ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The two State Governments of Maharashtra and Mysore gave me full co-operation in the course of my enquiry and showed me all possible courtesy and consideration and looked after my comforts in all its details. The Chief Secretary of the State of Maharashtra, Shri D. R. Pradhan, and the Deputy Secretary, Shri S. L. Ogale, not only personally looked after me but were very respectful and affectionate. So was Shri K. Balasubramanyam, Special Secretary to the Government of Mysore on duty with the Commission and other officers of that Government. I express my gratitude to the State Governments and their officers for all the consideration shown to the Commission. The enquiry was conducted peacefuly and in a cordial atmosphere in spite of the emotions of the people being considerably worked up on the linguistic issue. This was because of the interest the officers of the States concerned, their Collectors and Commissioners and members of the Police force took in maintaining a disciplined atmosphere all-round.

The State Government of Kerala though not taking part in the enquiry made all necessary arrangements for the sittings of the Commission at asaragod and in spite of threats of boycott and picketting, the Superintendent of Police of the Government of Kerala took all measures to ensure that the Commission's work at Kasaragod was conducted in a calm, peaceful and disciplined atmosphere in spite of the surcharged and tense situation of the place. The Commission expresses its sense of appreciation of the arrangements made to the Government of Kerala.

To the people of the various disputed areas and particularly those who came to meet the Commission and placed their views before it, the Commission is thankful for their helpful attitude and disciplined and respectful manner in which they behaved and acted during the interviews.

The Commission is also thankful to the learned counsel of the State Governments who argued their respective cases before it. The arguments were conducted in a fair and straightforward manner and were very helpful to the Commission in arriving at its conclusions.

The Secretary of the Commission, Shri S. Narayanswamy, is a person of great experience and ability. He has managed the Commission's proceedings and its sittings as well as the tours that the Commission undertook with admirable thoroughness. No one could have done better than what he did. He was most helpful in every way in the proper functioning of the Commission. Not only he worked as an efficient officer but was a kind friend and a companion to the solitary One-Man Commission in all its wanderings in the disputed areas. The Commission expresses its gratitude to him for his kindness and courtesy.

The staff of the Commission was put to very hard work and all of them discharged their functions admirably and without a frown. Shri K. R. Singhal, Section Officer, was responsible for organising the office work and he did it effectively. The Commission's Private Secretary, Shri J. C. Ghatak, is a very hard working and conscientious person and is very efficient in his work as Stenographer. During my official career I have hardly found a more efficient person as Private Secretary than him. I am thankful to him for all the help he gave me in the discharge of my work.

I cannot help thanking the Union Government for placing confidence in my judgement in resolving this difficult issue. No directions were issued to me and I was given unfettered discretion in conducting my proceedings and in settling the procedure of my work, and even deciding the question about my jurisdiction.

In conclusion, I may add that none of the Governments concerned have on my recommendations got what they claimed, and I presume that they will not be satisfied with these recommendations. All that I can say is that I have made my recommendations to the best of my ability and intelligence and without any pressures of any kind. The Chief Ministers of Maharashtra and Mysore were pleased to meet me and showed me all the courtesy and kindness but they never interfered in any way in the conduct of the Commission's proceedings. I am grateful to them for the kindness and courtesy shown to the Commission. The Chief Minister of Kerala expressed his willingness to meet the Commission if it visited Trivandrum but the Commission felt no necessity for doing so, particularly when the attitude of the State Government was one of indifference. I am, however, grateful to the Chief Minister of Kerala for placing his views before me.

To the Chief Secretary of the State of Madras, I have to express my thanks for arranging for the Commission's stay and for arranging for its sittings at Ooty.

I was requested by a large number of persons to say in my report that quite a number of respectable and intelligent persons who came to meet the Commission were fed up with the linguistic reorganisation of the States in India and that speakers of other languages in unilingual States were being treated as second-class citizens, and that steps be taken to reorganise the States on Zonal basis so that the unity of India be strengthened and separatist tendencies be curbed. The Commision feels that it is outside its function to express any opinion on this matter. It is outside the ambit of its charter.

MEHR CHAND MAHAJAN,

Chairman.

NEW DELHI;

Dated 25th August, 1967.

GMGIPND—Minto Road—TSS—125 HA 11-9-1967—3,700

D.O. No. 1/1/67-MC

COMMISSION ON MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE-KERALA BOUNDARY DISPUTES.

New Delhi, September 3, 1967.

My dear Home Minister,

My attention has been drawn to the recommendation in my report in regard to the Kasaragod Taluk and it is stated that it is not definite about the precise villages to be transferred to Mysore and to be retained in Kerala. I hasten to clarify the position as follows:

My recommendation is that the present Kasaragod Taluk minus the 8 villages noted in the margin lying to the south of the Chandragiri and Payaswini rivers and south of the Adoor hills and the reserve forest should be transferred to Mysore and that the 8 villages mentioned above may remain part of Kerala as at present. If necessary this clarification may be embodied suitably in paragraph 40 in the Chapter on Kasaragod Taluka in Part IV, Volume 1, of my Report.

1. **Bandadka**
2. **Kuttikole**
3. **Bedadka**
4. **Kolathura**
5. **Tekkila**
6. **Perambale**
7. **Chemnad**
8. **Kalanadu**

2. It has also been pointed out to me that the boundary of the village Chankibail in the Khanapur Taluk which I have proposed for transfer to Maharashtra has not been shown correctly in the map attached to the Report. The village boundary was demarcated on the basis of the maps received from the Government of Mysore and I have asked the Secretary to the Commission to ascertain the correct boundary of this village. In this case there is no mistake about the village but only about its exact boundaries. The boundary of village Chankibail in the map attached to the Report may be corrected, if necessary, on the basis of the information received from the Government of Mysore.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) MEHR CHAND MAHAJAN.

Shri Y. B. Chavan,
Home Minister,
Govt. of India,
New Delhi.