examples may be
cited here. The Directors of Public Instruction, Collegiate Education, Technical Education, Agriculture, Horticulture, Industries and Commerce, Bureau of Economics and Statistics and a few others like these should be headed by Technocrats. Because they are directly held responsible for the exercise of policies and programmes at the field level. They are in a better position to understand the conditions and situations since they are encountered with practical difficulties at the field level. These are a few suggestions for the rationalisation of the Secretariat and Departments.

2) Divisional Administration

It has already been pointed out in the text of the Chapter III that the jurisdiction of the Divisions in the State was redrawn twice times — once in 1956 and another time in 1966 and Government created the posts of Divisional Commissioners in order to rationalise the administration at the divisional level. But still there is a controversy whether the posts of Divisional Commissioners should be continued or should there be a Revenue Board system in lieu of it? In this connection, it may be suggested that the posts of Divisional Commissioners are quite essential for a big State like Karnataka which
has a very large area. The Districts of Hyderabad-Karnataka area and the Bombay-Karnataka area are very far away from the capital of the State. There must be some link between the Headquarters level and the District level. The Deputy Commissioners in a vast State like Karnataka cannot establish the link between the two levels, since they are situated at very long distant spots. It is only the Divisional Commissioners who can fill in the gap between the two levels. Moreover, the concept of regional planning is gaining much importance in a developing economy like India. In such a changing context, the Divisional Commissioners can attend to the regional development problems. The regional imbalances can be set right. At present, the Divisional Commissioners are designated as Deputy Development Commissioners. Under the circumstances explained above, the posts of Divisional Commissioners are quite essential and they must be continued.

3) Administrative Units

Broadsly, there are three categories of administrative units viz., Divisions, Districts and Talukas. Though twenty years have elapsed since the formation of Karnataka, administrative units have not yet been rationalised. Though the One-Man Commission headed by Mr. M. Vasudeva Rao
was appointed in July 1973 and the report of the same was submitted to the Government in 1975 March, the report is kept confidential and it has not been released to the press and the people. It may be suggested here that now it is very high time for the release of the report. There is a wide-spread feeling among the people in the State that there is a need for readjustment of Divisions, Districts and Talukas. Bangalore and Belgaum Divisions are having heavy administrative charge. It may be suggested here that the number of Divisions in the State should be increased to six by dividing Bangalore and Belgaum Divisions. Because one Divisional Commissioner can effectively manage the affairs of four districts at the most. At present, Bangalore Division is having five districts and 4 more Division is having six districts. If the jurisdiction of a Division is very wide, then it becomes very difficult for the Divisional Commissioner to co-ordinate the activities at the divisional level and to attend to the regional development planning. Hence the following Divisions may be created:

a) Bangalore Urban District, Bangalore Rural District, Tumkur and Kolar Districts may be formed into a Division with headquarters at Tumkur.
b) Mysore, Mandya, Coorg and Hassan Districts may be formed into a Division with headquarters at Mandya.

c) Shimoga, Chickmaglur, South Kanara and North Kanara Districts may be formed into a Division with headquarters at Shimoga.

d) Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar and Bellary Districts may be formed into a Division with headquarters at Gulbarga.

e) Bijapur, Bagalkot (to be created newly) and Belgaum Districts may be formed into a Division with headquarters at Belgaum.

f) Dharwar, Davengere (to be created newly) and Chitrardurga Districts may be formed into a Division with headquarters at Davengere.

Thus Divisions may be redrawn on the above lines by creating two more Districts of Bagalkot and Davengere Districts and by bifurcating the present Bangalore District into Bangalore Urban and Bangalore Rural Districts.

With regard to the manageable size of the Districts, it may be said here that it is purely a matter of judgement
rather than that of a formula. Area, population, proximity between the District Headquarters and Taluka Headquarters, proximity between the District Headquarters and the State Headquarters must be the criteria in the formation of the District. A District may comprise eight Talukas at the most. Otherwise it becomes unmanageable to the Deputy Commissioner. Hence it may be suggested that the present 175 Talukas may be regrouped into 22 Districts. Some of the present Districts like Dharwar, Bijapur and Bangalore have become unwieldy and unmanageable. They may be bifurcated by adding their Talukas to some other neighbouring Districts. After examining the existing position of Districts and Talukas, suggestions have been made for the rationalisation of Districts and Talukas. The following is the existing position:

1) Bangalore District: Anekal, Bangalore North, Bangalore South, Channapatna, Devanahalli, Doddaballapur, Hoskote, Kanakapura, Magadi, Nelamangala, Ramanagaram (eleven Talukas).

2) Belgaum District: Athani, Belgaum, Chikodi, Gokak, Hukkeri, Khanapur, Parasgad, Raibag, Ramdurg and Sampagaon (Ten Talukas).
3) Bellary District: Bellary, Hadagali, Harpanahalli, Hospet, Kudligi, Mallepuram, Sandur and Siraguppa (Eight Talukas).

4) Bidar District: Aurud, Bagalkot, Basavakalyan, Bhalki, Bidar and Humnabad (Five Talukas).

5) Bijapur District: Badami, Bagalkot, Basavan-Bagewadi, Bijapur, Bilgi, Hungund, Indi, Jamakhandi, Muddebihal, Mudhol and Sindgi (Eleven Talukas).

6) Chickmagalur District: Chickmaglur, Kadur, Koppara, Madigere, Narasimharajapura, Sringeri, Tarikere (Seven Talukas).


8) Coorg District: Mercara, Somaverpet and Virajpet (Three Talukas).

9) Dharwar District: Byadgi, Dharwar, Gedag, Hangal, Haveri, Hirekerur, Hubli, Kalghatagi, Kundgol, Mundargi, Nargund, Navalgund, Ranebennur, Ron, Savanoor, Shiggaon and Shirhatti (Seventeen Talukas).


12) Kolar District: Bagepalli, Bungarpet, Chickballapur, Chintamani, Gauribidnur, Gudibande, Kolar, Malur, Mulbegal, Sidlagbutra and Srinivasapur (Eleven Taluks).

13) Mandy District: Krishnarajpet, Maddur, Malavalli, Mandy, Nagamangala, Pandavapura, Srirangapatna (Seven Taluks).


18) South Kanara District: Belthangady, Duntwal, Coondapur, Karkal, Mangalore, Auttur, Sullia and Udupi (Eight Talukas).

19) Tumkur District: Chikkanayakhalli, Cubbi, Koratagere, Kunigel, Madugiri, Ravaguda, Sira, Tiptur, Tumkur and Turuvekere (Ten Talukas).

It may be suggested here that three more Districts may be created. Out of three proposed Districts, Davangere and Bagalkot Districts should be newly formed and Bangalore District may be bifurcated into Urban and Rural Districts instead of Bangalore North and South. The new Districts proposed may be formed by the process of addition of the following Talukas by deleting them from the existing Districts.

A) The proposed Davangere District should consist of 4 Talukas namely Haveri, Byadgi, Ranebennur and Hirekerur existing in the present Dharwar District, 2 Talukas of present Chitradurg District namely Harihar and Davangere and one Taluka of present Shimoga District namely Honnali.
B) The proposed Bagalkot District should consist of 4 Talukas of present Dharwar District namely Gadag, Kargund, Navalgund and Mundargi, 2 Talukas of present Bijapur District — namely Badami and Bagalkot, and one Taluka of Belgaum District namely Ramdurg.

C) The present Bangalore District should be bifurcated into two Districts — Bangalore Urban and Bangalore Rural. Bangalore Urban District should consist of 4 Talukas of the present Bangalore District namely Bangalore North, Bangalore South, Nelamangala and Ramanagaram and 3 Talukas of present Kolar District namely Bangarpet, Chintamani and Gauribidnur.

Thus the 22 districts and 175 Talukas would be manageable in their size and population.

4) Village Administration

Though the village administration has been rationalised and though the abolition of hereditary Village Officers like Headmen and the Inferior Village Servants has been accepted in principle, the Government have not yet finalised their views. In this connection, it may be suggested that the Headmen and the Inferior Village Servants should be made as Government servants, on the lines of Village Accountants.
at the earliest. The present scheme of Village Protection Squad for the maintenance of law and order in the village may be dispensed with. Because the village people are not so much trained to undertake such heavy responsibility. Moreover, it is likely to tend to group rivalry in the village politics thereby vitiating the rural atmosphere.

5) Panchayati Raj Institutions

It has already been mentioned in the text of the chapter that the recommendations of Balwant Rai Mehta study team were accepted with modifications by the Government of Karnataka in respect of Panchayati Raj institutions. They were rationalised in the State of Karnataka in the year 1960 with the passing of Karnataka Village Panchayats and Local Boards Act, 1959. There are some deviations in the structure of Panchayati Raj envisaged in the Karnataka Act from that contemplated by the Mehta Team. It would be quite pertinent to make suggestions in the light of Mehta study team recommendations. The Mehta study team had recommended a three-tier structure of local bodies with a directly elected Village Panchayat at the village level, a Panchayat Samithi at the block level indirectly elected by the Panches of all the Panchayats and electing men from amongst themselves
to be members of the Panchayat Samithis and the Zilla Parishads at the District level, consisting of all the Presidents of the Panchayat Samithis, all the members of the State Legislature and of Parliament representing a part or whole District and the District level officers of the medical, public health, agriculture, veterinary, engineering, education departments. The team contemplated the Panchayato and Panchayat Samithis as Executive bodies and Zilla Parishads as a co-ordinating and supervisory body. But Karnataka is having two major differences in respect of Panchayati Raj institutions. In the three-tier structure of Panchayati Raj institutions as recommended by the Kehta study team as described above, Karnataka deviated from its recommendations in two respects. In Karnataka, the middle-tier is at the Taluka level but not at the block level. The second major difference is that in Karnataka, the Taluka Boards are not indirectly elected by the Electoral College consisting of the members of the Panchayats but are directly elected. The functions of Village Panchayats and Local Boards are listed in the Act. They may be briefly stated here. The Act categorizes them into obligatory and discretionary functions. Amongst the obligatory functions of these Local Bodies, the cleansing of public roads, drains, ponds, tanks and wells,
lighting of public streets, maintenance and regulation of burning and burial grounds may be classified as Civic Functions. Regulation of buildings, shops, shows, eating and entertainment houses, maintenance of cattle pounds, regulation of sale and preservation of meat, fish and other perishable articles of food may be classified as regulatory functions. Construction, repair and maintenance of public wells, ponds and tanks, planting and preservation of public wells, ponds and tanks, planting and preservation of trees and promotion and development of economic conditions come under the category of development functions. From the above description of the functions of Local Bodies, it would be clear that the range of functions allotted to the Local Bodies is very wide. The Act contemplates constitution of a Panchayat Fund and a Taluka Board Fund. The Panchayat Fund consists of:

a) tax proceeds;
b) sale proceeds;
c) income from property;
d) sums contributed by the Taluka Board;
e) amounts allotted by Government under the Act;
f) loans and contributions from the Government and Taluka Boards;
g) funds contributed by Taluka Board.
Similarly the composition of Taluka Board Fund consists of:

1) Rates, cesses, taxes, fees and penalties paid and levied by the Government and the Taluka Board;

2) Sale proceeds and rents from lands or other properties of the Taluka Board;

3) Funds of the District Boards allotted to them as well as sums received by Taluka Boards;

4) Interest, profit; and

5) Other moneys accruing by way of gifts, grants or transfers from Government or private individuals.

In the light of the broad structure described above, a few suggestions for further rationalisation of Panchayati Raj institutions may be made here.

a) The recommendation of Mehta study team that the entire charge of development work within its jurisdiction - the term development work being used to connote agriculture, animal husbandry, local communication, sanitation, health and medical relief, local amenities and similar subjects, should be accepted immediately. Taluka Boards should be
abolished and in their place Panchayat Samithis at the
block level should be established.

b) Functions allotted to the Local Bodies in
the State will have to be matched by sufficient finances.
Otherwise, the wide-range of development functions will
remain only in the Statute book on account of insubstantial
revenues. In fact, finance is vital to the success of
Panchayati Raj institutions. Hence adequate financial
resources should be provided to the Local Bodies. Proceeds
of some taxes like sales tax, excise, land revenue,
agricultural income-tax, entertainment tax and tax on
lotteries should be diverted to these bodies at a certain
percentage to make them financially self-sufficient to
undertake development works. The District Officers of
the various Departments are expected to take utmost
interest in the functioning of Local Bodies in the District.
But at present, the role of the various District Officers
at the District Development Councils is merely confined
to participation in the discussion of the District
Development Councils. They cannot shirk off their res-
ponsibility by transferring the responsibility of development
programmes to their subordinates at the Taluka level.
Hence specific instructions should be issued to all the
District Officers to engage themselves continuously in the review of work of the developmental activities of the District.

d) The Local Bodies cannot grow to the highest stature of their personality unless their autonomy is fully respected. Hence it may be suggested here that the Government should not interfere in the internal working of their organisation. They must be left to themselves so long as they discharge their responsibilities properly. Party considerations should not come in the way of supersession of the Local Bodies. In fact, one of the essential conditions for the success of the Panchayati Raj is the extent of encouragement given by the State Government in promoting these bodies.

e) At present, the bulk of development staff viz., the Block Development Officers and the Extension Officers working in the Taluka Development Boards are all on deputation from the respective Departments of Government. They will be under the control of the Deputy Commissioner of the District and the Divisional Commissioner of the respective Division. But they have no control over these officials. They are likely to neglect their immediate assignments of development activities since they owe
allegiance to the respective Heads of their parent Departments. Hence in order to overcome the above difficulties, it is better to have Panchayati Raj Service Commission, for the recruitment of Panchayati Raj personnel.

With regard to the separation of the Judiciary from the Executive, it may be stated here that the scheme of separation was carried out in Karnataka in 1965. But still there are certain issues which have not yet been solved. The following observations and suggestions may be made here.

a) The New Code of Criminal Procedure came into force with effect from 1st April 1974. But yet, the powers and functions of the Executive and Judicial Magistrates have not been clearly specified under the provisions of the New Code. They must be clarified immediately.

b) Similarly, though uniformity in respect of the several laws of the State has been brought about, the old laws pertaining to the separation of the Judiciary from the Executive existing in the different integrated areas prior to reorganisation, have been continued in respect of the exercise of powers by the Judicial and
Executive Magistrates. It may be illustrated here by examples:

1) Sections 46, 75, Clause (a) of sub-section (3) in Section 76, 141 of the Madras Public Health Act, 1939 have been continued.

2) Sections 47, 68, 75, 76, Clause A of sub-section 5 in Section 77, Section 143 Clause B of the Mysore Public Health Act, 1894 have been continued.

3) Sections 15 and 16 of the Coorg Agricultural Pests and Diseases Act 1933 have been continued.

4) Section 29 of the Hyderabad Ferries Act 1314 F, sub-section 1 of Sections 18, 21 of the Hyderabad Cattle Trespass Act, 1337 F, sub-section 2 of Section 6 of the Hyderabad Fisheries Act 1356 F have been continued.

Now, it is high time for the Government to mention clearly the powers and functions of the two categories of Magistrates under the various provisions of the laws of the State in respect of which uniformity has been already brought about (Vide Chapter II). It may be suggested here that these are the important issues and they must be solved immediately, in order to complete the process of separation.
One can easily find from the text of the Chapter V on Integration of Services that the Inter-State Seniority Lists of the Government Departments of Karnataka have been finalised by the Union Government and they have been published in the Government Gazettes of the State from time to time. Now the balance remaining with the Government is in respect of three Inter-State Seniority Lists mentioned below.

Statement showing the Lists not yet finalised (position as on 16th April 1976).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>No. of lists/cadres involved</th>
<th>No. of persons involved in each list/cadre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Revenue Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Deputy Tahasildars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) First Grade Revenue Inspectors/First Division Clerk of Mysore Division and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) First Grade Revenue Inspectors/First Division Clerk of Bangalore Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On enquiry with the authorities of the Integration Department, it is learnt that the same position still continues to exist. Thus out of 175 Inter-State Seniority Lists, only 172 lists have been finalised. The number of persons whose seniority has been settled is 38413 out of which 2858 are gazetted officers and 35,555 are non-gazetted officers. Though the Government has done a commendable work with the help of its civil servants, it has not been in a position to solve this problem. Of course, there is much delay in the finalisation of the Inter-State Seniority Lists pertaining to the Revenue Department. But the whole process of integration of services over a period of twenty years has affected the civil servants a lot.

It is quite embarrassing to see that the matter is still a live issue. The procedure prescribed for the finalisation of the Inter-State Seniority Lists is quite cumbersome. Several Inter-State Seniority Lists had to be redrafted by the Integration Department in the light of instruction of the courts and then the Government. All this has created feelings of remorse and dissatisfaction among the employees. During the course of these twenty years, most of the employees have retired from service thus being deprived
of their legitimate claims of promotion. At least, they could have been happy and contented if those retired employees had been given retrospective promotions with all the consequential financial benefits. They would have enjoyed the notional promotions and spent the remaining days of the evening of their life with contentment. But even that has been denied to the retired employees and also the employees serving at the fag end by enacting a legislation providing for prospective promotions without any arrears of pay. (Vide Appendix No.6) The inordinate delay on the part of the State Government in the finalisation of the several Inter-State Seniority Lists has affected the morale of the civil servants in the State. The employees of the integrated areas have developed a feeling of step-motherly treatment since their legitimate claims were ignored.

The following are the reasons pertaining to the exhorbitant delay in the finalisation of the Inter-State Seniority Lists:

1) The State Government adopted the most complicated procedure for the preparation and finalisation of the Inter-State Seniority Lists. It could be seen from the text of the Chapter on Integration of Services.
2) The State Government resorted to frequent transfers of the personnel. Consequently, the integration work was slowed down as the new incumbents had to go through a number of cases.

3) On account of the complicated procedure and the frequent transfers of the personnel of the Integration Department, the allottees could not get justice. Consequently they had to approach the High Court and the Supreme Court to get justice. There are 202 writ petitions pending in the High Court and the Supreme Court pertaining to the Integration of Services. The court proceedings of affected individual Government servants have also added to the exorbitant delay in the finalisation of the lists.

The employees of the integrated areas are now feeling that the reorganisation has been a curse to them. Sometimes, they express that it would have been far better had they opted for their parent State Civil Services. Any Government servant, like the author of this thesis, knows one's own limitations in the criticism of the policies and programmes of the Government. But this much could be said that the slow-pedalling policy adopted by the State Government has burnt the hearts of many civil servants and their fond
hopes of promotion have been shattered into pieces. Hence the finalisation of the Inter-State Seniority Lists in order to achieve the integration of services should be given top priority for the maintenance of good morale and esprit de corps among all the sections of the public personnel of the State. Though 172 lists have been finalised, several lacunae have been left in the process of finalisation as a result of which, aggrieved individual Government servants have approached the Law Courts for the redressal of their grievances. The Government should have fairly applied the principles governing the equation of posts and fixation of Inter-State Seniority of all the integrated areas. Now it is high time for the Government to expedite the process of finalisation of the lists. All the allottees are retiring within a decade at the most. If the lists are not finalised and their legitimate claims are not honoured, the problem will have a natural death within a decade and the Government will have to earn a very bad name.

Another burning unsolved problem quite similar to the integration of services is the problem of Division of Assets and Liabilities of our State with the neighbouring States. The progress in solving the problem is quite
unsatisfactory. Because there are intense feelings among the people of the State that whatever was due to Karnataka was not given to them. The general principles, on which the assets and liabilities should be divided, have been thoroughly dealt with in Chapter VI in the light of the recommendations of the States' Reorganisation Commission Report 1955, the provisions of the States' Reorganisation Act 1956, the directions issued by the Central Government and the Government of Karnataka from time to time. Several Inter-State Conferences of Ministers and of Officers have been held from time to time for the division of assets and liabilities. But the following 43 items have not yet been solved by the Government still so far.

1) Mines and Minerals - sharing of money payable to M/s Tandur and Navandgi Stone Quarries (Private Ltd.) and M/s Kurukunta and Serum Stones Private Ltd. between Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka.

2) Division of printed forms, registers and books and publications of the former Hyderabad State.

3) Division of Agricultural Machinery of the Department of Agriculture.
4) Division of earth-moving machinery purchased under Tungabhadra Project.

5) Division of equipment and machinery of Community Development Programme.

6) Assets and Liabilities of Ex-District Boards - Apportionment of Rs.1,63,216/- to Andhra Pradesh.

7) Apportionment of assets and liabilities of the defunct District Boards, Raichur and Gulbarga - Transfer of amount.

8) Payment of Local Fund Cess due from the Nizam of Hyderabad in respect of Surf-E-Khas Lands in Parabanni District.

9) a) Division of assets and liabilities of the Road Transport Department.

   b) Overall financial adjustment with regard to the division of assets and liabilities of Road Transport Department.

10) Grant-in-aid under further Education Scheme to ex-service men and their Dependents belonging to Maharashtra region.
11) Apportionment of loan of Rs.12 lakhs given from Scheduled Caste Trust Fund to the People's Education Society, Bombay for starting the Agricultural College.

12) Assets and Liabilities - Decretal amount relating to civil suit No. 14 B/1959 in the Court of Civil Judge, Class I Berhampur (Madhya Pradesh) sharing of expenditure of Rs.4,668.23


14) Allocation of loans taken from the Central Government for relending purpose.

15) Liability of income-tax in respect of certain loans advanced by H.E.n. the Nizam to the Ex-Hyderabad State Government.


17) Division of claims received by the Andhra Pradesh Government on account of pay and allowances, travelling allowance and to civil team officers deputed to Ex-Hyderabad
State after Police Action (includes claims relating to all Departments of Secretariat).

18) Cheques issued prior to 1-11-1956 but encashed thereafter -- Allocation of the liability.

19) Division of the stores in the Public Works Department, Central Workshop to the former Hyderabad State.

20) Cost of Crime Police employed on the Railway lines passing through the Ex-Hyderabad State.

21) Recovery of leave and pension contributions in respect of Police Personnel deputed to Hyderabad.

22) Claims of Police Officers on deputation to the former Hyderabad State.

23) Replenishment of the amount of imprest looted from the Office of the District Superintendent of Police, during the Police Action in Hyderabad.

24) Adjustment of expenditure on the Police staff deputed to the former Hyderabad State by the Government of Madhya Pradesh during the Police Action in 1948.

25) Settlement of arrears of Travelling Allowance claims of certain Police Personnel of Maharashtra
Government sent on deputation to former Hyderabad State during Police Action.

26) Allocation of capital expenditure as on 31-10-1956 between Andhra Pradesh, Ex-Bombay and Karnataka State under States' Reorganisation Act 1956.

27) Division of Hyderabad Government's Industrial investment among the successor States of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Karnataka.


29) Allocation of investment of fund for development scheme of Ex-Hyderabad State.


31) Suit filed by certain shareholders of the Ex-Nizam State Railway against the Government claiming profits.

32) Allocation of shares in commercial concerns.

33) Final settlement — settlement of receipts and payments in respect of Life Insurance Fund.
34) National division of credit balances of Hyderabad State Life Insurance.

35) Recovery and payment of Loan Fund Cess P.D.C/F dues in respect of Surf-E-Khas lands of the Nizam of Hyderabad.

36) Hyderabad Central Co-operative and Land Mortgage Bank - Payment of interest on the loan of Rs.10 lakhs received from the Ex-Hyderabad Government.

37) Division of assets and liabilities in respect of:
   A) Madilge -- Shipur Road
   B) Sungameshwar -- Gadhinglaj -- Antoli Road

38) D.M.E. Technical Instructions and Mechanical Engineering Regulations -- supply of, to police writs.


40) Settlement of claims of arrears of pay of Police Constable, B.C. Kocharekar for the period from 1949 to 1952.

41) Payment of the proportionate share at the
amount paid by the Andhra Pradesh on account of hire charges of vehicles requisitioned by the Government of Madras in connection with Hyderabad Police Action.

42) a) Share of Maharashtra State in the sale proceeds of Rs.70-72 lakhs of the Sapeen House property.

b) Valuation of financial adjustments in respect of the Hyderabad Guest House at New Delhi and land adjacent to the Hyderabad Palace at New Delhi.

43) Allocation of the cash balances of the former District Board - Bidar.

All the above items have been left unsolved by the Government of Karnataka. So far as the division of assets and liabilities is concerned, the neighbouring States of Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra have not extended their co-operation in solving the problems. In this connection, it may be said that the Central Government should take over the responsibility of dividing the assets and liabilities among the States whenever the States are reorganised just as it has taken over the responsibility of finalisation of the Inter-State Seniority lists. Otherwise some of the States are likely to become recalcitrant and
adamant in their attitude and they will deliberately block the solution of the problem. Even now, it is not too late if the Union Government headed by Janata Party intervenes in this issue and solve the above problems.

Regarding the problem of Linguistic Minorities in Karnataka, it is happy to note that all the Linguistic Minorities are quite satisfied over the facilities extended by the Government of Karnataka. Even the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has expressed his satisfaction over the provisions and the facilities extended by the Government and it can be verified from the Annual Reports submitted by the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities about which a detailed reference has already been made in the text of the Chapter. A few suggestions may be made here in connection with the issues pertaining to the Linguistic Minorities.

1) Kannada language should be taught to all the children of the Linguistic Minorities since it is the Official Language of the State. Otherwise, they will find it difficult to pass the Kannada Language Test after their entry into the State Civil Service.

2) The text-books should be provided to the children
of Linguistic Minorities in their respective languages at all the levels of instruction — from pre-primary education to the University education stage. At present, they are put to much inconvenience and hardships on account of non-availability of text-books. In this connection, it may be suggested that the Directorate of Text-Books and the Universities in our State should contact their counterparts of the neighbouring States and get the text-books well in time.

In the Chapter on Border Disputes, it has been pointed out that Karnataka has claimed certain areas of Jath Taluka, Akkalkot Taluka, Gadhinglaj Taluka, Neerargod Taluka, Kangelwedha Taluka and South Sholapur Taluka. Mahajan Commission submitted its report eight years ago but the problem has not yet been solved and still it remains as a live issue.

Many of our brethren living in certain adjoining areas like Madakasira Taluka of Anantpur District, Hosur Taluka of Salem District, Taiwadi Pirka of Copiche-Lyapolyam Taluka in Coimbatore District, the Nilgiris District, Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg Talukas have made representations to the Central Government and the Government of Karnataka that their areas should be included in Karnataka. Similarly,
Maharashtra has laid claims on certain areas in Karnataka. All the claims and counter-claims of the three States of Karnataka-Maharashtra-Kerala involved in the border disputes have been thoroughly examined in the text of the Chapter on Border Disputes. In order to find out solutions, several Committees and Commissions suggested different criteria, the merits and demerits of which have already been examined in the text. But the crux of the problem among the disputant States is whether the principles adopted by the States' Reorganisation Commission and approved by Parliament should still hold good or whether they should be given a good-bye and a new set of principles should be applied. In this connection, the following suggestions have been made to solve the issues:

1) Among all the theories of Village Unit Theory popularly known as Pataskar Formula, Taluke Unit Theory, Tract Unit Theory and District Unit Theory, preference should be given to District as a basic unit for territorial readjustments. Because Districts in India have developed organic administrative and economic life of their own during the course of the past several centuries. Hence acceptance of any unit below the level of a District will lead to all sorts of controversies and perilous problems.
2) We accepted the boundaries of the States in 1956 when the States of India were reorganised. There is no meaning in reopening of settled boundaries. Otherwise, there will be no end to the border problem.

3) It is almost impossible to have rigid demarcation of Linguistic States. Because population in the border areas of the States goes on fluctuating on account of migration.

4) The Government of Karnataka should not have agreed for the appointment of Mahajan Commission under any circumstances. Because every Commission or Committee has its own formula or a set of principles in settling the border disputes. If some concession is given to any State on the basis of a new set of principles, all other States which are likely to be benefitted by the new principle will rise up and demand areas from the neighbouring States and the vicious circle will continue.

5) Now it is high time for the centre to accept the recommendations of Mahajan Commission (Vide Appendix No.8) without any reservations and then amend the Constitution providing for a District as a basic unit for territorial readjustments. There should not be any
exception to this principle though the State might be willing for mutual agreement. If this rigid policy is followed, then only there will be an end to the border disputes in India as a whole.

Karnataka has the least irrigated area of all the States involved in the Water Disputes. While Tamil Nadu in South India has 36 per cent of irrigated area, Andhra Pradesh has 26 per cent, Maharashtra has 8 per cent while Karnataka has only 5.5 per cent. Irrigation has not at all developed eventhough the mighty rivers like Cauvery, Krishna and Godavari and the equally big tributaries of Krishna viz., Tungabhadra, Malaprabha, Bheema and Ghataprabha flow through Karnataka. As the State is very backward in the development of irrigation, the average agriculturist in Karnataka has become poorest. There was no common Government to cater to the needs and requirements of the integrated areas which have now come together to form United Karnataka. 88 Talukas of 12 Districts of Karnataka have been declared as the drought affected areas by the Second Irrigation Commission of 1972. Out of a total of 72,000 and odd square miles of the territory of Karnataka, roughly about 20,000 square miles comprising the Districts of Gulbarga, Raichur, Bijapur and Bellary and parts of
Belgaum, Dharwar and Chitradurg Districts are chronically affected with scarcities and famines. But in allocating the waters to Karnataka, all these factors have been ignored by the various Commissions and Tribunals. The issues connected with Water Disputes have remained unsolved except Krishna river in respect of which the tribunal has declared its final award in 1976 May.

A) Krishna River

The Krishna Water Tribunal or Bachawat Commission announced its award on 24th December 1973. When Karnataka requested for review of the award and issue of certain clarifications, the tribunal modified its award in May 1976 and allocated to three States of Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh at the rate of 560, 700 and 600 T.M.C.F.Ta. respectively. This has caused great injustice to Karnataka. In this connection, the following observations may be made:

1) The northern Districts of Karnataka which are semi-arid, depend on the utilisation of Krishna waters flowing in the region, for their welfare and prosperity. This has been totally ignored by the tribunal.

2) According to the award of the tribunal the
distribution of waters of Krishna and its tributaries among the three States is limited only to 75% dependable flows. After the assessment of dependable flow in the Krishna river at 2060 T.M.C.F. Tons, nearly 250 T.M.C.F. Tons of water will be left in excess of 2060 T.M.C.F. Tons. and the tribunal has not provided for the distribution of these surplus waters. It is estimated that one T.M.C.F. Tons of water will irrigate 10,000 acres yielding 15 to 20 thousand tonnes of foodgrains per annum. Andhra Pradesh is likely to use these surplus waters for extension of Srisailam and Nagerjunasagar Projects.

3) Inflated, extra-basin and overlapping claims of Andhra Pradesh have been accepted by the tribunal without scrutiny, as a result of which the interests of other riparian States and their obligations to their thirsty lands have been ignored.

B) Godavari River

In regard to the sharing of Godavari waters, Karnataka is a minor partner in the available waters of river Panjra, a tributary of Godavari. Godavari basin has a drainage area of 2000 square miles in Karnataka. The total requirement of Godavari waters would be 51 T.M.C.F. Tons. On this
assumption, it has prepared a number of irrigation projects across Karanja, Manjra and Chulkinala in the wake of 1973 drought. Pending a final settlement of the issue of allocation of Godavari waters, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh have reached a temporary accord.

Though Godavari Water Tribunal was appointed in the year 1969, the tribunal has not yet announced its award. It is hoped that the claim of Karnataka for 51 T.M.C.F.1s. of water is quite reasonable. Because Bidar District is an arid region and it is industrially very backward. A small quantity of 51 T.M.C.1s of water out of dependable annual flow of 4630 T.M.C.F.1s. of water is not much.

C) Cauvery River

With regard to the Cauvery Water Dispute, the following observations may be made in the light of facts found in the agreement of 1924 between Karnataka (Old Mysore) and Tamil Nadu (Old Madras).

1) 1924 Agreement is unworkable and cannot be accepted. Because when this Agreement was entered into between Tamil Nadu and Karnataka, the former was a British province and the latter was a dependent Princely State under the British suzerainty. The dispute between the
two States was settled through the authoritarian decision of the sovereign power of the British Crown. After the reorganisation of States, Kerala has also become a party to the dispute since the upper portions of some of the tributaries of the Cauvery have come to lie in the State of Kerala. Hence there has been change of circumstances which has the effect of modifying the terms of Agreement.

2) The river Cauvery rises in Coorg and so Karnataka is an upper riparian State and similarly Tamil Nadu is a lower riparian State. Under 1924 Agreement, Tamil Nadu which is a lower riparian State was given "Veto Power." Old Mysore was made to give an undertaking that it would not undertake to build fresh irrigation projects on the river Cauvery and its tributaries, without the prior consent of Madras. The 1924 Agreement put unjust restrictions on the powers of an upstream State - Karnataka.

3) Tamil Nadu is adhering to the Doctrine of Prior Appropriation. Because Ex-Madras farmers were the first to use the waters of Cauvery. On this basis, they are claiming that they have acquired a right over the waters of the river Cauvery by continuous use from ancient times. But in most of the countries in the world, the water law is based upon the principle of equitable distribution of
waters among the riparian States. Karnataka, which is an upstream State, contributes nearly 75% of water to the river Cauvery, should have greater share in the allocation. Any impartial tribunal faced with Cauvery Water problem will have to accept this fact.

4) Karnataka is no longer a dependent Princely State. It is one of the constituent units of Indian Federation. Hence, Cauvery Water Dispute should be settled on a footing of equality with the State of Tamil Nadu.

5) Under Clause XI of Article 10 of 1924 Agreement, it will be open for reconsideration after the expiry of 50 years. The Agreement of 1924 expired on February 13, 1974. When an Agreement is terminated, it releases all the parties to the Agreement from the bonds of obligations. On the basis of the above observations, it may be submitted that now it is high time for the total revision of the Agreement in the light of changed circumstances. There must be a basin-wide approach modelled on the Tennessee Valley Authority of the United States. Only then, all the three States involved in the present dispute would be able to utilise the waters of Cauvery to the maximum extent. In this connection, the following suggestions have been made:
1) In the adjudication of the allocation of waters of inter-State rivers, the assessment of the human aspirations, realities, the needs and requirements in the basin area of each State should be the essential factor rather than the legal niceties by which the judicial authorities are likely to be swayed.

2) In the rational and equitable distribution of inter-State rivers the factors like (a) drainage area, (b) cultivable area, (c) net sown area, (d) population, and (e) scarcity and famine affected areas should be taken into consideration. The average of all these factors would constitute the fairest principle in sharing the waters of inter-State rivers.

3) Rivers are the gifts of Nature. Like other natural resources as mountains, forests and mineral wealth, they must be declared as natural asset. They should not be the exclusive possessions of the States. They serve as the best media of national integration. National economic progress is retarded since the river disputes have held up execution of various irrigation and power projects. If they are declared as national asset, the Centre can easily draw up and execute irrigation and power projects for the entire country rather than allowing the States to draw up
plans piecemeal. Side by side, a National River Grid on the lines of National Power Grid should be formed in order to control the floods during the rainy season and for ensuring water-supply to the arid regions during droughts. The Central Government should have effective say in husbanding such resources. At present, the rivers come under the purview of the States. Their judicious harnessing is left to the States concerned and is dependent on the financial resources of each State and the central assistance it gets. In that event, individual States will have to subordinate their own interests and advantages to the interests of the nation as a whole. The Centre will become the arbiter and then the available waters will have to be distributed equitably according to the needs of each State.

4) So far as riparian rights are concerned, they should be left to the engineers and agronomists. Because they alone can understand the intricacies of economy in water management. Politicians cannot assess dispassionately the needs of a region.

5) Now, the award on Krishna Waters has been banded down by the tribunal. It is final and binding on all the parties. Though Karnataka is disappointed with
the verdict, it will have to accept it with grace. It has learnt a bitter lesson in regard to Krishna waters. Now, the task before Karnataka is to enlist the support of vulnerable sections of drought-prone areas in the State, harness every source of irrigation and go ahead with full utilisation of the allocated waters by implementing the major northern projects in the Krishna basin without any further delay. Let this be a pointer to tackle the Cauvery waters with foresight and determination.

Thus if all these issues pertaining to the above unsolved problems are solved by the Government of Karnataka, it will be the first State in solving the administrative problems arising out of reorganisation.