Introduction

The States' Reorganisation Commission headed by Syed Fazl Ali drew the attention of the new States to be formed to the need for rethinking on the reorganisation of administrative structure and advised them to the effect: "After the scheme for reorganisation has been given effect to, it may be necessary for some of the administrations to review the number and territorial extent of the existing Districts and Commissioners' charges with particular reference to the rationalisation of the administrative structure."(1) Soon after the reorganisation of Karnataka, the State Government was seized of the problem of rationalisation of its administrative structure. Because the new State comprised five integrated areas, each with distinct administrative traditions and practices of its own. The problem of rationalisation became quite complex and the need for overhauling the administrative machinery gained urgency.

Implications of Rationalisation

It would be quite pertinent if a brief reference is made to the definition of the term "Rationalisation."
The term is open to a variety of interpretations. This is because everybody has his own notion of what can really be regarded as rational thinking and action in the organisation and management of administration. The concept of rationalisation has been interpreted in different ways and words by the various authorities on the subject at different times and in different conditions. The term 'Rationalisation' has been derived from the German word "Rationalisierung" or the English word 'Rational' which means an act endowed with reason. Rationalisation as a method of industrial reorganisation was initiated in Germany to reconstruct her industries that were devastated during the First World War. There are various aspects of rationalisation. They may broadly be divided into four categories:

1) Technological,

2) Organisational,

3) Financial, and

4) Social.

But in the context of administration, it has organisational aspect. In May 1937, the Advisory Committee
of the International Labour Organisation adopted the following definition: "Rationalisation in general is any reform tending to replace habitual antiquated practices by means or methods based on scientific reasoning."(2) But in the present context of this study, the term rationalisation has been used to mean "reorganisation of administrative pattern and organisation." The rationalisation of administrative structure may be examined under the following heads:

1) Rationalisation of Secretariat and Departments.
2) Rationalisation of Divisional Administration.
3) Rationalisation of Administrative Units - Divisions, Districts and Talukas.
4) Rationalisation of Village Administration.
5) Rationalisation of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

1) Rationalisation of Secretariat and Departments

A) General Description

After reorganisation, the size of the new State of Karnataka became much bigger and it resulted in considerable increase of work both at the Secretariat and at the Departmental level. The Old Mysore State provided the
Secretariat for the new State and it required to be rationalised to cope up with the increased volume of work. It would not be out of place if a brief account of the organisation and role of the Secretariat and Departments are described here.

The Karnataka Government Secretariat is the seat of the State Government. It is just akin to the central nervous system in the human body. There is a distinction between the Secretariat Departments and the non-Secretariat Departments, sometimes referred to as the field Departments. Both have their own inbuilt hierarchical systems. In both the systems of Departments, there is the four-fold division of Governmental functioning. In the management language, these four cadres are called as top-management cadre, middle-management cadre, the Ministerial or operational cadre and the cadre of Subordinate Helpers in the descending orders. In the Secretariat, the Chief Secretary represents the top-management cadre. Below the Chief Secretary, there are three management cadres corresponding to the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary and the Under-Secretary respectively. In certain Secretariat Departments, there are higher levels above the Deputy Secretary, they are designated as Special Secretary, Additional Secretary
and Joint Secretary. These functionaries are confined only to a few departments and they do not basically alter the four-fold management cadre of the Secretariat. One can observe the same four levels generally constituting the management cadres in the non-Secretariat departments. In a large number of departments, the Director, who is the head of the department, the Joint Director, the Deputy Director and the Assistant Director represent these levels.

In the Revenue Department, these levels would correspond to the Divisional Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner and Tahasildar. In the police department, the four levels are those of the Inspector-General of Police, the Deputy Inspector General of Police, the Superintendent of Police and the Deputy Superintendent of Police. Thus the designations differ from department to department. Formulation of long-range and short-range policies is the primary function of the secretariat departments. But there is an emphasis on the execution of these policies and programmes in the non-secretariat departments. This is a broad portrayal of governmental functioning in the two spheres. The Administrative Reorganisation Committee, appointed under the Chairmanship
of Shri S.G. Barve, the then Minister for Finance, in their report submitted to the Government of Maharashtra, in the year 1962, describes the role of the Secretariat: "The Secretariat is an overhead unit, a staff organisation intended to assist the Government in the discharge of its responsibilities. It is firstly designed to help the Ministers in making policy. The political process brings to the top of an administration elected Ministers committed to certain programmes and policies. But those platforms are naturally only broad guidelines, and have to be translated into detailed administrative action. The Secretariat is responsible for this translation. It is also responsible for advice to the Ministers in identifying and deciding the future policy issues that may arise in the course of day to day working.... Briefly then, the Secretariat exists as an over head office for policy making and legislative relations, as a memory and a clearing house preparatory to certain types of decision and a general supervisor of executive action."(3)

3) Position of the Secretariat after Unification

At the time of reorganisation, there were the following Secretaries to Government:
1) The Chief Secretary;
2) The Secretary to the Government, Finance Department;
3) The Secretary to Government, Revenue Department;
4) The Secretary to Government, Home, Forest and Agriculture Departments;
5) The Secretary to Government, Development Department;
6) The Secretary to Government, Public Works and Electricity;
7) The Secretary to Government, Education and Local Self Government Departments;
8) The Secretary to Government, Planning Department;
9) The Special Temporary Secretary to Government, Reorganisation Department;
10) The Temporary Secretary to Government, Revision of State laws;
11) The Secretary to Government, Law Department.

The first nine posts were held by officers belonging to the I.A.S. cadre and the last two were held by officers belonging to the cadre of District Judges. The Education
Secretary and the Revenue Secretary were entrusted with work relating to other Departments in addition to the Education and the Revenue Departments. They were saddled with heavy responsibilities and with the increase of work, after the formation of the new State, it was impossible for them to do all the items of work. With the all-round increase of work in the Departments, work in every branch of the Secretariat increased correspondingly and to have necessary relief, there was need for creating posts of Deputy Secretaries. Similarly, there were 21 posts of Under and Assistant Secretaries to Government including the Registrar, Karnataka Government Secretariat and they were the following:

1) Under Secretary, Home;
2) Assistant Secretary, Revenue;
3) Assistant Secretary, Agriculture and Forest Department;
4) Registrar, Karnataka Government Secretariat;
5) Assistant Secretary, Education;
6) Assistant Secretary, Finance;
7) Assistant Secretary, Medical and Public Health;
8) Assistant Secretary, Chief Secretariat.
9) Assistant Secretary, Municipal Branch;
10) Assistant Secretary, State Reorganisation (Temporary);
11) Assistant Secretary, Budget;
12) Assistant Secretary, Labour;
13) Assistant Secretary, Food and Traffic Board; (Temporary);
14) Assistant Secretary, Legislation;
15) Assistant Secretary, Special Revenue;
16) Assistant Secretary, Commerce and Development (Temporary);
17) Assistant Secretary, Local Boards;
18) Assistant Secretary, Industries;
19) Under-Secretary, Public Works;
20) Assistant Secretary, Electrical;
21) Assistant Secretary, Law.

Some of the Assistant Secretaries had heavy work. With the formation of the new State, the activities of the Departments increased. It was found impossible to cope up with the work efficiently and expeditiously. In view of this, it was necessary to increase the number of Under
and Assistant Secretaries. With regard to the non-gazetted staff, the ministerial strength of the Secretariat was as noted below:

1) Superintendents - 34.
2) First Division Clerks - 212.
3) Second Division Clerks - 150.
4) Stenographers and Typists - 130.

C) Observations of Gorwala Committee

Soon after the formation of the new State, Dr. A.B. Gorwala, an eminent administrator, was invited to study our administrative system and to suggest improvements. He submitted his report to the Government of Karnataka on 11th May 1956. He observed: "The two weakest links in the Koyore Secretariat chain are the Secretaries and the First Division Assistants. With rare exceptions, the Secretaries are much below the standard to be expected from men in that rank. Initiative they definitely lack. Avoiding responsibility for decisions seems to have become a habit. Most Secretaries seek to take shelter under the Chief Secretary's wing rather than to act as independent Secretaries themselves, thus greatly addition to the former's burden." (7) He further expressed: "In this
matter, it seems to me that the time has come to seek a completely new approach. Secretarial noting is responsible work and ought to be undertaken at a truly responsible level, relevant papers being just collected and put up by the Second Division Clerks. A Section would thus consist of an Under Secretary with three or four Second Division Clerks. The Assistant and Superintendent would disappear. For the general supervision of the work of Second Division Clerks, the proper maintenance of registers etc., for each Department, there might be two Registrars of Superintendents' rank. The number of Under Secretaries would have to be increased but the cost of their increase would fall well within the amount that would be saved by the abolition of Assistants and the reduction in the number of Superintendents."

Hence Mr. Gorwala recommended to the effect: "In the circumstances of Mysore, the Chief Secretary has to carry a very special burden. It is not enough for him to be the normal efficient Chief Secretary. He must, in addition, be a most competent Inspector-General devoting attention not merely to the Secretariat but to all important administrative matters, throughout the State. It is accordingly necessary that he should have the
capable assistance of a competent Special Secretary who, directed by him, can look after a good deal of the paper work in consultation with him."(9)

D) Reorganisation of Secretariat

Thus in the light of observations and recommendations made by Mr. A.D. Gorwala, a number of measures for rationalisation of the Secretariat were undertaken by the Government of Karnataka. It is almost impossible to review the measures of rationalisation of all the Departments of the Government - both Secretariat and non-Secretariat - in this short chapter. Hence, I confine myself to an examination of only a few Departments.

E) Rationalisation of Structural set-up

There was general increase in all the branches of the Secretariat and it was necessary to enhance the strength. The entire set-up of the Secretariat and the Departments was rationalised by framing the new rules of business. Under the rationalised system, the business of the Secretariat is classified and distributed among the several Departments in the manner specified in the First Schedule to the Karnataka Government Rules of
Business. The work in the Secretariat is being attended to in the following 13 Departments:

1) General Administration;
2) Revenue;
3) Home;
4) Commerce and Industries;
5) Education;
6) Agriculture and Forest;
7) Law and Parliamentary Affairs;
8) Planning and Social Welfare;
9) Finance;
10) Development; Housing, Panchayat Raj and Co-operation;
11) Food, Civil Supplies and Labour;
12) Health and Municipal Administration;
13) Public Works and Electricity;

There is a separate Secretariat for the Karnataka State Legislature. Of the thirteen Secretaries mentioned above, the Chief Secretary is in a special position being the Head of the Services and the Secretary to the Cabinet.
The administrative control of all the Secretariat Departments vests in the Chief Secretary. The Development Commissioner is concurrently the Special Secretary for Agricultural Production and Secretary, Planning and Social Welfare Department. His duties as Development Commissioner are of the same nature and those of a head of the Department and his duties as Secretary, Planning and Social Welfare Department are of the same nature as those of other Secretaries to Government. His duties as Special Secretary for Agricultural Production have been specified in Rule 7-A of the Rules of Business. The Home Secretary to Government is concurrently the Special Secretary to Government, General Administration Department (Organisation and Methodo) and his duties are specified in Rule 7-B of the Rules of Business. The following key positions have been elevated to the rank of super-time grades and they are designated as Commissioners:

1) Commissioner for Land Reforms and Ex-officio Secretary to the Revenue Department;

2) Commissioner for Industries and Commerce and Secretary;

3) Commissioner for Home Affairs and Secretary;

4) Development Commissioner and Special Secretary for Agricultural Production and Secretary to the Planning Department;
5) Commissioner for Commercial Taxes;
6) Commissioner for Health and Municipal Administration and Secretary;
7) Commissioner for Public Works and Electricity; and Secretary;
8) Commissioner for Finance and Secretary;
9) Commissioner for Education and Secretary;
10) Commissioner of the Corporation of Bangalore City.

P) Nationalisation of Organisation and Methods Division

The Organisation and Methods Division of the General Administration Department was constituted with effect from 26th July 1958. The Deputy Secretary to Government, General Administration Department (Organisation and Methods) used to function under the Chief Secretary for work connected with office procedure, preparation of Cadre and Recruitment rules of various Departments, supervise inspection of sections, checking up of arrear statements furnished by various Departments of the Secretariat and Heads of Departments etc. The Organisation and Methods unit used to visit offices in order to fix staff patterns, reorganise the set up of offices etc. The Deputy
Secretary (Organisation and Methods Division) had to look after the administrative sections of the Anti-Corruption Department and the Section dealing with political, palace and other miscellaneous subjects. The Efficiency Audit Department and the Organisation and Methods Division were working independently causing duplication of efforts. It was essential to keep the Anti-Corruption and Efficiency Audit wings independently and separately for all practical purposes. Accordingly, the Directorate of Efficiency Audit and Anti-Corruption was redesignated as the "Directorate of Anti-Corruption and Technical Audit, P.W.D." The Government created the post of Special Secretary to Government, General Administration Department (Organisation and Methods and Inspections) to assist the Chief Secretary in the effective working of the Organisation and Methods Unit. The Organisation and Methods Section which was functioning directly under the Chief Secretary was brought under the control(11) of the Special Secretary to Government, General Administration Department. The Efficiency Audit and Anti-Corruption Department was reorganised,(12) through Government Order No.CAD 43 BAC 59, dated 10th August 1959 and the post of Director, Efficiency Audit and Anti-Corruption with a complement of officers and staff for looking into:
(a) Inefficiency and Corruption charges against Gazetted Officers and (b) Inspection of the offices of the Heads of Department (excluding the offices of the Deputy Commissioners of Districts). The responsibilities of the inspection of the subordinate offices of the various Departments were left to the Heads of Departments themselves.

Tukol Pay Commission appointed in the year 1966, had recommended for the creation of an independent Department in the Secretariat to be designated as "Department of Administrative Reforms," which would be in charge of both Inspection of Offices and Organisation and Methods. It was expected to undertake time and motion studies in the offices of the several Departments. Previously, the Organisation and Methods wing had been saddled with many miscellaneous duties. To make it more purposeful and for ensuring efficiency in Governmental operation, it was reorganised (13) and redesignated as the Efficiency Research Bureau, with effect from 1-1-1969. Now it has three wings:

1) Organisation and Methods Wing, which deals with matters relating to methods and procedures of work and other techniques of administrative improvements;

2) Training and Extension Wing which is in charge of the training of staff in the Secretariat and provides
assistance to all the Secretariat Departments in matters relating to procedure; and

3) Inspection Wing which concerns itself with the inspection of Secretariat Departments and outside offices.

G) Rationalisation of Secretariat Procedures

It has already been mentioned that Mr. A. D. Gorwala, in his report, pointed out the defective type of noting being done by the First Division Assistants in the Secretariat. He had suggested that the noting on the files should be restricted to responsible officers like the Under Secretaries. The only work that could be assigned to the Assistants, according to him, was the docketing and referring of the files and putting them up to the Under Secretaries for noting and action. It was considered desirable to give a fair trial to Mr. Gorwala's system. Hence it was decided to introduce a scheme (14) as an experimental measure. On the lines of the recommendations of Mr. Gorwala, his system of office procedure was first introduced in the six sections of the Revenue Department in the subsequent year. The working of the scheme was closely watched. The Sub-Committee of Secretaries appointed in 1960 enquired into
the working of the Gorwala system which relied mainly on the officer orientation involving reliance on the Under Secretaries. The Sub-Committee decided in favour of compact Sections with Superintendents. While the modification of the Gorwala system was under consideration, the Government appointed the Resources and the Economy Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. A.G. Ramachandra Rao in 1960. It submitted its report in 1962. The Committee came to the conclusion that the Gorwala system should be scrapped in favour of the Madras system. Hence the Gorwala pattern of Secretariat procedure was scrapped in favour of the reversion to the old Madras system as part of the reorganisation of the Secretariat. A feature of the reorganisation is the provision for what is called 'level jumping' intended for speedier processing of important papers and the designation of one of the Assistants in the heavy Sections as Senior Assistant, who will handle the 'level jumping'. Although it was decided to give up the Gorwala system the officer orientation principle of the system was incorporated in the new set-up.

Under the Madras system, (15) staff allocation is on the basis of one Under Secretary being in charge of two Sections. Each Section will have the staff consisting;
of one Superintendent, three Assistants, one Junior Assistant, one Typist and one Stenographer, three Dalayats including one for Under Secretary. A new Secretariat Manual incorporating the latest techniques of administrative improvement has been issued. The Rules of Business of the Secretariat have been re-issued incorporating the latest amendments. The Weekly Gazettes of the Secretariat Departments have been replaced by a monthly compilation containing policy decisions and orders of a general nature which would cover a large number of cases. Cadre and Recruitment Rules have been finalised. The Efficiency Research Bureau has also conducted work studies of some of the Departments of Government. It has also evolved a revised procedure for the submission of cases to the Cabinet which eliminates and reduces the volume of papers flowing into the Chief Minister's Office. A new system of filing known as the White Hall System being followed in the Defence Ministry of the Government of India was introduced from 1st November 1968 in the General Administration and Home Departments, with certain modifications to suit the needs of Civil Departments.

"Its essential features are the ready availability of notes and the correspondence in the same jacket and the progressive linking of the notes with the incoming and outgoing communications." (16)
II) Rationalisation of Planning Department

The Planning Commission in their letters stressed the need for a functional restructuring of Planning Department at the State level so as to effect improvement in the formulation and implementation of plan programmes and also suggested the setting up of new Planning bodies like Perspective Planning Unit, Plan Formulation Unit, Plan Monitoring, Plan Information and Evaluation Unit, District and Regional Planning Unit and Plan Co-ordination Unit. In response to the above suggestions of the Planning Commission, the State Government set up the following units,

1) Economic Advisor's Division;
2) District Planning Units;
3) Project Formulation Unit;
4) Plan Information and Statistics Unit; and
5) Economic Division.

The Government has restructured the Planning Department on the following lines. It consists of the under-mentioned functional units responsible to Secretary to Government, Planning Department.

1) District and Regional Planning - under the charge of an Economic Advisor.
2) Perspective Planning - under the charge of a Director working directly under the Secretary (Planning);

3) Man power and Employment - under the charge of a Director working directly under the Secretary (Planning);

4) Plan Monitoring and Information - under the charge of a Director working directly under the Secretary (Planning);

5) Project Formulation - under the charge of a Director working directly under the Secretary (Planning);

6) Evaluation - under the charge of a Director working directly under the Secretary (Planning);

I) Rationalisation of Non-Secretariat Departments

Soon after the formation of the new State, the office procedures had to be rationalised. Because in the Bombay-Karnataka area, the Anderson system was in vogue. In Old Mysore area, the Tottenham system, modelled on the Madras system, was in vogue. The Maxwell system was prevailing in South Kanara and Coorg Districts. Another unique system was prevailing in Hyderabad-Karnataka area. As a result, the situation in the Offices of the
State was complicated. Hence a Committee was appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. Hirani, the then Director of Industries and Commerce to revise the Manual of Office procedure for offices outside the Secretariat. A common procedural pattern was suggested by the Committee and a Hand-Book was prepared. The rationalized system is popularly known as Hirani System named after its initiator. "The Hirani system leans heavily towards the Tottenham system. The Tottenham system requires every paper to be registered, thus leaving nothing to human honesty."(17) The following major departmental reorganizations were effected for the efficient operation of Government business.

1) Reorganisation and strengthening of the Inspectorate of the Department of Public Instruction;

2) Establishment of a cell in the Food, Civil Supplies Department;

3) Creation of the Directorate of Youth to concentrate exclusively on youth programmes;

4) Formation of the new Departments like Fisheries, Languages and Development of Kannada, Literary and Cultural Development, Collegiate Education, Bureau of

The Department of Revenue has compiled an up-to-date Revenue Manual for the guidance of Revenue Officers. It has issued a Handbook for the guidance of Land Acquisition Officers indicating the salient features of law and procedure and also the important decisions of the Court and Executive Orders issued by the Government from time to time. Similarly the staffing pattern in the various Revenue Offices in the State varied widely from region to region. This was largely due to integration of the State which brought together areas from five integrating States of Old Mysore, Ex-Madras, Ex-Hyderabad, Ex-Coorg and Ex-Bombay, each of which had different staffing patterns and methods of work. The staffing patterns prevailing in these areas almost continued to be the same even after twenty years, since reorganisation. Hence the Government requested Mr. Balasubramanyam, the then Advisor for Land Reforms and State Revenues, to examine
the matter and undertake such studies as may be necessary to bring about a Uniform Staffing Pattern in the Revenue Offices of the State at the levels of Taluka, Sub-Division and Districts by making use of the services of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms if needed and submit his report in the matter. Accordingly, he completed his study and submitted his report to the Government on 28th June 1976. The Government accepted the report and adopted the revised staffing pattern.

2) Rationalisation of Divisional Administration

The new State of Karnataka is made up of five slices of area known as Bombay-Karnataka, Hyderabad-Karnataka, Madras-Karnataka, Ex-Coorg and Old Mysore. While the Bombay and Hyderabad areas were pretty big, Ex-Coorg and Madras Karnataka areas occupied a small area. But the Old Mysore constituted the biggest unit. They were having their distinct administrative patterns. The problems will have to be seen in their proper historical perspective. Hence a brief historical account of their administrative patterns at the divisional level will not be out of place here.
a) Bombay-Karnataka Area

The District administration in the Districts of Belgaum, Bijapur, Dharwar and North Kanara was on the pattern of Bombay State. There was a Divisional Commissioner immediately above the Collectors of the Districts. He was the Chief controlling authority in land Revenue matters and was exercising general supervision over the District administration. There were functional Commissioners for settlement, excise and sales tax with jurisdiction over the whole State. There was no Board of Revenue. The posts of Commissioners of Divisions were abolished in 1950 and Collectors worked directly under the Government, in matters relating to Land Revenue and general administration. But the Bombay State had made arrangements there for the inspection of revenue officers after the abolition of the posts of Divisional Commissioners on August 15, 1950. An Inspection Unit was created in the Revenue Department with a view to inspecting the revenue offices in the State. This unit was abolished on November 1, 1956 and the offices of Divisional Commissioners were revived.

b) Madras-Karnataka Area

Bellary District was part of Madras State up to 30-9-1953 and South Kanara District and Hollegal Tana
of the present Cysore District were parts of Madras State up to 31-10-1956. In these Districts, the Collectors were subject to the control of the Board of Revenue in most of the matters. The Revenue Board had administrative, supervisory and appellate powers over the Collectors. There was a functional distribution of work among the members but important matters were disposed of by the Board Collectively. The subjects handled by the Board covered Land Revenue, Irrigation, Survey and Settlement, Food and Civil Supplies, Excise and Sales Tax.

c) Hyderabad-Karnataka Area

In the Districts of Bidar, Raichur and Gulbarga, which were in Hyderabad State up to 30-10-1956, the Heads of Districts, who were called First Talukdars, worked under the general control and supervision of the Subedar, who had a number of Districts under him. His functions were similar to those of the Divisional Commissioners in British Provinces. In 1949 a Board of Revenue on the Madras pattern was constituted in Hyderabad State under the Hyderabad Board of Revenue Regulation 1359 Fasli and the posts of Subedars were abolished.
d) **Ex-Coorg Area**

Coorg was a Chief Commissioner's province up to 26-1-1950, when it became a Part C State. There was only one District Officer comparable to a Collector. He was called the Commissioner. The Resident in Mysore acted as a Commissioner of the District as well as Chief Commissioner of Coorg. After the appointment of a separate Chief Commissioner for Coorg, the District Officer was designated as Assistant Commissioner. But there was no office of Divisional Commissioner in Coorg area.

e) **Old Mysore Area**

District Administration, on the pattern of British Province was introduced into Old Mysore State during its administration between 1831 and 1881. In 1862-69, the State had been divided into three divisions and these three divisions had been further sub-divided into eight districts. The Heads of the Divisions were known as Superintendents and the Heads of the Districts were known as Deputy Superintendents. In 1869, the designations of Superintendents of Divisions and of Deputy Superintendents of Districts were changed into those of Commissioners.
and Deputy Commissioners respectively. In 1879, the
posts of Commissioners of Divisions were abolished
and the Deputy Commissioners came under the direct control
of the Central Administration. There were neither
Divisional Commissioners nor functional Commissioners.
Commissioners for Excise, Land Revenue, Food and Civil
Supplies, Sales Tax and Local Self Government were
appointed between 1881 and 1956 and they worked independently
of the others and exercised supervision and control over
the work of the Deputy Commissioner in regard to the
particular departments administered by them. The Board
of Revenue was constituted in 1955 under the Mysore
Board of Revenue Act 1955. It was purely an appellate
Tribunal with no administrative or executive functions.
This Board exercised all the appellate and revisional
powers of Government under the various revenue laws but
the Board of Revenue Act provided for exercise of revisional
jurisdiction by Government in cases disposed of by the
Board. This was the broad pattern of Divisional and
District administration prevailing in the five different
regions prior to the formation of Karnataka.

The Position after Unification

The posts of Divisional Commissioners in the new
State of Karnataka were created by the Mysore Adaptation
of laws Order 1956 under the provisions of Section 120 of the States' Reorganisation Act 1956. There are four Divisional Commissioners. Bangalore, Mysore, Belgaum and Gulbarga are the headquarters of the respective Divisional Commissioners. The Divisional Commissioner is the highest local executive Authority to organise and supervise the administrative machinery in his division and for implementing the policies of the Government under the various Government Orders(29) issued from time to time. After the creation of the posts of the Divisional Commissioners, there was public agitation to reduce the number of posts of Divisional Commissioners. Some even agitated for their abolition on the grounds of economy. There was wide difference of opinion as to whether the post of Divisional Commissioner was at all necessary.

However, Shri B.D.Jatti, the then Chief Minister of Karnataka, in the course of the debate on the floor of the Legislative Council said: "As Divisional Commissioners, it will be their duty to acquaint themselves with regional problems. They should study these regional problems and solve them. That will satisfy the people who have joined the new Karnataka State. So far, various regional problems have been solved and satisfaction is being created. So, at least for sometime to come, in order to
create more confidence in the people who come into the new Karnataka State for the first time, we feel that it is necessary to continue these offices. But, we are considering whether it is absolutely necessary to keep all the Divisional Commissioners as they are today or whether we can reduce the number to a certain extent. That we are considering. When we come to a conclusion that there is sufficient scope for a reduction either by one or two, we will consider it and take a decision. We are not going to abolish these offices immediately."

Public agitation subsided as a result of assurance held out by the Chief Minister.

The Views of the Fact-Finding Committee

The Fact-Finding Committee headed by Mr. V. Keshastr was also for the retention of the Commissioners. It pointed out to the effect - "To ensure quick decision and speedy implementation of measures for the uplift of the people and for the maintenance of security in the event of an emergency, we think that the Kannada Districts in Hyderabad and Bombay will have to be grouped into separate divisions under the administrative control of a Commissioner who should have extensive powers to take
decisions and to implement them. In our opinion, the Commissioner should be invested with powers to supervise the activities of the Head of the Department and be held responsible for the efficient administration of the areas in his charge. In our judgment, it will be necessary to station an efficient Armed Police Force of sufficient strength under the control of each Commissioner to assist him in the maintenance of Law and Order. (31)

The Views of Resources and Economy Committee

The Resources and Economy Committee, appointed by the Government of Karnataka in 1960 and headed by Sri A.G. Ramachandra Rao observed in their report: "In regard to the administrative Divisions, we have already expressed our views that Divisional Commissioners in the State have to be continued until at least uniformity in the State laws is brought about and residuary problems of State reorganisation are solved. The recent trends, however, favour the strengthening of administration at the regional level, particularly in the context of the planned development. It is at the same time considered by many that the Revenue Board System as in Madras, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala, is preferable to the Divisional System and is better suited for the State. We must leave
the relative merits of the two systems to be carefully examined and the permanent pattern suited to the State decided upon, in due course. Since Divisional Commissioners have, according to our recommendations, to be continued for some more time at least, the question to be considered immediately is the minimum number of Division in the State required in the interests of administration, consistently with economy. In our opinion, the existing four Divisions in the State may be reduced to three forthwith, with a suitable reallocation of areas between them."

The Views of Tukol Pay Commission

But the Report of the Pay Commission appointed by the Government of Karnataka and headed by Justice T. Tukol, did not favour the retention of the posts of Divisional Commissioners and made the following observations: "Under the Mysore Land Revenue Act and many other enactments, the Divisional Commissioners have neither the original powers nor appellate powers. In certain subjects like Food, Endowments and Law and Order, the Deputy Commissioners correspond directly with the Heads of Departments concerned or with Government and the Divisional Commissioner has no direct responsibility for such matters. In revenue matters decided by the Deputy Commissioners, the aggrieved parties
have to go to the Mysore Revenue Appellate Tribunal in appeal. The Divisional Commissioners, no doubt, exercise some control over the Local Bodies within their division but this arrangement does not make for uniformity in policy matters as there is no central agency to co-ordinate the activities of the Local Bodies in all the four divisions. The main function of the Divisional Commissioner is to act as friend, philosopher and guide of the Deputy Commissioners and to co-ordinate the work of the various Departments at the Divisional level. The Deputy Commissioners are senior officers of the Indian Administrative Service and should be able to manage the work of the District without continuous and proximate advice and guidance from the Divisional Commissioners.\(^{(33)}\) It further expressed:

"It has been suggested to the Commission that the posts of Divisional Commissioners might as well as abolished and instead a Board of Revenue created as in Madras, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala. This question has been considered by Government on more than one occasion in the past. In view of the later developments, the posts of Divisional Commissioners have become superfluous. They have no statutory powers under any of the enactments to be effective instruments of administration... Even in matters of co-ordination, their work has become very diffused. It is
understood from the evidence of officers that their tours serve no purpose and meetings convened by them hardly function in a businesslike manner. The Commission has examined the merits of the existing system in all its aspects. After taking all aspects of the matter into consideration, the Commission is satisfied that there is no justification for continuing the posts of Divisional Commissioners; all the four posts of Divisional Commissioners may be abolished and a post of Revenue Commissioner in the super time scale of the Indian Administrative Service be created instead. Some items of work like Development, Municipal Administration and Inter-Departmental Coordination which the Divisional Commissioners are now attending to may be taken over by the Development Commissioner and the others like Land Revenue, Land Reforms and abolition of privileged tenures by the Revenue Commissioner. There would thus be four functional Commissioners in the super-time scale of the I.A.S. Viz the Revenue Commissioner, the Development Commissioner, the Excise Commissioner and Commissioner for Commercial Taxes.** With regard to the establishment of the Revenue Board, the report said: "The Commission has examined the suggestion that a Board of Revenue should be established. The Commission would have recommended the constitution of a Board consisting..."
of these four functional Commissioners and it been shown to its satisfaction, that such a board has functions to perform under the present administrative set-up. The Commission has recommended that a Mysore State Appellate Tribunal should be constituted at the highest appellate and revisional authority to hear matters relating to various administrative laws, revenue, sales tax, agricultural income tax, transport etc. The Board of Revenue cannot be entrusted with appellate work. If there be any matters of common interest, they could be resolved by periodical meetings held by these Commissioners, even without constituting a Board. The Commission sees no particular advantage in creating a Board of Revenue as in Madras, Andhra Pradesh or Kerala and accordingly suggests that such a Board need not be created." (35)

The Views of the Administrative Reform Commission

The Report of the Administrative Reforms Commission on State Administration, appointed by the Government of India, expressed the view: "As regards Divisional Commissioners, we do not agree with the Study Team that there should be an intermediate level of administration between the districts and the Government. Though the concepts of co-ordination and supervision are prima facie
attractive, in actual practice in situations like the
ones in which a Collector functions in a District, these
only result in curbing the initiative and responsibility
of the officer functioning at the District level. In
view of our recommendation that the District Collector
should be relieved of the responsibility of development
administration, he should be able to devote more attention
to his regulatory functions and should not be in need
of supervision. The existence of the institution of
Commissioners in many States does not appear to have
resulted in marked improvement in efficiency or speed in
disposal. Even the so-called co-ordination, does not
appear to have achieved any worthwhile results. Further,
the Ministers nowadays tour the Districts frequently and
problems of co-ordination are bound to come to their
notice. In these days, when there are facilities for
speedy communication, the Collector can, in an emergency,
easily get in touch with the headquarters of the State.
There will hardly be any matters for referring to an
intermediate authority, who, most often, refers then,
in his turn, to Government. We are, therefore, of the
view that there is no need for an authority like the
Divisional Commissioner functioning as an intermediary
authority and exercising supervision over the District
Collector. The Commission made the following recommendations:

1) The system whereby a Commissioner in charge of a specified number of Districts acts as supervisory and directing officer, occupying an intermediate position in the hierarchy between the District Collector and the Government, may be abolished.

2) Commissioners may, however, be appointed in large States with jurisdiction over fairly large-sized regions which are homogeneous in terms of economic conditions for discharging the following specific functions:

   a) regional planning for urban and rural areas with special reference to environmental purity;

   b) statutory functions having an inter-District coverage which cannot be assigned to any regional departmental officer;

   c) inspection of District officers including that of the District Development Officer.

The Views of Gorwala Committee

Mr. A.D. Gorwala, a retired Indian Civil Servant, had been invited by the Government of Karnataka in 1950 to
study the administrative system and suggest improvements in administration. Dealing with the continuance of the posts of Divisional Commissioners in his report submitted to the Government on 11th May 1953, he expressed: "Of the need for the posts of Commissioners, there would seem to be no doubt, what was said in my letter of 18th December 1957, may be repeated - Divisional Commissioners ought to be expeditors, co-ordinators, advisors and supervisors. If they fail in these capacities, it may be because wrong men are selected or because the men appointed are not permitted to remain sufficiently long in their posts. The usual tenure for a Commissioner ought not to be less than three years. Commissioners should be men of understanding, personality, initiative and courage. (I say nothing about integrity, because it is a sine qua non for all concerned with Government work - elected or official). They should be sufficiently senior but need not be the most senior, since for such posts proper choice is very important.....I will not dwell on the Commissioner's function as co-ordinator. The need for an authority to pull together for prompt and proper solution of local problems, the views and actions in the various departments is evident. The Commissioner's advice must flow both to Government above and to the District and sub-divisional officers below. His mind must be wide awake, his study
of the important problems in his own region deep. He should be able to instil sufficient confidence in his juniors to enable them to talk to him freely about the difficulties they encounter in their own work. He should not, of course, take over their problem, but just give sufficient indication to enable them to work them out rightly. The Commissioner's supervision naturally covers the Revenue Department. It should not, however, be limited to that, for all that happens in his division, especially in Governmental activities in his division, should be of interest to him. His supervision of other departments may be informal, but it must, nonetheless be effective. A good many injustices can be prevented, a great deal of corruption stopped, if it is known that the Commissioner of the Division is prepared to take considerable trouble personally to find out the exact facts and try to have action taken accordingly." (38)

Arguments for and against the posts of Divisional Commissioners

Arguments for abolition

Certain arguments are adduced to support the case for the abolition of Divisional Commissioners. They are
mainly based upon three considerations - administrative, financial and political.

a) In the field of administration, the Commissioners are described as the "fifth wheel in the coach," superfluous layer in the hierarchy, a mere post office to serve as a channel of communication between the District officers and the Government etc. Tamil Nadu never believed in the utility of his office. So the example of Tamil Nadu, which does not have Divisional Commissionerships, is cited to support the thesis that these officers are unnecessary and redundant.

b) There is also a financial angle of the problem. As a senior member of the Indian Administrative Service, the Commissioner is a highly paid officer and, therefore, the abolition of the posts is recommended on grounds of economy.

c) The issue has political overtones. The office of the Divisional Commissionership, perhaps owing to its high emoluments, vast authority and big status, has come to be associated in political circles as the symbol of colonial rule. So the desire to demolish one of the strongholds of bureaucracy became the first target of attack after independence.
Arguments for Retention

Similarly some arguments are also advanced for the retention of these posts on certain administrative grounds.

a) He is a good liaison between the Government and the people. He is responsible for implementing and executing the decisions and policies of the Government in the field.

b) He transmits his first hand experience gained from the field. It is of immense help to the Government. He is indirectly a policy-maker. Because in his reporting function, he points out the weakness in the existing administrative approach, inadequacies in current policies, programmes and issues.

c) He is a co-ordinator par excellence. Co-ordination becomes necessary because of size and complexity, personalities and political factors, and the lack of leaders with wisdom and knowledge pertaining to public administration.

d) Some of the States in India have several Districts and their supervision on a region basis becomes necessary.
e) He acts as the friend, philosopher and guide to young and inexperienced District officers and thus he imparts good training to them.

f) The latest trend in India is towards regional planning and development. He can be instrumental in solving the problems of the region effectively.

The Views of the Royal Commission upon Decentralisation

The Report of the Royal Commission upon Decentralisation (1909) summarised the case for the retention of these posts on the following grounds: "Commissioners should be retained as a valuable link in the chain of administration between individual Districts and the headquarters administration. To put Districts under headquarters directly in revenue matters would inevitably lead to increased centralisation. A system of decentralisation must necessarily include devolution of greater powers to officers possessed of wide experience and with ample opportunities for keeping in touch with the people. By exercise of his many executive functions, the Commissioner could considerably relieve the headquarters of matters of detail and expedite disposal of public
business." (39) The Commission, therefore, recommended:

"The Commissioner should be the administrative head of his division and that he should be consulted and have certain powers of control, in respect of the operations of special Departments in so far as these affect the general administration or welfare of the people, while abstaining from intervention in technical details. The Commissioner was a valuable picked officer who could maintain closer personal relations with officials subordinate to him and with the people of his division than any headquarters authority. He was in the best position to help a new Deputy Commissioner or Collector. At the same time, his advice to headquarters was likely to be more mature and comprehensive than that of the District Officer." (40)

Thus the question of the utility of this post has always been debatable. There is no uniform pattern of administrative set up above the District level in the States of the Indian Union. There is no consensus as to whether there should be one single intermediate administrative agency or two such agencies between the Deputy Commissioner and the State Government. "Thus in Sachya Pradesh, it was abolished in the year 1948 but revived
in 1956. Madras never believed in the utility of this office while in the State of Bombay, the Commissioner's posts were abolished in 1950 but revived in 1956. After bifurcation of Bombay, Gujarat abolished them in 1964."

Out of the maze of this confusion about the adoption of the system—either the institution of Divisional Commissionership or the Revenue Board, the alternative view hold by the neutral school of thought seems quite congenial under the circumstances of reorganised Karnataka. In India, most of the States are larger in size in respect of area and population. There are also some small States like Kerala, Punjab, Haryana etc., where Government is easily accessible even to the remotest Districts. They have no problems of distance or population. According to the neutral school, Divisional Commissionership system is suitable to the larger States and the Revenue Board system is suitable to smaller States. In this connection, the observation made at the proceedings of the Conference held at Thubaneshwar on April 8 and 9, 1961 by the Indian Institute of Public Administration seems to be quite pertinent in the context of Karnataka: "In summing up the merits of Divisional Commissioners' and Functional Commissioners' system compared with the Revenue Board system, it can be safely pointed out that the Divisional
Commissioners' system works very effectively where a state like Hyderabad has a large area and the capital of the State is also situated at one end of its territory. Actually, the distance between Bangalore and Bidar, the farthest District, from the capital city will be nearly 500 miles. When the Divisional Commissioners have their Headquarters in the areas surrounding their Districts, they will be able to tour effectively and also hear appeals etc., from the public at very short notice. In the Revenue Board System, the Revenue Board Members will have to be always on tour from one end of their Headquarters to the Districts lying far away which very often becomes difficult and they may not be performing their functions effectively. In a compact State, say like Madras, it may not present many difficulties. Apart from this, by historical accidents if the Civil Services in some of the States contain very senior officers holding posts of Collectors, the Revenue Board system may function smoothly. In other States where the Collectors or Deputy Commissioners are not very senior officers by the accident of history, there may be difficulties in the working of Revenue Board system which presupposes greater decentralisation and delegation of powers to the head of the District administration."(42) So, during the course of past several
years, the Government of Karnataka has had the experience of Divisional Commissioner and has found them quite useful. The Divisional Commissioners have been continued. It has become possible for the Government to take quick decisions and to implement them with the help of those Divisional Commissioners. It has also become possible to develop the new integrated regions of the State.

3) Rationalisation of Administrative Units

Territorial Set-up of Karnataka

It would not be out of place here if a brief description about the territorial set up of the State is explained. The new State of Karnataka with an area of 1,91,773 square kilometres and a population of 29,29,99,014 crores is territorially divided into 4 Divisions, 19 Districts, 48 Sub-Divisions and 175 Talukas (Vide Appendix No.3). The present State of Karnataka is a new State which came into existence on 1st November 1976 under the States' Reorganisation Act 1976. The Part A State of Mysore and the Part C State of Coorg as they existed immediately prior to 1st November 1976 have been included in their entirety in the new State of Karnataka and parts of the States of Bombay, Hyderabad and Madras.
as they existed immediately before 1st November 1956 have been included in the new State of Karnataka. The area and population contributed by each of these five units to the new State of Karnataka are as follows.\(^{(45)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>Area in square miles</th>
<th>Population in lakhs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Old Mysore State including the portion of Bellary District of Madras State transferred to Karnataka State under Andhra State Act 1953</td>
<td>33,310</td>
<td>98,48,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Areas from Bombay</td>
<td>20,934</td>
<td>51,35,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Areas from Hyderabad</td>
<td>13,789</td>
<td>27,18,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Areas from Madras</td>
<td>4,313</td>
<td>14,69,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Coorg area</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>2,29,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But during the course of the past 20 years after the formation of the new State, certain changes in the jurisdiction of Divisions, Districts and Taluks have taken place. The Government of Karnataka issued an order\(^{(46)}\) regarding the administrative set up of the
reorganised State and came into force with effect from 1st November 1956. The above mentioned Order created four Commissioners' Divisions. The jurisdiction of each of the Divisions placed in charge of the Commissioners was indicated in the Order as mentioned below:

1) Bangalore Division - Comprising of the Districts of Bangalore, Tumkur, Kolar, Chitradurg and Bellary with headquarters at Bangalore.

2) Mysore Division - Comprising of the Districts of Mysore, Shimoga, Chickmagalur, Hassan, Coorg, South Kanara and Mandya with headquarters at Mysore.

3) Gulbarga Division - Comprising of the Districts of Bidar, Raichur, and Gulbarga with headquarters at Gulbarga.

4) Belgaum Division - Comprising of the Districts of Belgaum, Bijapur, Dharwar and North Kanara with headquarters at Belgaum. But on 31st August 1962, the State Government decided to bifurcate Bangalore District into Bangalore Urban and Bangalore Rural Districts. The Divisional Commissioners are directly responsible for the administration of Revenue and Local self-Government

Note: The order pertaining to bifurcation of Bangalore District was not implemented.
Departments, maintenance of law and order and co-ordination of development activities. But the Government of Karnataka, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4(1) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act 1964, again issued an order altering the limits of the Bangalore, Mysore, and Gulbarga Divisions as indicated below in the Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name of the Division</th>
<th>Alterations effected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Mysore Division</td>
<td>Shinoga District excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Bangalore Division</td>
<td>Bellary District excluded and Shimoga District to be included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Gulbarga Division</td>
<td>Bellary District to be included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above scheme of reorganisation of the Divisions in the State came into effect from 1st January 1966. Similarly there have been some changes in the jurisdiction of Talukas between 1961 and 1971.

A) A new Taluka known as Basavakalyan was formed in 1965 under the Government Order No. G.S. 3454 dated
10-11-1965\(^{(49)}\) This Taluka was formed by drawing 89 villages and Kalyan town (now called Basavakalyan) from Rumnabad Taluka and 25 villages from Shalki Taluka.

B) In Dharwar District, a new Taluka known as Savanur Taluka was formed in 1969 under the Government Order No. RD 19 LRD 66 dated 26-1-1969.\(^{(50)}\) This Taluka was formed by the transfer of 26 villages from Javeri Taluka and 36 villages and Savanur Town from Shiggaon Taluka.

C) In South Kanara District, a new Taluka Cullia was formed in 1965 under the Government Order No. RD 4 LRD 61 dated 14-12-1965.\(^{(51)}\) This Taluka was formed by the transfer of 41 villages from Puttur Taluka.

Thus, for administrative purposes, the nineteen Districts of the new State have been grouped into four divisions as follows with effect from 1-1-1966.

1) Bangalore Division - consisting of Bangalore, Kolar, Tumkur, Chitradurg and Shimoga Districts.

2) Mysore Division - consisting of Mysore, Mandya, Coorg, Hassan, South Kanara and Chickmaglur Districts.
3) Belgaum Division - consisting of Belgaum, Bijapur, Dharwar and North Kanara Districts.

4) Gulbarga Division - consisting of Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar and Bellary Districts.

The Bangalore Division has an area of 49,232 square kilometres and a population of 92,08,823 lakhs; the Mysore Division an area of 43,472 square kilometres and a population of 63,88,235 lakhs; the Belgaum Division an area of 54,491 square kilometres and a population of 76,00,251 lakhs and Gulbarga Division an area of 45,570 square kilometres and a population of 51,01,705 lakhs. Regarding the area, population of the Districts vide Appendix No.4. Thus the State has 15 Districts and 175 Talukas. Among the Districts, Bijapur is the largest (17,056 square kilometres) while Coorg is the smallest (4,104 square kilometres). Similarly among the Talukas the Kollegal Taluka in the Mysore District is the biggest (2,787.5 square kilometres) and the smallest is the Sringeri Taluka (433.7 square kilometres) in the Chickmaglur District. This is the broad administrative structure of the territorial jurisdiction of Karnataka. Certain observations made by some Committees regarding the administrative units of the State may be examined here.
The Views of Fact-Finding Committee

The Fact-Finding Committee headed by Dr. K. Shekhar and appointed by the Government of Old Mysore in connection with the reorganisation of States, drew attention to the fact that the Bombay and Hyderabad Districts were too large. It said: "We notice that the present Districts are very extensive in point of area. For efficient administration, we think it would be necessary to reduce the area of the Districts and regroup the Talukas into units of manageable size." (52)

The Views of Hyderabad Economy Committee

In this connection, the following observation of the Hyderabad Economy Committee is most pertinent. It observed: "The case of the Hyderabad Districts has been quite otherwise and their history has even been described as a record of the errors and follies of its rulers and the misfortune of its subjects." (53)

It has already been pointed out that the Government had to tackle the problem of rationalisation of administrative units. The rationalisation of units attracted the attention of the Government soon after reorganisation.
In the meanwhile, the Government invited R.A.D. Gorwala to suggest improvements for overhauling the administrative machinery. He submitted his report on 11th May 1953.

The Views of Gorwala Committee

"The present 19 Districts of Mysore State can be comfortably reduced to 16. The four Bidar Talukas, Bidar, Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur and the seven Gulbarga Talukas to the north of the river Kiona, Gulbarga, Chitapur, Yadgir, Huzulpur, Aland, Chincholi, and Serai should together form the new District of Gulbarga with a population of 14,25,000 and an area of 6,263 square miles. The remaining three Talukas of the present Gulbarga District Shahapur, Shorapur and Jowargi combined with six Talukas of Raichur District, the population being 9,90,000 and the area 5,833 square miles. Bellary District as at present together with the remaining three Talukas of the Raichur District, Sindhoor, Gangavati and Joppal can make up another District, with population of 10,67,000 and area of 5,500 square miles. The joining of the present Shimoga and Chickmaglur Districts can together constitute a new District with a population of 10,81,000 and an area of 6,834 square miles. Hassan and Mandya with a population of 14,32,000 and an area of 4,551 square miles make a
sizeable District. The suggestion would have been made that the small District of Coorg should be added to South Kanara, the total population being 15,60,000 and the area 4,833 square miles but in deference to the States' Reorganisation Commission's view that the identity of Coorg should be preserved by letting it remain a separate District, it is not being pressed. These 16 Districts fall naturally into three Commissionerships instead of the present four, the first comprising the new Gulbarga, Raichur and Bellary Districts and the old Belgaum and Bijapur Districts, area 29,331 square miles and population 65,44,000; the second consisting of the present South Kanara, Coorg, Shimoga Districts, Dharwar, Chitradurga and North Kanara Districts, area 24,939 square miles, population 56,02,711; and the third including the new Mandya District and the existing Tumkur, Kolar and Bangalore and Mysore Districts, area 19,290 square miles, population 72,64,000 of which about 11 lakhs is contained in the three urban locations of Bangalore, Mysore and Kolar. The natural headquarters for these three divisions would seem to be Mandya, Shimoga and Bagalkot. It is in accord with the fitness of things that the Commissioners, whose work lies almost entirely in the countryside, should live in moderate sized or small towns rather than in cities.
While the reduction of one division and four Districts will effect not inconsiderable savings, efficiency is not likely to be detrimentally affected." (54) The Government placed Sri Gorwala's report before the State legislature for consideration. The question of rationalisation of administrative units was discussed during the deliberations. Shri B.D. Jatti, the then Chief Minister, during the course of the deliberations remarked as follows: "This Government has thought about the number of Districts, expenditure connected with it etc., and has not yet come to conclusions. But, before coming to a definite conclusion, I can place our views which are not final. The intention of this Government is also not to abolish Coorg District. If it is possible, we will try to increase the size of these two Districts and keep them intact. If necessary, we can think of appointing a Judicial officer to go into the whole question and after getting the correct information and records and looking to the income and expenditure, whatever proposal will be made, will be finally considered and approved." (55)

Report of Indian Statistical Institute

The Research and Training School of the Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta made a case study of the
Divisions and the Districts in Karnataka. In its report published in April 1960 under the caption "Planning Regions in Mysore", the study Group recommended raising the existing number of four divisions and 19 Districts to 6 and 21 respectively to serve as viable planning sub-regions and units. The Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta also undertook a study of the size frequency of all the Districts in India in respect of area and population with a view to distinguishing different size categories of Districts. "For this purpose, a District with an area of more than 4,000 square miles and a population of one million and a Taluka with more than 750 square miles and 1,50,000 population were considered to be unfavourable for efficient administration and implementation of development programmes."

Based on these area and population standards, the above Study Group of the Institute felt the need for readjustment of District boundaries in Karnataka State either because of large area or population or both. The Study Group remarked: "The need for readjustment seems to be pressing, even by the consideration of the size of Districts in area and population. Six Districts Bijapur, Gulbarga, Dharwar, Belgaum, Mysore and Tumkur together claim about one-third of the area and population of the State. Bijapur District is the largest in area
(6,563 square miles) closely followed by Gulbarga (6,271 square miles). Bangalore District has the largest population (2,127,061) in the State, of which about 36 per cent is concentrated in Bangalore city alone. The smallest District in area and population is Coorg (1,590 square miles), the size of which is almost equal to that of Puttur Taluka (1,424 square miles) of South Kanara District. The reason for keeping Coorg as a separate District in the Mysore State after reorganisation seems to be more due to political than regional considerations; at the same time regional sentiment sometimes demands recognition and this may be a case in point. (57) With regard to the principles of regional limitation, the study Group further expressed: "In the context of regional planning, regions should be delimited for purposes of over-all resources development and therefore based on composite factors. Planning regions in Mysore State have been delimited on the following principles. The region should preferably: 1) be contiguous in area; 2) include functionally inter-related areas and 3) include as far as possible, whole but not partial problem areas; 4) there should either be homogeneity in the regional character or diversity within unity; 5) the region should have a regional centre which is accessible to all parts of the region and acts as a cultural,
administrative and economic focus; 6) the region should preferably be economically viable.\(^{(58)}\) The Study Group proposed a revised regional set-up on the basis of the principles mentioned above. The authors have suggested a redemarcation of the present administrative units of 4 divisions comprising 19 Districts into a new group of 6 divisions (Planning Sub-regions) and 21 Districts (Planning Units) which would be more suitable for the purpose of integrated economic development. The following regional hierarchy is suggested: Nation, Zone, State (region), Division (Sub-Division), District (Planning Unit), Taluka (Development Block) and Tract (group of villages within the block) sometimes approximately to the Hobli.

The proposed Regions:\(^{(59)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Division and District</th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
<th>Area in square miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgaum Division (North-Western)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17,160 (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgaum District</td>
<td>Belgaum</td>
<td>4,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijapur District</td>
<td>Bijapur</td>
<td>4,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagalkot District</td>
<td>Bagalkot</td>
<td>3,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharwar District</td>
<td>Dharwar</td>
<td>3,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Division and District</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
<td>Area in square miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II) Mangalore Division (Coastal)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11,249 (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) North Kanara District</td>
<td>Karwar</td>
<td>3,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) South Kanara District</td>
<td>Mangalore</td>
<td>3,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Shimoga District</td>
<td>Shimoga</td>
<td>4,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III) Mysore Division</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9,233 (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Hassan District</td>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>3,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Coorg District</td>
<td>Mercara</td>
<td>2,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Mysore District</td>
<td>Mysore</td>
<td>3,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV) Bangalore Division (South-Eastern)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13,212 (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Bangalore City</td>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>0,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Bangalore Rural</td>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>2,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Tumkur District</td>
<td>Tumkur</td>
<td>4,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Mandya District</td>
<td>Mandya</td>
<td>3,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Kolar District</td>
<td>Kolar</td>
<td>2,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V) Davangere Division (Central)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7,780 (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Davangere District</td>
<td>Davangere</td>
<td>3,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Chitradurg District</td>
<td>Chitradurg</td>
<td>3,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the recent trends, the accent in administration is upon development. Hence the study Group suggested that the administrative units of Karnataka State should be reorganised into development regions from the point of view of planned use of resources than the arbitrarily drawn boundaries of the existing Divisions, Districts and Talukas, designed mainly for administrative convenience after reorganisation. In the meanwhile, the Government constituted the Resources and Economy Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri. A.G. Ramachandra Rao in their Order No. FD 264 DOD 60 dated 7th October 1960. It submitted its report on 14th March 1962.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Division and District</th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
<th>Area in square miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI) Gulbarga Division (North-Eastern)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14,896 (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Bidar District</td>
<td>Bidar</td>
<td>2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Gulbarga District</td>
<td>Gulbarga</td>
<td>4,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Raichur District</td>
<td>Raichur</td>
<td>4,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Bellary District</td>
<td>Bellary</td>
<td>3,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The views expressed by the Committee in respect of rationalisation of administrative units are quite pertinent in this context. The Committee pointed out - "The size of Districts and Talukas is relatively smaller than in the neighbouring States and also vary from one region of the State to the other. The smallest Districts in area as well as population are Coorg, Bidar, Kasar, Kandy and Chickmaglur. Bangalore District is the heaviest administrative charge and has the highest population of all the Districts in the State. Among the Talukas, Sringeri and Yelandur are the smallest." (60) The Committee further expressed: "The administrative Divisions are of recent creation, having been brought into existence after the State reorganisation. Some Districts and Talukas have been constituted as such for historical rather than administrative reasons. Bangalore District was bifurcated in 1947 but became a single District again in 1950-51. Neither the jurisdiction nor the work of the several administrative charges is equal and uniform and there are many territorial maladjustments which require rectification. The administrative map of Mysore has therefore to be redrawn on a rational basis with due regard to geographical contiguity, trade and cultural affinities,
facilities for communication and public convenience. A rationalisation of administrative jurisdiction in the State is reform long overdue but is likely to give rise to opposition by vested interests. Such opposition should be met and overcome by the Government and the reorganisation brought into effect in the larger interests of administrative efficiency and economy in expenditure." (61)

The Committee observed: "In our view, administrative divisions in the State should serve both development and non-development purposes equally. The State cannot afford the luxury of a separate administrative set up for development alone. With rapid development of communication and transport facilities in the State, and decentralisation of development functions, smaller administrative jurisdiction and charges are no longer necessary. Our considered view is that it is preferable to have fewer and more efficiently administered Districts and Talukas of small size. It is also necessary to equalise the work of administrative charges in the State. Taking all aspects into consideration, we recommend the reorganisation of the Districts and Talukas as follows:

1) The area of a Taluka may be 750 square miles generally, with an average population of 2 lakhs.
2) A District may comprise 6 such Talukas, keeping in view regional and other factors. The optimum size of the future District may be 5,000 square miles with a population of a million and half on the average. On the basis of this, the existing 171 Talukas may be conveniently reduced to 120 and 19 Districts to 15. We recommend the immediate abolition of the Sringeri and Yelandur Talukas and also of the sub-Talukas of the Old Mysore area which were later upgraded as Talukas.\(^{(62)}\)

The report further added: "Administrative difficulties may arise in merging and regrouping smaller Districts and Talukas. We do not suggest the abolition of any particular District or specific merger pattern. But a recombination and readjustment of jurisdictions on a rational basis, which would cause least amount of administrative difficulty or public inconveniences, has to be considered and adopted. We, however, recommend the bifurcation of the existing Bangalore District into a City and a Rural District. Bangalore has always been the heaviest administrative charge in the State. With the abnormal growth of the city in the recent years and increase in the volume and complexity of administrative work, involving special problems, it has become unwieldy as administrative charge. Bifurcation of the District, as proposed by us, is
The administrative Reforms Commission appointed by the Central Government also examined the case for reorganisation of Districts in the Country. The Commission in their report on State Administration have expressed:

"In the present climate in the country which is surrounded with parochial sentiment and emotion, it would not be easy to bring about a reorganisation of the existing Districts. In any case, it will not be possible for the Commission to undertake a close and detailed examination of this problem and make recommendations for reorganising the Districts. The magnitude of the work involved is such that if a single body were to embark upon it, it would not be able to complete it even within a decade. It would, therefore, be more appropriate for each State to undertake this work at a later date when times are better suited for it. The people concerned will have to be consulted and to the maximum extent practicable, attempts should be made to carry public opinion, in favour of the alteration of boundaries if any. In this
connection, a Committee may have to be appointed in each State for ascertaining public opinion, gathering necessary evidence and making suitable recommendation. We recommend that when conditions become more propitious for considering the question of readjusting the boundaries of the Districts, the State Government may appoint Committees for the purpose of examining the size and boundaries in the light of administrative requirements. 

Thus several Committees and Commissions have expressed divergent opinions and views about the rationalisation of administrative units. It is not only in Karnataka but also in the entire country that the Districts vary widely both in respects of area and population. The following statement indicates the variations of size and population of the Districts in the various states.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home of the State</th>
<th>Average District area in square kilometres</th>
<th>Average District Population in millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>13,179</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Assam</td>
<td>9,961</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Bihar</td>
<td>10,228</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Gujarat</td>
<td>10,315</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Haryana</td>
<td>6,317</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>5,567</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Jammu and Kashmir</td>
<td>22,283</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Kerala</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>10,298</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Manipur</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Meghal Pradesh</td>
<td>10,093</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Maharashtra</td>
<td>11,838</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Nagaland</td>
<td>5,509</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Orissa</td>
<td>11,988</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Punjab</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Rajasthan</td>
<td>13,162</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>9,291</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Tripura</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) West Bengal</td>
<td>5,491</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Irrespective of their size, they have remained as administrative units for several decades past. The people have developed a kind of local attachment to them. Any alteration in their areas is, therefore, likely to lead to public agitation. There is no relation between the area and population of the District. Many times, the area of the District is very small but yet there is heavy population. The size of some of the Districts is quite large. At the same time, the cost of creating a new District is high both recurring and non-recurring. The average size of a District varies from District to District and the optimum size of the District is not possible to calculate. It is also suggested that the size of the District should be reduced to a manageable limit to enable the Deputy Commissioner to grasp the spirit of the community and situations. But the task of reducing the size of some of the big Districts and carving out new Districts is not a simple matter. In this context, the observations of Mr. Sudech Kumar Sharma, an eminent Research Scholar, are quite relevant. Examining the case of Punjab, he expresses: "Britishers always took into consideration the administrative convenience regarding law and order etc. before fixing the boundaries of the
Two factors which have affected the size of the States and the Districts vis., (a) the integration of the princely States and (b) the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis merit some comment. The integration of States resulted in formation of some very small Districts, for example in the Punjab, Fapurthala District is much smaller as compared to its adjacent District Jullundur. PEPSU was merged in 1956 and the people of erstwhile PEPSU State pressed for constituting their State areas into separate Districts although they were not administratively viable units. Political reasons weighed with them and a good opportunity for reconstituting Districts of proper size was, unfortunately, lost. The reorganisation of the Punjab in 1966 on the linguistic basis further affected the boundaries of some of the Districts."(66) He further opines: "As regards the manageable size of a District, it is purely a matter of judgement rather than a formula. Even if it were possible to determine an average District by the number of villages or area or collection of land revenue, it will not provide with a practical solution because this will create problems far more troublesome than even those presented by the States' Reorganisation. However, there is a big gap in
area, population etc. of the District and by making them uniform, some disparity might reduce.

Appointment of One-Man Commission by Karnataka

At last, the Government of Karnataka appointed in July 1973 the One-Man Commission headed by Suri K. Vasudev Rao, to examine the question of reorganisation of Districts and Talukas in the State. In the Government Order No. RD 6 LRD 73 dated 13th July 1973, the following reasons and objects have been stated: "The Districts and Talukas in Mysore State as constituted at present, vary widely in respect of areas, population, revenue and development potential. This has caused some administrative inconvenience in cases where the areas in charge of local officers are unduly large or heavily populated. Representations are also being received by Government time and again from the people in different parts of the State requesting for changes in the present set up of the Districts and Talukas so as to facilitate quicker disposal of Government business. It is therefore considered that in the interest of smooth administration both in the District and Talukas which are big with double development blocks and double constituencies should be reorganised having regard to their administrative viability, peculiar problems of the area..."
like recurring scarcity conditions, the need for intensive development planning in the areas, the need for small Districts in the ayacuts of irrigation projects and historical development of the existing Districts. Government have accordingly decided to appoint a One-Man Commission to ascertain the public opinion in regard to the reorganisation of Talukas and Districts, collect necessary evidence, examine all aspects of the problems and make suitable recommendations for readjustment of boundaries of existing Districts and Talukas and formation of new ones wherever it is necessary."(68) The Committee submitted its report to the Government in March 1975. In the meanwhile, the Governor of Karnataka promulgated an Ordinance(69) enabling the State Government to reorganise Districts, Talukas and hoblis without calling for preliminary objections. The Ordinance called Karnataka Land Revenue (Amendment) Ordinance 1976 has dispensed with the present system of calling for objections from the people before passing final orders to reorganise Districts, Talukas and hoblis in the State.

4) Rationalisation of Village Administration

There were different systems of village administration prevailing in the five integrated areas of the State at
the time of reorganisation. The wide divergence of the structure of the village establishment posed a great problem to the State Government. In order to rationalise the village administration of the entire State, the Government appointed in G.O.No. R.D. 140 VCA-57-11 dated 5th November 1957 a Special Officer to suggest certain specific recommendations. It would be appropriate to give a brief account of the position existing at the time of reorganisation in the five different integrated areas before dealing with the recommendations of the Committee of the Special Officer.

a) Old Mysore Area

In the Old Mysore area, the system of village administration had its origin in what is known as the 'Barabiluti' (70) system under which there were twelve members comprising the village administrative machinery like Headman, Accountant, Astrologer, Watchman, Guard, Washerman, Water-regulator, Barber, Potter, Blacksmith, Carpenter and Goldsmith. With the efflux of time, most of the Baluthidars who were doing purely social services of the village ceased to be recognised as part of the village establishment under Governmental control. At the
time of reorganisation, the village establishment consisted of: 1) Patel - Village Headman; 2) Shanbhogues - Village Accountant; 3) Talari - The Village Scout; 4) Thot - The Village Watchman; 5) Dirganti - The distributor of water from irrigation tanks. All of them were hereditary village officers.

b) Bombay-Karnataka Area

In the Bombay-Karnataka Area, the system of village administration was common in the first three Districts while it was different in North Kanara District. The village establishment in the three Districts of Belgaum, Bijapur and Dharwar consisted of the following posts: (71) 1) (a) Revenue Patels; (b) Police Patels; (c) Combined Patels; 2) Talatie (Previously known as Kulkarnis) equivalent to the post of Shanbhogues in the Old Hydoro area; 3) Seth Samadhis or Wallikars, Talaries, Mahors and Barkars.

Their offices were hereditary under the provisions of the Bombay Hereditary Offices Act, 1874 with the exception of Village Accountants whose hereditary offices were abolished in 1950. In the District of North Kanara,
the system was different and was based upon the Madras pattern obtaining in the South Kanara District. The Bombay Hereditary Offices Act 1874 was not applicable to this District. All the offices of the village establishment were stipendiary in nature. There was only one category of patele doing the duties of both the Revenue Pateles and the Police Pateles. The Talatis were full-time Government servants. There was only one class of village servants known as Ugronis(72) who were also stipendiary.

c) Hyderabad-Karnataka Area

In the Hyderabad Karnataka area, the system prevailing was practically identical with that in the adjoining Bombay Karnataka area except the village Shanbhogue who was known as Patwari.(73) The following offices constituted the village establishment: 1) Patwari; 2) Mali Patol; 3) Police Patol; 4) Seth Sanadi; Waliker or Talwar; 5) Meeradies; 6) Baluthidars. All these offices were hereditary. Sonads were issued to all these officials. They were, for all practical purposes, deemed to be Government Servants.

d) Madras-Karnataka Area

In the Madras Karnataka area, that is in the Districts of Bellary and South Kanara and in Kollegal
Taluka, the structure of the village establishment was as described below. In Bellary District and Kollegol Taluka, it consisted of: 1) Village Headman (Patel); 2) Karnam; (Shanbhogue); 3) Talyari (Village watchman); 4) Vetti (Village Peon); and 5) Nirganti. In the South-Kanara District, it consisted of: 1) Patol; 2) Shanbhogue; 3) Talyari; and 4) Ugrani. All these offices were hereditary. The Madras Hereditary Village Officers Act of 1895 was applicable to the areas of Bellary District which formerly belonged to the Madras State.

e) Ex-Coorg Area

In the Chief Commissioner's province of Ex-Coorg, the structure of the village establishment was different from that in any other part of the State. Here, the Taluka was divided into Hoblis and each Hobli was incharge of a Parapathagar(74) who had an office known as the 'Nad' office. Two to three Nad clerks and two to five Shanbhogues were attached to the Nad office - all of them being full time Government servants. There were the Patele and Kulwadis corresponding to Thotis in the villages and their offices were hereditary.
Therefore, a fully rational organisation of village servants had to be effected to set right the maladjustments in the system of village officers. The following proposals (75) were submitted for the consideration of the Government by the Committee by the Special Officer:

1) Conversion of Shanbhogues' posts into whole-time Government service posts.

2) Regrouping of villages to enlarge the Patels' jurisdiction.

3) Conversion of Patels into whole-time Government servants together with a similar change in respect of inferior village servants.

The Government ultimately decided to abolish all the hereditary village offices to rationalise the set up of the village administration and accordingly a legislation known as the Mysore Hereditary Village Offices Abolition Act 1961 was passed. In Notification No. 89 87 GVC 61 dated 29th November 1961, the Government directed for the appointment of Village Accountants as full-time Government servants. Regarding Patels and other Inferior
Village Servants, they have not yet finalised their views in the matter, though they have accepted the principle of abolition.

**Nationalisation of Panchayati Raj Institutions**

It has already been mentioned in the Chapter on Unification of Laws, Rules and Regulations that there were five different pieces of legislation with regard to the rural local bodies or the Panchayati Raj Institutions, when the new State of Karnataka was formed. Uniformity was brought about after the enactment of Karnataka Village Panchayate and Local Boards Act, 1959. This Act bears the imprint of the recommendations of two previous Committees appointed by the Government of Old Mysore. Even before the advent of Community Development Programme, the Integration and Co-ordination Committee for Local Bodies, known as Venkatappa Committee, had submitted its report on 12th June 1950. The Local Boards Enquiry Committee known as Chandrasekharaih Committee had submitted its report on 28th August 1954. Venkatappa Committee had recommended a two tier system of Panchayati institutions known as Village Panchayats and District Boards. But Chandrasekharaih Committee had
recommended a three-tier system of Panchayati Institutions known as District Boards, Taluka Boards and Village Panchayats. But in the meanwhile the report of Balwant Rai Mehta Study Team on Community Development Projects and National Extension Schemes, appointed by the Government of India, was released in 1957. The Mehta Study Team had recommended a three-tier structure of Panchayati institutions - a Village Panchayat at the Village level, a Panchayat Samithi at the block level and a Zilla Parishad at the District level. The recommendations of Chandrasekharaiyah Committee and the pattern recommended by the Mehta Team were accepted by the Government with such modifications to suit the local circumstances and Karnataka Village Panchayats and Local Boards Act was passed in 1959. Panchayati Raj was formally inaugurated by the then President, the late Dr. Rajendra Prasad on 21st December 1960. It is desirable to mention here the salient features of the Act:

A) There is a Village Panchayat for a revenue village or for a group of revenue villages having a population of not less than 1,500 but not more than 10,000.

B) The Taluka Development Board is established for every Taluka with members directly elected by ballot with
a strength of 15 seats for Taluks with a population of less than one lakh and 19 seats for a population of one lakh and above.

0) The District Development Council is established for every District with Deputy Commissioner as the De-Office President. The members of the House of the people, the State Legislative Assembly, the State Legislative Council, the Council of States residing in the District, the Presidents of Taluka Boards, Officers nominated by the Government, a member of the scheduled castes and a woman nominated by the Government are the members of the Council.

The existing Act differs from the pattern indicated by the Mehta Study Team in two respects. The first difference is that the middle tier in Karnataka is not at the block level but at the Taluka level. The second difference is that in Karnataka, the Taluka Boards are directly elected. Thus the Panchayati Raj Institutions have been rationalised after the formation of the new State. But representations and suggestions were made by the people from time to time to the effect that the Act be amended with a view to making the Panchayati Raj Institutions more efficient and self-sufficient so as to
enable them to take up the development programmes. In this connection, two Committees have expressed certain views.

Observations of Resources and Economy Committee (1962)

"While in the present scheme of Democratic Decentra-lisation in the State, the emphasis is upon the Taluka Board, there is, in our opinion, necessity to establish a strong local body at the District level in place of the present District Development Councils, which are only reviewing and co-ordinating agencies. ... to feel that the District level is not sufficiently emphasised in the scheme and that the District Development Council should be made a prime democratic local body in the State with not only control and supervision over the Taluka Development Boards and Panchayats in the Districts but with wide functions and powers to take up and execute all developmental works and plan schemes up to the District plan." (80)

Observations of Committee On Panchayati Raj (1965)

The Committee on Panchayat Raj appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. Kondajji Basappa, the then Deputy -
Minister for Co-operation, in their report, observed:
"The new Panchayati Raj Bodies are not comparable to the local bodies that functioned earlier in many States. For all practical purposes, they are Government institutions discharging the functions of Government at the appropriate levels. The magnitude and variety of Government activities are so stupendous that it will not be possible to implement every scheme from the State level. There has to be decentralisation of real authority and functions to the lower levels and the representatives of the people made fully responsible for the formation and implementation of policies and programmes. The representatives of the people in these institutions will have to appreciate the essential aims and objectives of Panchayati Raj and their role in contributing to the realisation of those objectives. They have to establish healthy conventions of work. Officers have to reorient their outlook to the changing order and realise the immense scope before them for rendering useful service to the people."(61)

Thus, though rationalisation has been effected, the people feel that overhauling of these institutions is quite essential. Pending issues pertaining to the problems of this Chapter have been dealt with in the last Chapter.
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