

From the original
Ecclesiastical (18/17) Department.

Original
—ORDINARY—

G.O. No. *1492*

DATED *26-11-1917*

96
[Despatch Abstract.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Government of Madras

HOME DEPARTMENT (EDUCATION)

G.O. No. 1492, 26th November 1917

Special Tests

Directing that it is no longer necessary to prescribe any of the — for any office or appointment in the Police Department and requesting the Commissioner for Government Examinations to submit a draft of the necessary alterations in the Public Service and Special Tests Notifications.

READ—the following papers:—

G.O. No. 673, Educational, dated the 21st September 1908.

ABSTRACT.—Directing that all clerks and others on Rs. 50 and upwards in the office of the Inspector-General of Police, the Commissioner of Police, Madras, and the Deputy Inspector General of Police for Criminal Intelligence and Railways except the Storekeeper in the office of the Inspector-General of Police shall, for the future, be required to pass only the Account test (higher) and the departmental test in Police Orders and Practice and declining to exempt the head clerk of the Inspector-General's office from the necessity of passing the Précis-writing test.

G.O. No. 969, Home (Education), dated the 13th September 1916.

ABSTRACT.—Inviting the views of the Board of Revenue and of other heads of departments on certain proposals for the amendment of the rules embodied in the Public Service and Special Test Notifications.

G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on the proposals made by the Board of Revenue and other heads of departments with reference to G.O. No. 969, Home (Education), dated 13th September 1916, relating to the amendment of the rules in the Public Service and Special Test Notifications.

Order—No. 1492, Home (Education), dated the 26th November 1917.

The Government have carefully considered the question of the suitability of the special tests prescribed for the various appointments in the Police Department. They have come to the conclusion that the Précis-writing test now prescribed for certain ministerial posts of the District and Central offices is unnecessary and that the Criminal Judicial test is needless for the executive branch of the department in view of the fact that a knowledge of criminal law is ensured by the course of training at the Police Training School. Nor do the Government deem the latter test essential for the ministerial posts in the Police Department. A separate special test in accounts is also unnecessary as such of the holders of the ministerial appointments for which the Account test is at present prescribed may be required to answer questions in accounts which may be added to the existing departmental test in Police Orders and Practice. None of the special tests will thus be prescribed for any appointment or office in the Police Department in future.

2. The Commissioner for Government Examinations is requested to submit a draft of the necessary alterations in the Public Service and Special Test Notifications.

(True extract)

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioner for Government Examinations.
" Home (Judicial) Department (with copy of notes).
" Inspector-General of Police through Home (Judicial) Department.
" Commissioner of Police.
Editors' Table

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1492, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED 26TH NOVEMBER 1917

[SUBJECT.—*Revision of the Public Service and Special Test notifications.*]

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The following points require further examination :—

- * Dealt with on page 7 infra.
- * (1) *Article 3, Public Service notification.*—Prescription of tests for special appointments—cf. also schedule to “Special Test examinations.”
- (2) *Article 4.*—Powers of exemption.
- * Dealt with on page 7 infra.
- * (3) *Simplification of Special Test examinations.*

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—6-8-17.

Please see paragraph 3 on page 14 of notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated 6th August 1917. The points still for consideration are dealt with below :—

(a) Attention is solicited to clause (b) of paragraph 2 on page 3 of the notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917, in which it is suggested that the new rule requiring the incumbents of posts on Rs. 20 to possess a completed secondary school-leaving certificate should not have retrospective effect—cf. also Mr. Ellis's note on page 8 of the same notes. This proposal is only reasonable and may be approved. If so, a note may be subjoined to that effect in article 1 of the revised notification called for from the Commissioner for Government Examinations in paragraph 3 of G.O. No. 1021, dated the 6th August 1917.

(b) Again in clause (c) on page 3 of the notes, the Superintendent, Government Museum, considers it inexpedient to extend this new rule to posts on an incremental pay with a maximum of Rs. 20. This proposal may also be accepted and a second note be similarly subjoined.

(c) Orders have also to be passed in regard to the eligibility of Middle school first-class men to appear for the special tests—vide page 9 of the notes to the Government Order—cf. also the Legislative Council question and answer recorded in G.O. No. 229, Home (Education), dated 22nd February 1917.

2. *Powers of exemption (article 4 of the Public Service notification).*—The present powers of exemption possessed by the Government, the heads of departments and other officers are enumerated in article 4 of the notification. The Secretary has directed that they should be considered and overhauled in consultation with the several officers concerned. The Superintending Engineer, V Circle, proposes to exempt Bellary, Anantapur and Ganjam from the operation of the new rule insisting upon the possession of a secondary school-leaving certificate for posts on Rs. 20 per mensem. The Inspector-General of Police also suggests that the rule should not be made applicable to the Ceded Districts (paragraph 5 on page 4 of G.O. No. 1021, dated 6th August 1916). Again the Board of Revenue recommends that Collectors may be empowered to exempt unpassed men to posts up to Rs. 30 provided passed men are not available. Further the views of the Public Works Department are given in Mr. Molesworth's note on page 8 of the notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917. Extracts of this paragraph together with a copy of the notes to the Government order may be sent un-officially to the departments of the Secretariat with the request to state whether they agree to the above suggestions. They may also be requested to consult their heads of departments if necessary to see whether any further changes are required in the existing rules regarding powers of exemption.

3. Attention is also solicited to the Secretary's note, dated the 18th June 1917, on page 9 of the notes to the Government order in which he stated that he would

As this particular point has not been referred to by Honourable Member, it may be dropped for the present.

R.R.—13-9-17.

and Sir Alexander Cardew's note on page 12 of the notes to G.O. No. 969, Home (Education), dated the 13th September 1916.

E.A.V.—4-9-17.

T.K.—5-9-17.

Special tests.

* Already received?

R.R.

* Presumably the proceedings on pages 39-41 of G.O. 1021, 6th August 1917.

E.A.V.—3-9-17.

I should like the file noted on *briefly* and circulated to me at an early date. It should not be buried in office notes.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—26-8-17.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Copies of note on the discussion and the recommendation of the sub-committee are attached.

F. J. RICHARDS—28-8-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Treat as urgent.

Deal separately with—

- (1) Nature of special tests: subjects, etc.
- (2) Qualifying tests—article 3 of the Public Service notification.
- (3) Sub-committee's report.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—29-8-17.

COLLECTORS' CONFERENCE.

SUBJECT 12—Representation of backward classes in Government service.—The general trend of the discussion showed that while it was essential that there should be in public offices a fair representation of all communities, it was not desirable to fix any definite proportion for particular castes. It was pointed out that efficiency was the real test and not the passing of examinations, and that the special test was an obstacle. In order that efficient men might not be debarred from promotion on the score of their not passing some tests and with a view to give Collectors a free hand in the matter of promoting efficient men, it was thought that some of the special tests might be simplified or abolished. As this question appeared to be a complicated one, a suggestion was made that the point should be examined by a sub-committee. During the course of the discussion a doubt also arose as to the exact meaning of the words "completed secondary school-leaving certificate." An informal sub-committee consisting of the following gentlemen was, therefore, appointed, and it was requested to report—

(1) what was the exact meaning of the words "completed secondary school-leaving certificate" occurring in rule (1) of clause (2) of the Public Services notification, and

(2) to what extent any of the special tests should be either simplified or abolished.

The Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg,
Mr. Venugopal Chetti,
Mr. Stokes,
Mr. Campbell,
Mr. Davis, and
Mr. Richards.

The following conclusions which were arrived at by the sub-committee were read by the Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg:—

Committee's notes on Special tests.

I. The meaning of the "complete secondary school-leaving certificate" merely is that the holder has completed his studies up to and in the fourth, fifth and sixth forms of a secondary school, and has kept all his terms and has appeared for the School Final Public Examination. It does not necessarily mean that he has any special ability or has attained any particular knowledge of subjects useful in Government service. It exhibits the Presidency average and compares the ranks attained by the candidate therewith. The practice has been, it appears, for Collectors to notify to Divisional officers a proportion of ranks to be required as the minimum necessary for appointment to Government service. In view of the great differences in the conditions of districts we consider that Collectors should have discretion to decide the standard, as in fact they frequently do at present.

II. The Committee have found great difficulty in formulating united recommendations, and the time at their disposal has not been sufficient to enable them to discuss the details of possible alternative schemes and as the merits of any scheme that can be formulated can only be judged in the light of detailed application, they regret that it has not been possible to put forward, as a Committee any cut and dried proposals.

The annexed note sets forth, as a possible solution, a scheme formulated by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes which the Committee think might be circulated to Collectors and considered by Government. Its principle, briefly, is to substitute for Special tests, special periods of training in various branches of administrative work to be given to selected men; this period to be followed by probationary periods of actual service during which the men's work would be specially watched. Sir Robert Clegg has indicated in his note appended to this report several serious practical objections, the force of which the Committee recognise, but neither he nor the Committee consider that these criticisms need preclude the further examination of the suggestions put forward. The alternative to some such scheme of *abolition* of Special tests as that formulated by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes seems to be while retaining the tests, to simplify them and render them less burdensome; in this direction proposals have been framed in the Board's Proceedings quoted in Sir Robert Clegg's note above referred to—pages 39-41 of G.O. No. 1021, dated 6th August 1917. These appear to the Committee to lead in the right direction and the Committee would like to see the simplification carried further if possible. The Committee endorse generally the remarks of Messrs. Campbell and Stokes in the first part of paragraph 13 of their note.

ROBERT CLEGG.

H. G. STOKES.

E. A. DAVIS.

A. Y. G. CAMPBELL.

V. VENUGOPAL CHETTI.

F. J. RICHARDS.

Note by Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell and Mr. H. G. Stokes.

We have considered the secondary question, namely, to what extent certain Special tests may be simplified or abolished only from the point of view of district administration under the control of the Collector.

2. The following scheme is not applicable to the Translation tests and the Equitation test.

3. As regards the Revenue tests, the Account test and the Criminal Judicial tests, we propose that the following scheme should be referred to Collectors for remarks and should be tried experimentally in a few selected districts in the various parts of the Presidency.

4. The general underlying principle on which we propose to proceed is the substitution of training and probationary work for the passing of examinations.

5. Each special test will be replaced by (a) effective training for a specified period, and (b) satisfactory service in a specified appointment on probation for a specified period.

6. No person may be appointed to a specified appointment on probation until he has obtained a certificate from a prescribed authority that he has undergone the prescribed training and is fit to be appointed on probation. A diary will be kept by the person undergoing training. The diary will be countersigned each day by the person under whom he is undergoing training.

7. No person will be appointed permanently to a specified appointment unless he had obtained both a certificate of training referred to above and also a certificate that since undergoing the training he has discharged the duties of the prescribed appointment on probation for the specified period satisfactorily.

8. Provision must be made in each district for persons undergoing training by allowing a certain number on a pay not exceeding Rs. 30 to be seconded or to be regarded as on special duty without deputation allowance.

9. Provision must be made for acting appointments of untrained men when absolutely necessary.

10. The success of the scheme will depend largely on the discrimination with which the prescribed authority grants the certificates referred to above. In the case of district appointments in the Revenue Department, this authority should be the Collector.

11. We recommend that no one should ordinarily be admitted to training unless he has rendered three years' continuous Government service to the satisfaction of the prescribed authority, but we do not recommend that any special educational qualifications should be necessary as a condition precedent.

12. We consider that ordinarily no person should be allowed to undergo training after the age of 30.

13. Under our proposals, the Special tests will have to continue for some years, and we recommend that the list of Acts, Regulations, Manuals and Codes prescribed for the several tests should be carefully examined with a view to their reduction. It appears to be unnecessary to prescribe that certain Acts which have only local application should be studied by candidates throughout the Presidency. Further acquaintance with the whole of certain Acts, Regulations and Manuals is unnecessary. One advantage of the proposals made in this note is that officials in each district would receive training in the special branches of law peculiar to the district. This may, if considered desirable, also be provided for under the present Special Tests scheme by arranging that candidates of certain districts or groups of districts should have to answer questions relating to the law peculiar to their districts.

Training and probation to be substituted for Special tests.

14. *Revenue test, lower grade.*—(a) Three months' training in the Collector's office; including check of village accounts by the Collector's establishment at jamabandi, unless a candidate has such previous experience of this branch of work as the Collector considers sufficient.

(b) One month training in the Taluk office.

(c) One month in charge of the work of headman and karnam of a village under a selected Revenue Inspector.

While on training in the Collector's office, the candidate shall study the simplified syllabus of the Acts, Regulations and books which we have recommended above.

Probationary service.—One year as Revenue Inspector.

15. *Account test.*—Training as now prescribed for Taluk Head Accountants.

Probation.—Six months as Taluk Head Accountant.

16. *Criminal Judicial test, lower grade.*—(a) One month's training in a Sub-Magistrate's office.

(b) Two months' training in a District Magistrate's office.

During this period of training the candidate must study the simplified syllabus prescribed for the Criminal Judicial test, lower grade, with the addition of the following:—The Indian Arms Act and Rules, portions of the Extradition Manual and certain other Acts, such as, the Explosives Act, which affect a Magistrate's work.

A candidate who has done satisfactory work as a Subdivisional or Sub-Magistrate's clerk for a period exceeding one month may be excused the training in a Sub-Magistrate's office.

Probationary service.—Six months as a Magisterial clerk, preferably under a District Magistrate or a Subdivisional Magistrate.

17. *Revenue test, higher grade, and Criminal Judicial test, higher grade.*—Before promotion to be a Deputy Collector a person in Government service should be required to obtain from the District Magistrate a certificate that he has satisfactorily discharged the duties of a Stationary Sub-Magistrate with second-class powers for not less than one year and from the Collector a certificate that he has satisfactorily discharged the duties of a Tahsildar for a period of at least one year. These certificates will take the place of the Criminal Judicial test, higher grade, and the Revenue test, higher grade, respectively.

18. We do not propose any alteration in the remarks in column 3 of the "table showing the various offices in the superior service for which special professional or technical tests are prescribed in the Public Services notification opposite to C. Revenue Department, (2) Deputy Collectors.

19. *Modifications effected by this scheme on the present arrangements.*—Under this scheme we contemplate that the ultimate result will be that the Revenue tests, the Account test and the Criminal Judicial tests may disappear but for the time being the two systems will continue side by side.

20. The certificates of training and proficiency after probation in Revenue work, Accounts and Criminal Judicial work, will take the place of the Revenue test, lower grade, the Account test and the Criminal Judicial test, lower grade, respectively, prescribed for certain appointments in the Public Service notification.

Sir Robert Olegg's note.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stokes' scheme, as it enables Collectors to select capable men for the grade of Revenue Inspector and higher grades without reference to their abilities to pass examinations and thereby to secure a proper proportion of non-Brahmans. I hesitate to accept the scheme without more careful consideration than we have been able to give it in the limited time at our disposal. At present we have to give six weeks' training in survey to clerks for the post of Revenue Inspector and three months' training for taluk head accountants and I have no doubt even this causes some dislocation of work because they have to be relieved by acting men. Under the scheme before a man is qualified for the post of Deputy Tahsildar he will have to undergo practically one year's training and probation for two years. The cost will possibly be prohibitive because no office can afford to let its hands go for training without substitutes and the numbers on training for posts up to Deputy Tahsildar's grade will be very considerable if this training has to supersede the present Special tests. I anticipate also that substitutes will be frequently necessary for men on probation. My present opinion is that it will in practice be unworkable. Probation and reading of books are parts of the scheme. The acting appointments which are now made before confirmation furnish probably sufficient probation. Without some kind of examination I do not see how a Collector can certify that a man has read his books intelligently. I am doubtful whether the certificates to be given by the Collector will be of much value. Collectors have little time to train and examine their men and will have to rely on the opinions of others. I am afraid such certificates will tend to become mere matters of routine.

There is however room for some modification of the special tests required for particular appointments. The Board has already considered the question and its proposals are given in paragraph 5 of the Full Board's Proceedings Mis. No. 930, dated 10th July 1917 (pages 39-41, of G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917). I was not a member of the Board which issued that resolution but I am generally in agreement with my colleagues.

I am further of opinion that it should be possible to simplify and make the tests more practical but the question requires more minute scrutiny than we have been able to give it.

The Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew then observed that the scheme proposed in the note by Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stokes required a good deal of consideration and examination, and that it was too complicated a matter to discuss with much benefit. He doubted whether it would be possible to arrange for the training of large numbers of men, and thought that there might be alternatives to certain tests. In conclusion, he said that the Government would consider very carefully the suggestions that the special tests might be simplified and their scope reduced.

Mr. Legh said that a distinction should be drawn between the Account test and the Judicial and the Revenue tests. The Account test was an examination on paper and of very little practical value, and he was therefore of the opinion that that test might be abolished.

Mr. Aziz-ud-din thought that the training proposed by the Committee would apply only to officers in Government service.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT

The simplification of special tests is one of the subjects which were left over for separate consideration when general orders regarding the Public Service and Special tests notifications were passed—c.f. paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917.

2. The points referred to by the Secretary on page 2 ante are dealt with below:—

(1) *Nature of Special tests, subjects, etc.*—Article 1 of the Special test notification gives a list of the Special tests prescribed for the several offices, and article 5 deals with the scope of the examination in each of these subjects. The schedule appended to the notification gives the offices or appointments in the public service for which they have been from time to time prescribed by the Government. Recently the opinion has been expressed that some of the existing tests are unnecessarily elaborate and that the number of appointments for which others are prescribed might safely be curtailed (paragraph 4 of G.O. No. 969, Education, dated 13th September 1916). The remarks of heads of departments who were consulted on the point will be found summarised on pages 10–11 of the notes to G.O. No. 1021, Education, dated the 6th August 1917. Of these the following are in the direction of simplifying the tests:—

(a) *General.*—It was stated by Mr. Young, the Superintendent of Stationery, that greater importance should be assigned to the papers that have to be answered with the aid of books which might be made longer than the papers "without books" and allotted twice the marks. Mr. Schmidt however would allow candidates to use books throughout in answering question papers. It is for consideration whether Mr. Schmidt's suggestion may be approved.

(b) *Criminal Judicial test.*—Mr. Innes, the Second Presidency Magistrate, and the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, would take away Medical Jurisprudence from the list of subjects for the Criminal Judicial test. There seems no objection to the acceptance of this suggestion.

(c) *Revenue test.*—The Second Presidency Magistrate thought that it was unnecessary to set a separate paper on the stamp, income-tax and excise manuals for the Revenue test, but that the Acts embodied in those manuals might be included in the list of Revenue Acts and Regulations prescribed for that test. That officer also recommended the omission of the Special Funds Code and the Manuals of Village and Taluk Accounts from the list of subjects for the Revenue test. If this is agreed to there will be only two main subjects of examination, viz., Revenue Acts and Regulations and the Board's Standing Orders for the Revenue test as against the present seven subjects.

Orders are requested whether the above suggestion will be approved.

(d) *Precis-writing test.*—There is a general consensus of opinion that this test may be abolished altogether. It is for orders whether the Government will agree to this proposal.

(2) *Qualifying tests : article 3 of the Public Service Notification.*—On page 11 of the Notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917, the Secretary observed as follows:—

"Article 3 of the Public Service Notification which prescribes qualifying tests is a voluminous article and I think ought to be considered and overhauled in consultation with the offices concerned."

It may be noted that the opinions of heads of departments on this question have already been obtained and these will be found summarised on pages 10–11 of the notes to the above Government order. It is for consideration whether it will suffice if relevant extracts of such opinions are taken and forwarded to the administrative departments concerned separately for remarks. In that case a separate u.o. note and a tabular form exhibiting the points at issue and the opinions of heads of departments thereon will be prepared and submitted for approval.

(3) *Sub-committee's report.*—In the sub-committee's report, two alternative schemes are put forward—(i) complete abolition of the Special tests and the substitution in their place of special periods of training in various branches of administrative work to be given to selected men, these periods being followed by probationary periods of actual service during which the men's work would be specially watched. The Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg has also appended a note indicating several serious practical objections to the above scheme and the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew seems also very reluctant to adopt it. It does not therefore seem necessary to proceed with the further examination of this point and refer it to the Board of Revenue for their remarks. Further this scheme is defective since it does not take into consideration the requirements of departments other than the Revenue Department.

The alternative scheme, viz., the one for the simplification of special tests and the reduction of their scope, appears to commend itself to the Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg and the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew. A few suggestions in this direction have been dealt with in paragraph 2 (1) ante. It is for consideration whether the suggestion in paragraph 13 of the note by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes may be communicated to the Board of Revenue and they be asked to submit a revised syllabus for the Revenue and the Criminal Judicial tests. The syllabus for the remaining tests hardly calls for any change.

E.A.V. - 3-9-17.

T.K. - 5-9-17.

So far as Special tests and the orders regulating their prescription are concerned, Educational collate them and issue the orders in respect of them. The initial examination of the question of the desirability of prescribing Special tests or simplifying them is made in the administrative departments. It is therefore submitted that the papers may be circulated to the departments with the request that they will consider (1) which of the Special tests should be simplified or abolished, (2) to which of the appointments under them the special tests should be prescribed, (3) whether the powers of exemption exercised by the officers under them should be modified and if so why. The question of substituting special training and probation for special tests proposed by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes relates chiefly to appointments under the Revenue Department and has therefore primarily to be considered in that department. It is doubtful whether Educational can further examine the questions at this stage.

R.R.—13-9-17.

I agree, and probably after the Collector's conference report is received.

R.R.—13-9-17.

C. RAMANUJA AOHARIYAR—12-9-17.

Chief Secretariat.
Local and Municipal Secretariat.
Revenue Secretariat.
Public Works (Irrigation).
Public Works (General).
Miscellaneous and Judicial sections of the
Home Secretariat.

2. The question of the abolition of the Criminal Judicial test (lower) in respect of the appointments of managers and accountants in District Police offices advocated in the "Justice" of the 11th instant may be remitted to Judicial for examination.

E.A.V.—20-9-17.

T.K.—20-9-17.

The notes have been printed. Submitted that a copy thereof may be forwarded to each of the marginally-noted Secretariat offices with reference to the orders at **K** on the previous page.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—21-9-17.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—24-9-17.

HOME (JUDICIAL) DEPARTMENT.

As regards the three points at **K** on page 7 ante, the Inspector-General of Police has already expressed his opinion in his letter, dated the 27th November 1916 (page 11 of G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated 6th August 1917). He is against the simplification or abolition of any of the special tests prescribed for his department and he does not wish any curtailment of the number of appointments for which the tests have been prescribed. Again he desires that the powers of exemption at present possessed by him and the Deputy Inspector-General should continue. It therefore seems unnecessary to consult him again on these points. The matter dealt with in "Justice" of the 11th September is covered by the remarks already offered by the Inspector-General. The cutting may, however, be referred to him with the request that he will report specifically on the suggestion made in it. Draft memorandum put up.

P.S.R.—28-9-17.

C.V.—29-9-17.

It seems unnecessary to consult the Inspector-General again on the general question. His views may be accepted with the exception of the case of accountants. The memorandum on that point may issue.

D. N. STRATHIE—1-10-17.

I should like the office to examine if the tests for Police appointments can be reduced or simplified. Please let me have a note, e.g., the utility of the Précis-writing test is doubtful; also is Medical Jurisprudence necessary in the case of clerical Police appointments?

R.R.—2-10-17.

The following list shows the special tests prescribed and the appointments for which they are so prescribed in the Police department:—

Description of the special test.	Appointments for which prescribed.
Criminal Judicial test, lower grade	Police inspectors (except Reserve Inspectors), managers and accountants in the offices of District Superintendents of Police and the manager of the Finger Print Bureau.
Criminal Judicial test, higher grade	Managers in the offices of the Inspector-General and the Commissioner.
Account test	Managers in the offices of the Inspector-General and the Commissioner and of the Finger Print Bureau. All clerks and others on Rs. 50 and upwards in the offices of the Inspector-General, the Commissioner and the Deputy Inspector-General of Railways and Criminal Investigation Department and managers and accountants in the offices of District Superintendents of Police.
Précis-writing test	Managers in the offices of the Inspector-General and the Commissioner and head clerk in the office of the Inspector-General.

2. *Criminal Judicial test, lower and higher grades*—(a) *Necessity for the test in the case of the Police department*.—Reference is solicited to page 1 of the notes to G.O. No. 648, Educational, dated the 28th October 1904, from which it will be seen that the only clerical appointments in the department for which the test was considered a necessary qualification prior to 1904 were those of managers and accountants in District Police offices. The prescription of the test for other ministerial posts mentioned on page 8 supra was on the initiative of the Government themselves and not of the Inspector-General or the Commissioner of Police. That the need for the test was not felt by these heads of departments who never themselves moved in the matter is perhaps sufficient proof of the absence of any great necessity for it. Even in the case of the posts of accountants and managers in District Police offices, the test appears to have been required (vide paragraph 3 of Inspector-General's letter on pages 2 and 3 of G.O. No. 648, Educational, dated 28th October 1904), only because these appointments were formerly graded with those of inspectors of police. There would therefore seem to be no grave objection to the abolition of the test (lower or higher) so far as regards clerical posts in the Police department not excluding those of managers and accountants in District Police offices (cf. article in "Justice" of the 11th September 1917 and Secretary's remark thereon). Then there remain only inspectors of police. In their case, it is obvious that the test must continue and the only question is as to its reduction or simplification.

(b) *Simplification of the test in the case of inspectors of police*.—The subjects prescribed for the test now are—

- (1) The Indian Evidence Act, 1872.
- (2) The Indian Penal Code.
- (3) The Code of Criminal Procedure.
- (4) Medical Jurisprudence.

The first three subjects must evidently be retained if the test is to continue at all. The Board of Revenue by a majority, Mr. Innes and the Second Presidency Magistrate are of opinion that the fourth may be omitted from the test—pages 5, 9 and 40 of G.O. No. 1021, Educational, dated 6th August 1917. The Board's reason is that points of medical jurisprudence do not often arise in magisterial cases and when they do, they can seldom be decided without reference to the book. The Board, of course, does not trouble itself about the police aspect of the question. The importance of a knowledge of the elements of medical jurisprudence to the police officer who has to conduct an investigation under section 174 of the Civil Procedure Code may be gathered from the following passage in Chapter 1, section 1 of Gribble and Hehir's *Outlines of Medical Jurisprudence*, which explains the scope of the science:—

"In this country it rarely happens that a medical man sees a body when it is first found. It is generally sent to him for examination many hours, often several days, after death has occurred. In nine cases out of ten the preliminary examination is conducted by the police and the village authorities. Upon them devolves the first and most important duty of observation."

The above is in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 174, Criminal Procedure Code. A body need not invariably be sent to a medical man. The police officer has to do so only when there is any doubt regarding the cause of death or when for any other reason he considers it expedient to do so. It is with the officer in charge of the police station or wherever else is empowered to conduct the investigation under section 174, e.g., a head constable, that the primary responsibility rests for a decision as to the necessity for a dead body being examined by a medical man. It is thus clear that the Police officer holding investigation under section 174 should have at least an elementary knowledge of the science. But this need be no reason why the subject may not be eliminated from the test. For sub-inspectors of police and inspectors recruited direct have to pass an examination in the elements of medical jurisprudence before they pass out of the Police Training school, Vellore. It is the sub-inspectors of police who are primarily concerned with investigation under section 174, but it is only inspectors of police that are now required to pass the test. Inspectors are no doubt required to assist in and supervise

the investigation of important cases (Police Order No. 142, volume I), but they have to study the science at the Vellore school whether they are promoted sub-inspectors or recruited direct. The course of study now prescribed at the Vellore school may, if necessary, be expanded so as to make it cover a wider field and this department may agree to the omission of 'Medical Jurisprudence' from the subjects of the Criminal Judicial test.

II | 3. *Account test*.—It will be seen from paragraph 2 supra that prior to 1904 the test was considered necessary only for appointments of managers and accountants in District Police offices. As there is much of audit work to do in the Inspector-General's office and also in the offices of District Superintendents, the test may be retained—vide paragraphs 4 and 5 of Inspectors-General's letter on pages 3 and 4 of G.O. No. 2382, dated 6th October 1916. But it will be seen from the list at page 13 of the Public Service Notification that all those officers who have to pass the account test have also to pass a departmental test in police orders and practice. It is therefore for consideration whether, as suggested by the Director of Public Instruction in the case of sub-assistant inspectors and inspectresses, the test may not be allowed to form part of the departmental tests in such shape as may be deemed suitable by the Inspector-General—vide page 7 of G.O. No. 1021, Educational, dated 6th August 1917.

III | 4. *Précis-writing test*.—The High Court by a majority and the Board of Revenue are agreed as to the abolition of this test—vide pages 38, 39 and 40 of G.O. No. 1021, Educational, dated 6th August 1917. There can be no stronger reason for the retention of the test in the case of those officers of the Police department who have now to pass the tests—vide page 8 supra than in the case of Munsifs and Sub-Judges and officers of the Revenue department.

P.S.R.—4-10-17.

But see Sir Alexander Cardew's note on page 1.
D.N.S.—7-10-17.

5. Perhaps the Inspector-General's remarks may be invited.

C.V.—5-10-17.

If it is proposed to abolish the Criminal Judicial test for clerical posts, it would not require any alteration. For a knowledge of medical jurisprudence is necessary for an inspector; as he has already studied it, the examination should not cause him much trouble.

2. The suggested modification of the account test seems rather needless.

3. The Précis-writing test would seem to provide a useful course for the two managers and the head clerk who are required to pass it.

D. N. STRATHIE—7-10-17.

Regarding paragraph 2 of Under Secretary's note, the idea is to avoid duplication of examinations.

Regarding paragraph 3, I do not think that the test is really useful. Much depends on the candidate.

I shall be very glad if the Inspector-General of Police can give his views on I to IV above at an early date.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—10-10-17.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE.

I consider it is essential that managers in Police offices should have a knowledge of law and think they should be required to pass the Criminal Lower. As these officers are chosen from accountants and as the latter have to act for the former in their absence on leave or otherwise, it is highly desirable that the qualifications required for both the posts should be the same. It is true that the passing of an examination is not necessarily a hallmark of efficiency, but I can see no reason for abolishing the test which will in future be open to secondary school-leaving certificate holders. The posts of manager and accountant in District Police offices are

responsible appointments and are borne on a presidency cadre. In filling up vacancies the claims of clerks in all offices have to be taken into consideration and in my opinion there cannot be a better means of restricting the field of selection than by prescribing the Criminal test. As for the Commissioner's office manager I think he should be required to pass the Criminal Higher. The Commissioner is a Presidency Magistrate and his office manager should be more highly qualified than a District Police office manager. The chief office manager is usually selected from among the District office managers. It is the highest ministerial appointment in the department with considerable responsibilities. I think he should pass the Criminal Higher.

2. I am not in favour of taking away 'Medical Jurisprudence' from the Criminal test. Although it is one of the subjects for the final examination in the Provincial Training school, Vellore, it would be as well to have an independent test for inspectors in whose case the Criminal test is considered necessary. Further if the subject is removed those qualifying for manager and accountant will have no opportunity of studying it. A knowledge of Medical Jurisprudence is as useful to a manager as to an executive officer.

3. I do not think it would be feasible or desirable to amalgamate the Account test with the departmental test for managers and accountants. The former is intended as a test of general knowledge of accounting while the latter deals purely with departmental rules and procedure. The scope of each is distinct. If amalgamated I should find it difficult to nominate examiners in the Account Code and the Civil Service Regulations from among our officers who are not expected to be experts in these subjects.

4. My remarks regarding the Criminal test equally apply to the Précis-writing test which I consider to be a useful test for gauging an officer's capacity for drafting and presenting facts briefly and clearly.

P. L. MOORE—2-11-17.

HOME (JUDICIAL) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted.

The Inspector-General has only reiterated the views previously expressed by him on the subject—vide his letter, dated 27th November 1916, printed on page 11 of G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated 6th August 1917.

R.V.S.—7-11-17.

C.V.S.—9-11-17.

The retention of the Criminal test for managers would seem desirable, though I don't quite see how a knowledge of Medical Jurisprudence can be of much value to these officers.

2. I should agree with the Inspector-General's remarks in paragraph 3.

3. I have doubts as to the value of the Précis-writing test. The trick of expressing the gist of a long story in a few words is something of a gift. One meets clerks who could never possibly make a decent précis but who are otherwise capable and useful.

H. BROWN—10-11-17.

The general idea is that the special tests are too elaborate and that one who passes a particular special test is not necessarily better fitted—except in clear cases—than one who has not. Much more depends on the public servants' natural intelligence and application to work. So all departments are now engaged in revising the list of special tests so far as they qualify for promotion.

Some simplifications were suggested to the Inspector-General and he rejects them *in toto*. I however do not agree with the Inspector-General. But before passing on the file to Educational, I shall be glad to be favoured with the Honourable Member's views, so far as the proposals affecting the Police department are concerned.

Special tests are passed at an early stage of an official's career. Theoretically there is no objection to prescribe them, say, for promotion to a Rs. 50 grade. But

to prescribe any *exclusive* test for a police manager (say) is erroneous. One does not become a manager till after 20 or 25 years' service, at least 15 years after he has theoretically qualified himself.

If two candidates have worked themselves by dint of work and proof of competence to a stage next to that of a manager, it is not right to prefer one over the other, without reference to nature of work in the interval, simply because that latter passed in Criminal 15 years previously. Office procedure is better learnt by actual practice and not by passing book tests, though such tests may be retained for the junior clerks partly to acquire knowledge but chiefly to test of their inclination to qualify themselves and make themselves more fit to discharge their official duties.

The Précis-writing-test especially is unsuited for an examination and will probably be abolished.

As the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew is taking an interest in the subject discussed above, I beg to mark this file for him also so that I may be favoured with general instructions for use when the whole file comes up in Educational for orders.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—14-11-17.

The Criminal Judicial tests are not required for clerical appointments in the Police department, and in view of the training undergone at Vellore they may also be abolished for the executive branch of the service.

I have no particular views about the Account test.

The Précis-writing test may certainly go.

I am not in favour of simplification of the criminal Judicial tests where they are prescribed.

H. F. W. G[ILMAN]—15-11-17.

My Honourable colleague's decision that it is unnecessary to impose on any police officer the obligation to pass the Précis-writing test and that the Criminal test need not be required from any clerical or executive officer of the Police will be a great step in advance, I am sure. There remains only the Account test as to which my Honourable colleague has no special view. It would, I think, be preferable in many ways to let the necessary questions on accounts be added to the existing departmental

I agree.

H.F.W.G.—15-11-17.

test for managers and accountants and so to free the Police department entirely from the Special tests and cut all Police appointments out of the schedule to the Special Test rules. The great advantage of this would be that the Inspector-General would possess the power of exemption. It seems clearly better to leave this with the head of the department, who can get some real knowledge of the efficiency of the officer requiring exemption, instead of bringing the question up to the Government.

2. In view of my Honourable colleague's decision I need not note further on the Inspector-General's views, which are illuminating and demonstrate in an interesting way how the Special tests are really too often regarded, viz., as a means of 'restricting the field of selection'. This is much the same as it would be to rule that no Indian Civil Service man should be eligible for promotion to the Board of Revenue unless he had, when he was an Assistant Collector, passed some special examination in Revenue Law and History! The Government could then rule out a man because he had not passed the examination, regardless of his work during the last 20 years.

But may I venture to suggest that it seems contrary to sound principle that the appointment of manager and accountant in Police offices should be 'on a presidency basis'. We have been trying in all departments to decentralize, and it might be thought that this was an opening for decentralization. I suppose

This may be treated as a separate question. Let me know the history of the existing arrangement.

H.F.W.G.—17-10-17.

a District Superintendent of Police may be trusted to fill up a clerical post in his own

office or if not he can hardly be fit to control the District Police force. If he has not a suitable man at hand, he would import a good man he has known in another district, or apply to some neighbouring Superintendent or to the Inspector-General. I don't see how the Inspector-General can very well know the men all over the Presidency, and the retention of these appointments on a presidency basis probably leads to lots of intrigue. However this is purely a matter for my Honourable colleague who has practical experience and I merely throw out the suggestion for his consideration.

3. I presume that orders on this case will be issued at once, as it seems to be quite a distinct matter from all other possible questions affecting the Special Test examinations

A. G. C[ARDEW]—17-11-17.

Regarding paragraph 3, examine; also in the case of other subsidiary rules, see if piecemeal orders can be issued.

Submitted to the Honourable Member (Judicial).

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—17-11-17.

H. F. W. G[ILMAN]—17-11-17.

HOME (JUDICIAL) DEPARTMENT.

With reference to the Honourable Member's orders in the margin supra, an extract of the relevant portions of these notes will be taken for further action and the point submitted for orders separately.

The file may now be transferred to Educational for issue of orders on other points.

R.V.S.—20-11-17.

C.V.—20-11-17.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—21-11-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Please draft at once.

C.R.—21-11-17.

It has been decided by Judicial that the Police department may altogether be omitted from the schedule to the Special Test notification. The question of amending the existing Police Departmental test so as to provide for an examination in accounts will have to be disposed of by the Inspector-General of Police.

2. A draft order is submitted. The Secretary's instruction as to issue of piecemeal orders has been noted. The case has not been seen by His Excellency.

E.A.V.—21-11-17.

T.K.—22-11-17.

C.R.—23-11-17.

R.R.—24-11-17.

[G.O. No. 1492, Home (Education), dated 26th November 1917.]

Special Tests.- Directing that it is no longer necessary to prescribe any of the -----for any office or appointment in the Police Dept. and requesting the C.G.E. to submit a draft of the necessary alterations in the Public Service and Special Tests, Notifications.

R e a d:-

G.O.No. 673, Education, dated 21st September 1908 (K)

.. 969, Home(Educn.) dated 13th September 1916. (V)

.. 1021, 6th August 1917. (W)

ORDER:- 1492, 2/26-11-17
P.S.

The Government have carefully considered the question of the suitability of the special tests prescribed for the various appointments in the Police Dept. They have come to the conclusion that the Precise Writing Test now prescribed for certain ministerial posts of the District and Central Offices is unnecessary and that the Criminal Judicial Test ^{is} need- less for the executive branch of the department in view of the fact that a knowledge of criminal law is ensured by the course ^{of training} at the Police Training School. Nor do the Government deem the latter test essential for the ministerial posts in the Police Dept. A separate special test in accounts is also unnecessary as such of the holders of the ministerial appointments for which the Account Test

1917.

DEPARTMENT.

CUTTINGS FROM NEWSPAPERS.

1. Name of Paper--

Justice

2. Published at--

3. Dated--

11-9-17

Forfeiture

Ca

17-9-17

SPECIAL TEST EXAMINATIONS

SIR,—The public feel highly indebted to the Madras Government and owe an immense debt of gratitude to His Excellency Lord Pentland, our sympathetic Governor, for the amendment of the rules relating to qualification for public service. The amendment, viz., to permit those who possess a completed secondary school leaving certificate will remove a great barrier in the path of the candidates wishing to apply for the several special tests and would enable many to rise in the service provided they qualify themselves by completing the departmental tests.

As the recent G. O. on the subject contemplates simplification of the special test examinations in the near future, it is earnestly hoped that the following points will receive His Excellency's kind and careful consideration and that effect would be given to the suggestions, if found to be really a hardship and grievance and likely to improve the prospects of officers concerned.

Clerks of the district police offices according to the present rules are required to pass (1) Departmental Test in Police Orders and Practice (2) Account Test and (3) Criminal Judicial Test. Lower grade, to qualify themselves for the accountants' and managers' posts. As far as reliable information goes, the accountants and managers, especially the former, have neither the occasion, nor the necessity, to use their knowledge of law, nor are they required to administer law. If any question arises in connection with legal points there are law books for reference, while the prosecuting inspector in each district will do the needful. While so, it is surprising to find that the Criminal Judicial test should be prescribed as one of the tests necessary for promotion to these posts. The sub-inspectors of police who necessarily are expected to possess a knowledge of law are not required to pass this examination until they are to be promoted to the inspector's grade. The sub-registrars who likewise have occasion to be acquainted with law are not required to pass this examination. While so, it is incon-

prehensible as to why the accountants and managers of the district police offices alone should be required to pass this examination. Their daily office routine work can best be got through without any difficulty with the knowledge of the departmental and account tests. Now that the Government are kindly disposed to redress the grievances of hard-worked officers in the service and to remove several obstacles and inconveniences in the way, this grievance, it is sincerely hoped, may be taken into their benign consideration and that the Government will be pleased to remove criminal judicial test from the tests required for accountants and managers of district police offices. If it is still thought absolutely necessary under any circumstances that the latter should pass the examination, it may order that accountants should pass the criminal judicial test before they are appointed managers just as the sub-inspectors are expected to pass the criminal test before they are appointed inspectors.

In this connection, it may be added that your observation in your letter of the 6th instant that the Madras Presidency has been burdened with a multiplicity of examinations and that too many obstacles have been placed in the path of young men anxious to enter the Government service are really very appropriate and deserve the careful consideration of the Government. Before simplifying the rules, the Government will be good enough to consider any other disabilities, hardships, or inconveniences in the present rules which may absolutely need modification. I shall revert to my next to certain other points which need careful consideration and amendment when the rules are simplified.

"EXPERIENCE".

I agree with the letter made here.

Note in the penney file

18/9/17

Please see for 2nd & 3rd of note file.

18/9/17

at present prescribed may be required to answer questions in accounts which may be added to

the existing departmental test in Police Orders & Practice. None of the Special Tests will thus be prescribed for any appointment or office in the Police Dept. in future.

3. The Commissioner for Government Examinations is requested to submit a draft of the necessary alterations in the Public Service and Special Test Notifications.

23/11/17

24/11/17

To

The Commissioner for Govt. Examinations.

" Home (Judicial) Dept. (with copy of notes)

" I.G. of Police. (Through Home)

" Commissioner of Police (Judl.)

E.T.

28/11/17

28/11/17

28/11/17



7-2-17
10.12.17
11/20

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1492, HOME (EDUCATION),
DATED 26TH NOVEMBER 1917

[SUBJECT.—Revision of the Public Service and Special Test notifications.]

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

The following points require further examination :—

- * Dealt with on page 7 infra.
- * (1) Article 3, Public Service notification.—Prescription of tests for special appointments—cf. also schedule to “Special Test examinations.”
- * (2) Article 4.—Powers of exemption.
- * (3) Simplification of Special Test examinations.
- * Dealt with on page 7 infra.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—6-8-17.

Please see paragraph 3 on page 14 of notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated 6th August 1917. The points still for consideration are dealt with below :—

(a) Attention is solicited to clause (b) of paragraph 2 on page 3 of the notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917, in which it is suggested that the new rule requiring the incumbents of posts on Rs. 20 to possess a completed secondary school-leaving certificate should not have retrospective effect—cf. also Mr. Ellis's note on page 8 of the same notes. This proposal is only reasonable and may be approved. If so, a note may be subjoined to that effect in article 1 of the revised notification called for from the Commissioner for Government Examinations in paragraph 3 of G.O. No. 1021, dated the 6th August 1917.

(b) Again in clause (c) on page 3 of the notes, the Superintendent, Government Museum, considers it inexpedient to extend this new rule to posts on an incremental pay with a maximum of Rs. 20. This proposal may also be accepted and a second note be similarly subjoined.

(c) Orders have also to be passed in regard to the eligibility of Middle school first-class men to appear for the special tests—vide page 9 of the notes to the Government Order—cf. also the Legislative Council question and answer recorded in G.O. No. 229, Home (Education), dated 22nd February 1917.

2. Powers of exemption (article 4 of the Public Service notification).—The present powers of exemption possessed by the Government, the heads of departments and other officers are enumerated in article 4 of the notification. The Secretary has directed that they should be considered and overhauled in consultation with the several officers concerned. The Superintending Engineer, V Circle, proposes to exempt Bellary, Anantapur and Ganjam from the operation of the new rule insisting upon the possession of a secondary school-leaving certificate for posts on Rs. 20 per mensem. The Inspector-General of Police also suggests that the rule should not be made applicable to the Ceded Districts (paragraph 3 on page 4 of G.O. No. 1021, dated 6th August 1916). Again the Board of Revenue recommends that Collectors may be empowered to exempt unpassed men to posts up to Rs. 30 provided passed men are not available. Further the views of the Public Works Department are given in Mr. Molesworth's note on page 8 of the notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917. Extracts of this paragraph together with a copy of the notes to the Government order may be sent un-officially to the departments of the Secretariat with the request to state whether they agree to the above suggestions. They may also be requested to consult their heads of departments if necessary to see whether any further changes are required in the existing rules regarding powers of exemption.

3. Attention is also solicited to the Secretary's note, dated the 18th June 1917, on page 9 of the notes to the Government order in which he stated that he would

As this particular point has not been referred to by Honourable Member, it may be dropped for the present.

B.R.—13-9-17.

and Sir Alexander Cardew's note on page 12 of the notes to G.O. No. 969, Home (Education), dated the 18th September 1916.

E.A.V.—4-9-17.

T.K.—5-9-17.

Special tests.

* Already received?

B.R.

* Presumably the proceedings on pages 39-41 of G.O. 1021, 6th August 1917.
E.A.V.—3-9-17.

This subject arose at the Collectors' Conference as an outcrop from subject No. 12. Apparently a resolution from the Board of Revenue is on its way, and the report of the sub-committee of the Conference has also to be dealt with.

I should like the file noted on *briefly* and circulated to me at an early date. It should not be buried in office notes.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—26-8-17.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Copies of note on the discussion and the recommendation of the sub-committee are attached.

F. J. RICHARDS—28-8-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Treat as urgent.

Deal separately with—

- (1) Nature of special tests: subjects, etc.
- (2) Qualifying tests—article 3 of the Public Service notification.
- (3) Sub-committee's report.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—29-8-17.

COLLECTORS' CONFERENCE.

SUBJECT 12—Representation of backward classes in Government service.—The general trend of the discussion showed that while it was essential that there should be in public offices a fair representation of all communities, it was not desirable to fix any definite proportion for particular castes. It was pointed out that efficiency was the real test and not the passing of examinations, and that the special test was an obstacle. In order that efficient men might not be debarred from promotion on the score of their not passing some tests and with a view to give Collectors a free hand in the matter of promoting efficient men, it was thought that some of the special tests might be simplified or abolished. As this question appeared to be a complicated one, a suggestion was made that the point should be examined by a sub-committee. During the course of the discussion a doubt also arose as to the exact meaning of the words "completed secondary school-leaving certificate." An informal sub-committee consisting of the following gentlemen was, therefore, appointed, and it was requested to report—

(1) what was the exact meaning of the words "completed secondary school-leaving certificate" occurring in rule (1) of clause (2) of the Public Services notification, and

(2) to what extent any of the special tests should be either simplified or abolished.

The Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg,
Mr. Venugopal Chetti,
Mr. Stokes,
Mr. Campbell,
Mr. Davis, and
Mr. Richards.

The following conclusions which were arrived at by the sub-committee were read by the Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg:—

Committee's notes on Special tests.

I. The meaning of the "complete secondary school-leaving certificate" merely is that the holder has completed his studies up to and in the fourth, fifth and sixth forms of a secondary school, and has kept all his terms and has appeared for the School Final Public Examination. It does not necessarily mean that he has any special ability or has attained any particular knowledge of subjects useful in Government service. It exhibits the Presidency average and compares the ranks attained by the candidate therewith. The practice has been, it appears, for Collectors to notify to Divisional officers a proportion of ranks to be required as the minimum necessary for appointment to Government service. In view of the great differences in the conditions of districts we consider that Collectors should have discretion to decide the standard, as in fact they frequently do at present.

II. The Committee have found great difficulty in formulating united recommendations, and the time at their disposal has not been sufficient to enable them to discuss the details of possible alternative schemes and as the merits of any scheme that can be formulated can only be judged in the light of detailed application, they regret that it has not been possible to put forward, as a Committee any cut and dried proposals.

The annexed note sets forth, as a possible solution, a scheme formulated by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes which the Committee think might be circulated to Collectors and considered by Government. Its principle, briefly, is to substitute for Special tests, special periods of training in various branches of administrative work to be given to selected men; this period to be followed by probationary periods of actual service during which the men's work would be specially watched. Sir Robert Clegg has indicated in his note appended to this report several serious practical objections, the force of which the Committee recognise, but neither he nor the Committee consider that these criticisms need preclude the further examination of the suggestions put forward. The alternative to some such scheme of *abolition* of Special tests as that formulated by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes seems to be while retaining the tests, to simplify them and render them less burdensome; in this direction proposals have been framed in the Board's Proceedings quoted in Sir Robert Clegg's note above referred to—pages 39-41 of G.O. No. 1021, dated 6th August 1917. These appear to the Committee to lead in the right direction and the Committee would like to see the simplification carried further if possible. The Committee endorse generally the remarks of Messrs. Campbell and Stokes in the first part of paragraph 13 of their note.

ROBERT CLEGG.
H. G. STOKES.
E. A. DAVIS.
A. Y. G. CAMPBELL.
V. VENUGOPAL CHETTI.
F. J. RICHARDS.

Note by Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell and Mr. H. G. Stokes.

We have considered the secondary question, namely, to what extent certain Special tests may be simplified or abolished only from the point of view of district administration under the control of the Collector.

2. The following scheme is not applicable to the Translation tests and the Equitation test.

3. As regards the Revenue tests, the Account test and the Criminal Judicial tests, we propose that the following scheme should be referred to Collectors for remarks and should be tried experimentally in a few selected districts in the various parts of the Presidency.

4. The general underlying principle on which we propose to proceed is the substitution of training and probationary work for the passing of examinations.

5. Each special test will be replaced by (a) effective training for a specified period, and (b) satisfactory service in a specified appointment on probation for a specified period.

6. No person may be appointed to a specified appointment on probation until he has obtained a certificate from a prescribed authority that he has undergone the prescribed training and is fit to be appointed on probation. A diary will be kept by the person undergoing training. The diary will be countersigned each day by the person under whom he is undergoing training.

7. No person will be appointed permanently to a specified appointment unless he had obtained both a certificate of training referred to above and also a certificate that since undergoing the training he has discharged the duties of the prescribed appointment on probation for the specified period satisfactorily.

8. Provision must be made in each district for persons undergoing training by allowing a certain number on a pay not exceeding Rs. 30 to be seconded or to be regarded as on special duty without deputation allowance.

9. Provision must be made for acting appointments of untrained men when absolutely necessary.

10. The success of the scheme will depend largely on the discrimination with which the prescribed authority grants the certificates referred to above. In the case of district appointments in the Revenue Department, this authority should be the Collector.

11. We recommend that no one should ordinarily be admitted to training unless he has rendered three years' continuous Government service to the satisfaction of the prescribed authority, but we do not recommend that any special educational qualifications should be necessary as a condition precedent.

12. We consider that ordinarily no person should be allowed to undergo training after the age of 30.

13. Under our proposals, the Special tests will have to continue for some years, and we recommend that the list of Acts, Regulations, Manuals and Codes prescribed for the several tests should be carefully examined with a view to their reduction. It appears to be unnecessary to prescribe that certain Acts which have only local application should be studied by candidates throughout the Presidency. Further acquaintance with the whole of certain Acts, Regulations and Manuals is unnecessary. One advantage of the proposals made in this note is that officials in each district would receive training in the special branches of law peculiar to the district. This may, if considered desirable, also be provided for under the present Special Tests scheme by arranging that candidates of certain districts or groups of districts should have to answer questions relating to the law peculiar to their districts.

Training and probation to be substituted for Special tests.

14. *Revenue test, lower grade.*—(a) Three months' training in the Collector's office; including check of village accounts by the Collector's establishment at jamabandi, unless a candidate has such previous experience of this branch of work as the Collector considers sufficient.

(b) One month training in the Taluk office.

(c) One month in charge of the work of headman and karnam of a village under a selected Revenue Inspector.

While on training in the Collector's office, the candidate shall study the simplified syllabus of the Acts, Regulations and books which we have recommended above.

Probationary service.—One year as Revenue Inspector.

15. *Account test.*—Training as now prescribed for Taluk Head Accountants.

Probation.—Six months as Taluk Head Accountant.

16. *Criminal Judicial test, lower grade.*—(a) One month's training in a Sub-Magistrate's office.

(b) Two months' training in a District Magistrate's office.

During this period of training the candidate must study the simplified syllabus prescribed for the Criminal Judicial test, lower grade, with the addition of the following:—The Indian Arms Act and Rules, portions of the Extradition Manual and certain other Acts, such as, the Explosives Act, which affect a Magistrate's work.

A candidate who has done satisfactory work as a Subdivisional or Sub-Magistrate's clerk for a period exceeding one month may be excused the training in a Sub-Magistrate's office.

Probationary service.—Six months as a Magisterial clerk, preferably under a District Magistrate or a Subdivisional Magistrate.

17. *Revenue test, higher grade, and Criminal Judicial test, higher grade.*—Before promotion to be a Deputy Collector a person in Government service should be required to obtain from the District Magistrate a certificate that he has satisfactorily discharged the duties of a Stationary Sub-Magistrate with second-class powers for not less than one year and from the Collector a certificate that he has satisfactorily discharged the duties of a Tahsildar for a period of at least one year. These certificates will take the place of the Criminal Judicial test, higher grade, and the Revenue test, higher grade, respectively.

18. We do not propose any alteration in the remarks in column 3 of the "table showing the various offices in the superior service for which special professional or technical tests are prescribed in the Public Services notification opposite to C. Revenue Department, (2) Deputy Collectors.

19. *Modifications effected by this scheme on the present arrangements.*—Under this scheme we contemplate that the ultimate result will be that the Revenue tests, the Account test and the Criminal Judicial tests may disappear but for the time being the two systems will continue side by side.

20. The certificates of training and proficiency after probation in Revenue work, Accounts and Criminal Judicial work, will take the place of the Revenue test, lower grade, the Account test and the Criminal Judicial test, lower grade, respectively, prescribed for certain appointments in the Public Service notification.

Sir Robert Clegg's note.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stokes' scheme, as it enables Collectors to select capable men for the grade of Revenue Inspector and higher grades without reference to their abilities to pass examinations and thereby to secure a proper proportion of non-Brahmans. I hesitate to accept the scheme without more careful consideration than we have been able to give it in the limited time at our disposal. At present we have to give six weeks' training in survey to clerks for the post of Revenue Inspector and three months' training for taluk head accountants and I have no doubt even this causes some dislocation of work because they have to be relieved by acting men. Under the scheme before a man is qualified for the post of Deputy Tahsildar he will have to undergo practically one year's training and probation for two years. The cost will possibly be prohibitive because no office can afford to let its hands go for training without substitutes and the numbers on training for posts up to Deputy Tahsildar's grade will be very considerable if this training has to supersede the present Special tests. I anticipate also that substitutes will be frequently necessary for men on probation. My present opinion is that it will in practice be unworkable. Probation and reading of books are parts of the scheme. The acting appointments which are now made before confirmation furnish probably sufficient probation. Without some kind of examination I do not see how a Collector can certify that a man has read his books intelligently. I am doubtful whether the certificates to be given by the Collector will be of much value. Collectors have little time to train and examine their men and will have to rely on the opinions of others. I am afraid such certificates will tend to become mere matters of routine.

There is however room for some modification of the special tests required for particular appointments. The Board has already considered the question and its proposals are given in paragraph 5 of the Full Board's Proceedings Mis. No. 930, dated 10th July 1917 (pages 39-41, of G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917). I was not a member of the Board which issued that resolution but I am generally in agreement with my colleagues.

I am further of opinion that it should be possible to simplify and make the tests more practical but the question requires more minute scrutiny than we have been able to give it.

The Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew then observed that the scheme proposed in the note by Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stokes required a good deal of consideration and examination, and that it was too complicated a matter to discuss with much benefit. He doubted whether it would be possible to arrange for the training of large numbers of men, and thought that there might be alternatives to certain tests. In conclusion, he said that the Government would consider very carefully the suggestions that the special tests might be simplified and their scope reduced.

Mr. Legh said that a distinction should be drawn between the Account test and the Judicial and the Revenue tests. The Account test was an examination on paper and of very little practical value, and he was therefore of the opinion that that test might be abolished.

Mr. Aziz-ud-din thought that the training proposed by the Committee would apply only to officers in Government service.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT

The simplification of special tests is one of the subjects which were left over for separate consideration when general orders regarding the Public Service and Special tests notifications were passed—c.f. paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917.

2. The points referred to by the Secretary on page 2 ante are dealt with below :—

(1) *Nature of Special tests, subjects, etc.*—Article 1 of the Special test notification gives a list of the Special tests prescribed for the several offices, and article 5 deals with the scope of the examination in each of these subjects. The schedule appended to the notification gives the offices or appointments in the public service for which they have been from time to time prescribed by the Government. Recently the opinion has been expressed that some of the existing tests are unnecessarily elaborate and that the number of appointments for which others are prescribed might safely be curtailed (paragraph 4 of G.O. No. 969, Education, dated 13th September 1916). The remarks of heads of departments who were consulted on the point will be found summarised on pages 10-11 of the notes to G.O. No. 1021, Education, dated the 6th August 1917. Of these the following are in the direction of simplifying the tests :—

(a) *General.*—It was stated by Mr. Young, the Superintendent of Stationery, that greater importance should be assigned to the papers that have to be answered with the aid of books which might be made longer than the papers "without books" and allotted twice the marks. Mr. Schmidt however would allow candidates to use books throughout in answering question papers. It is for consideration whether Mr. Schmidt's suggestion may be approved.

(b) *Criminal Judicial test.*—Mr. Innes, the Second Presidency Magistrate, and the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, would take away Medical Jurisprudence from the list of subjects for the Criminal Judicial test. There seems no objection to the acceptance of this suggestion.

(c) *Revenue test.*—The Second Presidency Magistrate thought that it was unnecessary to set a separate paper on the stamp, income-tax and excise manuals for the Revenue test, but that the Acts embodied in those manuals might be included in the list of Revenue Acts and Regulations prescribed for that test. That officer also recommended the omission of the Special Funds Code and the Manuals of Village and Taluk Accounts from the

list of subjects for the Revenue test. If this is agreed to there will be only two main subjects of examination, viz., Revenue Acts and Regulations and the Board's Standing Orders for the Revenue test as against the present seven subjects.

Orders are requested whether the above suggestion will be approved.

(d) *Precis-writing test*.—There is a general consensus of opinion that this test may be abolished altogether. It is for orders whether the Government will agree to this proposal.

(2) *Qualifying tests (article 3 of the Public Service Notification)*.—On page 11 of the Notes to G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated the 6th August 1917, the Secretary observed as follows:—

"Article 3 of the Public Service Notification which prescribes qualifying tests is a voluminous article and I think ought to be considered and overhauled in consultation with the offices concerned."

It may be noted that the opinions of heads of departments on this question have already been obtained and these will be found summarised on pages 10-11 of the notes to the above Government order. It is for consideration whether it will suffice if relevant extracts of such opinions are taken and forwarded to the administrative departments concerned separately for remarks. In that case a separate u.o. note and a tabular form exhibiting the points at issue and the opinions of heads of departments thereon will be prepared and submitted for approval.

(3) *Sub-committee's report*.—In the sub-committee's report, two alternative schemes are put forward—(1) complete abolition of the Special tests and the substitution in their place of special periods of training in various branches of administrative work to be given to selected men, these periods being followed by probationary periods of actual service during which the men's work would be specially watched. The Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg has also appended a note indicating several serious practical objections to the above scheme and the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew seems also very reluctant to adopt it. It does not therefore seem necessary to proceed with the further examination of this point and refer it to the Board of Revenue for their remarks. Further this scheme is defective since it does not take into consideration the requirements of departments other than the Revenue Department.

The alternative scheme, viz., the one for the simplification of special tests and the reduction of their scope, appears to commend itself to the Hon'ble Sir Robert Clegg and the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew. A few suggestions in this direction have been dealt with in paragraph 2 (1) ante. It is for consideration whether the suggestion in paragraph 13 of the note by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes may be communicated to the Board of Revenue and they be asked to submit a revised syllabus for the Revenue and the Criminal Judicial tests. The syllabus for the remaining tests hardly calls for any change.

E.A.V.—3-9-17.

T.K.—5-9-17.

So far as Special tests and the orders regulating their prescription are concerned, Educational collate them and issue the orders in respect of them. The initial examination of the question of the desirability of prescribing Special tests or simplifying them is made in the administrative departments. It is therefore submitted

R.R.—13-9-17. that the papers may be circulated to the departments with the request that they will consider (1) which of the Special tests should be simplified or abolished, (2) to which of the appointments under them the special tests should be prescribed, (3) whether the powers of exemption exercised by the officers under them should be modified and if so why. The question of substituting special training and probation for special tests proposed by Messrs. Campbell and Stokes relates chiefly to appointments under the Revenue Department

I agree, and probably after the Collector's conference report is received.

R.R.—13-9-17.

and has therefore primarily to be considered in that department. It is doubtful whether Educational can further examine the questions at this stage.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—12-9-17.

K

Let the
order
pass

Chief Secretariat.
Local and Municipal Secretariat.
Revenue Secretariat.
Public Works (Irrigation).
Public Works (General).
Miscellaneous and Judicial sections of the
Home Secretariat.

The notes have been printed.
Submitted that a copy thereof may be
forwarded u.o. to each of the marginally-
noted Secretariat offices with reference
to the orders at **K** on the previous page.

2. The question of the abolition of the Criminal Judicial test (lower) in respect
of the appointments of managers and accountants in District Police offices advocated
in the "Justice" of the 11th instant may be remitted u.o. to Judicial for
examination.

E.A.V.—20-9-17.

T.K.—20-9-17.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—21-9-17.
R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—24-9-17.

HOME (JUDICIAL) DEPARTMENT.

As regards the three points at **K** on page 7 ante, the Inspector-General of Police
has already expressed his opinion in his letter, dated the 27th November 1916 (page
11 of G.O. No. 1021, Home (Education), dated 6th August 1917). He is against the
simplification or abolition of any of the special tests prescribed for his department
and he does not wish any curtailment of the number of appointments for which the
tests have been prescribed. Again he desires that the powers of exemption at present
possessed by him and the Deputy Inspector-General should continue. It therefore
seems unnecessary to consult him again on these points. The matter dealt with in
"Justice" of the 11th September is covered by the remarks already offered by the
Inspector-General. The cutting may, however, be referred to him with the request
that he will report specifically on the suggestion made in it. Draft memorandum
put up.

P.S.R.—28-9-17.

C.V.—29-9-17.

It seems unnecessary to consult the Inspector-General again on the general
question. His views may be accepted with the exception of the case of accountants.
The memorandum on that point may issue.

D. N. STRATHIE—1-10-17.

I should like the office to examine if the tests for Police appointments can be
reduced or simplified. Please let me have a note, e.g., the utility of the Précis-
writing test is doubtful; also is Medical Jurisprudence necessary in the case of clerical
police appointments?

R.R.—2-10-17.

The following list shows the special tests prescribed and the appointments for
which they are so prescribed in the Police department:—

Description of the special test.	Appointments for which prescribed.
Criminal Judicial test, lower grade	Police inspectors (except Reserve Inspectors), managers and accountants in District Superin- tendent of Police offices and the manager of Finger Print Bureau.
Criminal Judicial test, higher grade	Managers in the offices of the Inspector- General and the Commissioner.
Account test	Managers in the offices of the Inspector- General and the Commissioner and of the Finger Print Bureau. All clerks and others on Rs. 50 and upwards in the offices of the Inspector-General, the Commissioner and the Deputy Inspector-General of Railways and Criminal Investigation Department and managers and accountants in District Superin- tendent of Police offices.
Précis-writing test	Managers in the offices of the Inspector- General and the Commissioner and head clerk in the office of the Inspector-General.

2. *Criminal Judicial test, lower and higher grades.*—(a) *Necessity for the test in the case of the Police department.*—Reference is solicited to page 1 of the notes to G.O. No. 648, Educational, dated the 28th October 1904, from which it will be seen that the only clerical appointments in the department for which the test was considered a necessary qualification prior to 1904 were those of managers and accountants in District Police offices. The prescription of the test for other ministerial posts mentioned on page 18 supra was on the initiative of the Government themselves and not of the Inspector-General or the Commissioner of Police. That the need for the test was not felt by these heads of departments who never themselves moved in the matter is perhaps sufficient proof of the absence of any great necessity for it. Even in the case of the posts of accountants and managers in District Police offices, the test appears to have been required (vide paragraph 3 of Inspector-General's letter on pages 2 and 3 of G.O. No. 648, Educational, dated 28th October 1904), only because these appointments were formerly graded with those of inspectors of police. There would therefore seem to be no grave objection to the abolition of the test (lower or higher) so far as regards clerical posts in the Police department not excluding those of managers and accountants in District Police offices (cf. article in "Justice" at slip K and Secretary's remark thereon). Then there remain only inspectors of police. In their case, it is obvious that the test must continue and the only question is as to its reduction or simplification.

(b) *Simplification of the test in the case of inspectors of police.*—The subjects prescribed for the test now are—

- (1) The Indian Evidence Act, 1872.
- (2) The Indian Penal Code.
- (3) The Code of Criminal Procedure.
- (4) Medical Jurisprudence.

The first three subjects must evidently be retained if the test is to continue at all. The Board of Revenue by a majority, Mr. Innes and the Second Presidency Magistrate are of opinion that the fourth may be omitted from the test—(pages 5, 9 and 40 of G.O. No. 1021, Educational, dated 6th August 1917). The Board's reason is that points of medical jurisprudence do not often arise in magisterial cases and when they do, they can seldom be decided without reference to the book. The Board, of course, does not trouble itself about the police aspect of the question. The importance of a knowledge of the elements of medical jurisprudence to the police officer who has to conduct an investigation under section 174 of the Civil Procedure Code may be gathered from the following passage in Chapter 1, section I of the Gribble and Hepir's Outlines of Medical

Of what?

D.N.S.—7-10-17.

Jurisprudence, which explains the scope of the science.

In this country it rarely happens that a medical man sees a body when it is first found. It is generally sent to him for examination many hours, often several days, after death has occurred. In nine cases out of ten the preliminary examination is conducted by the police and the village authorities. Upon them devolves the first and most important duty of observation.

The above is in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 174, Criminal Procedure Code. A body need not invariably be sent to a medical man. The police officer has to do so only when there is any doubt regarding the cause of death or when for any other reason he considers it expedient to do so. It is with the officer in charge of the police station or whoever else is empowered to conduct the investigation under section 174, e.g., a head constable, that the primary responsibility rests for a decision as to the necessity for a dead body being examined by a medical man. It is thus clear that the Police officer holding investigation under section 174 should have at least an elementary knowledge of the science. But this need be no reason why the subject may not be eliminated from the test. For sub-inspectors of police and inspectors recruited direct have to pass an examination in

the elements of medical jurisprudence before they pass out of the Police Training school, Vellore. It is the sub-inspectors of police who are primarily concerned with investigation under section 174, but it is only inspectors of police that are now requested to pass the test. Inspectors are no doubt required to assist in and supervise the investigation of important cases (Police Order No. 142, volume I), but they have to study the sequece at the Vellore school whether they are promoted sub-inspectors or recruited direct. The course of study now prescribed at the Vellore school may, if necessary, be expanded so as to make it cover a wider field and this department II may agree to the omission of 'Medical Jurisprudence' from the subjects of the Criminal Judicial test.

3. *Account test.*—It will be seen from paragraph 2 supra that prior to 1904 the test was considered necessary only for appointments of managers and accountants in District Police offices. As there is much of audit work to do in the Inspector-General's office and also in the offices of District Superintendents, the test may be retained—vide paragraphs 4 and 5 of Inspectors-General's letter on pages 3 and 4 of G.O. No. 2382 dated 6th October 1916. But it will be seen from the list at page 13 of the Public Service Notification that all those officers who have to pass the account test have also to pass a departmental test in police orders and practice. It is therefore for consideration whether, as suggested by the Director of Public Instruction in the case of sub-assistant inspectors and inspectresses, the test may not be allowed to form part of the departmental tests in such shape as may be deemed suitable by the Inspector-General—vide page 7 of G.O. No. 1021, Educational, dated 6th August 1917.

4. *Precis-writing test.*—The High Court by a majority and the Board of Revenue are agreed as to the abolition of this test—vide pages 38, 39 and 40 of G.O. No. 1021, Educational, dated 6th August 1917. There can be no stronger reason for the retention of the test in the case of those officers of the Police department who IV have now to pass the tests—vide page 8 supra than in the case of Munsifs and Sub-Judges and officers of the Revenue department.

P.S.R.—4-10-17.

But see Sir Alexander Cardew's note on page 1.

D.N.S.—7-10-17.

5. Perhaps the Inspector-General's remarks may be invited a.o.

C.V.—5-10-17.

If it is proposed to abolish the Criminal Judicial test for clerical posts, it would not require any alteration. For a knowledge of medical jurisprudence is necessary for an inspector as he has already studied it, the examination should not cause him much trouble.

2. The suggested modification of the account test seems rather needless.

3. The Precise writing test would seem to provide a useful course for the two managers and the head clerk who are required to pass it.

D. N. STRATHIE—7-10-17.

Regarding paragraph 2 of Under Secretary's note, the idea is to avoid duplication of examinations.

Regarding paragraph 3, I do not think that the test is really useful. Much depends on the candidate.

I shall be very glad if the Inspector-General of Police can give his views on I to IV above at an early date.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—10-10-17.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE.

I consider it is essential that managers in Police offices should have a knowledge of law and think they should be required to pass the Criminal Lower. As these officers are chosen from accountants and as the latter have to act for the former in their absence on leave or otherwise, it is highly desirable that the qualifications required for both the posts should be the same. It is true that the passing of an

NOTES TO G.O. No. 1492, HOME (EDUCATION), 26TH NOVEMBER 1917 11

examination is not necessarily a hallmark of efficiency, but I can see no reason for abolishing the test which will in future be open to secondary school leaving certificate holders. The posts of manager and accountant in District Police offices are responsible appointments and are borne on a presidency cadre. In filling up vacancies the claims of clerks in all offices have to be taken into consideration and in my opinion there cannot be a better means of restricting the field of selection than by prescribing the Criminal test. As for the Commissioner's office manager I think he should be required to pass the Criminal Higher. - The Commissioner is a Presidency Magistrate and his office manager should be more highly qualified than a District Police office manager. The chief office manager is usually selected from among the District office managers. It is the highest ministerial appointment in the department with considerable responsibilities. I think he should pass the Criminal Higher.

2. I am not in favour of taking away 'Medical Jurisprudence' from the Criminal test. Although it is one of the subjects for the final examination in the Provincial Training school, Vellore, it would be as well to have an independent test for inspectors in whose case the Criminal test is considered necessary. Further if the subject is removed those qualifying for manager and accountant will have no opportunity of studying it. A knowledge of Medical Jurisprudence is as useful to a manager as to an executive officer.

3. I do not think it would be feasible or desirable to amalgamate the Account test with the departmental test for managers and accountants. The former is intended as a test of general knowledge of accounting while the latter deals purely with departmental rules and procedure. The scope of each is distinct. If amalgamated I should find it difficult to nominate examiners in the Account Code and the Civil Service Regulations from among our officers who are not expected to be experts in these subjects.

4. My remarks regarding the Criminal test equally apply to the Précis-writing test which I consider to be a useful test for gauging an officer's capacity for drafting and presenting facts briefly and clearly.

P. L. MOORE—2-11-17.

HOME (JUDICIAL) DEPARTMENT.

Submitted.

The Inspector-General has only reiterated the views previously expressed by him on the subject—vide his letter, dated 27th November 1916, printed on page 11 of G.O. No. 1021, HOME (Education), dated 6th August 1917.

R.V.S.—7-11-17.

C.V.S.—9-11-17.

The retention of the Criminal test for managers would seem desirable, though I don't quite see how a knowledge of Medical Jurisprudence can be of much value to these officers.

2. I should agree with the Inspector-General's remarks in paragraph 3.

3. I have doubts as to the value of the Précis-writing test. The trick of expressing the gist of a long story in a few words is something of a gift. One meets clerks who could never possibly make a decent précis but who are otherwise capable and useful.

H. BROWN—10-11-17.

The general idea is that the special tests are too elaborate and that one who passes a particular special test is not necessarily better fitted—except in clear cases—than one who has not. Much more depends on the public servants' natural intelligence and application to work. So all departments are now engaged in revising the list of special tests so far as they qualify for promotion.

12. NOTES TO G.O. No. 1492, HOME (EDUCATION), 26TH NOVEMBER 1917

Some simplifications were suggested to the Inspector-General and he rejects them *in toto*. I however do not agree with the Inspector-General. But before passing on the file to Educational, I shall be glad to be favoured with the Honourable Member's views, so far as the proposals affecting the Police department are concerned.

Special tests are passed at an *early* stage of an official's career. Theoretically there is no objection to prescribe them, say, for promotion to a Rs 50 grade. But to prescribe any *exclusive* test for police manager (say) is erroneous. One does not become a manager till after 20 of 25 years' service, at least 15 years after he has theoretically qualified himself.

If two candidates have worked themselves by dint of work and proof of competence to a stage next to that of a manager, it is not right to prefer one over the other, without reference to nature of work in the interval, simply because that latter passed in Criminal 15 years previously. Office procedure is better learned by actual practice and not by passing book tests. Those such tests may be retained for the junior clerks partly to acquire knowledge but chiefly to test of their inclination to qualify themselves and make themselves more fit to discharge their official duties.

The Précis writing test especially is unsuited for an examination and will probably be abolished.

As the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew is taking an interest in the subject discussed above, I beg to mark this file for him also so that I may be favoured with general instructions for use when the whole file comes up in Educational for orders.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—14-11-17

The Criminal Judicial tests are not required for clerical appointments in the Police department, and in view of the training undergone at Vellore they may also be abolished for the executive branch of the service.

I have no particular views about the Account test.

The Précis-writing test may certainly go.

I am not in favour of simplification of the criminal Judicial tests where they are prescribed.

H. F. W. G[ILLMAN]—15-11-17.

My Honourable colleague's decision that it is unnecessary to impose on any police officer the obligation to pass the Précis-writing test and that the Criminal test need not be required from any clerical or executive officer of the Police will be a great step in advance, I am sure. There remains only the Account test as to which my Honourable colleague has no special view. It would, I think, be preferable in many ways to let the necessary questions on accounts be added to the existing departmental

I agree.
H. F. W. G[ILLMAN]—15-11-17.

test for managers and accountants and so to free the Police department entirely from the Special tests and cut all Police

appointments out of the schedule to the Special Test rules. The great advantage of this would be that the Inspector-General would possess the power of exemption. It seems clearly better to leave this with the head of the department, who can get some real knowledge of the efficiency of the officer requiring exemption, instead of bringing the question up to the Government.

2. In view of my Honourable colleague's decision I need not note further on the Inspector-General's views, which are illuminating and demonstrate in an interesting way how the Special tests are really too often regarded, viz., as a mean of 'restricting the field of selection'. This is much the same as it would be to rule that no Indian Civil Service man should be eligible for promotion to the Board of Revenue unless he had, when he was an Assistant Collector, passed some special examination in Revenue Law and History! The Government could then rule out a man because he had not passed the examination, regardless of his work during the last 20 years.

But may I venture to suggest that it seems contrary to sound principle that the

This may be treated as a separate question: Let me know the history of the existing arrangement.

H. F. W. GILLMAN—17-10-17.

appointment of manager and accountant in Police offices should be 'on a presidency basis'. We have been trying in all departments to decentralize, and it might be thought that this was an opening for decentralization. I suppose a District Superintendent of Police may be trusted to fill up a clerical post in his own office or if not he can hardly be fit to control the District Police force. If he has not a suitable man at hand, he would import a good man he has known in another district, or apply to some neighbouring Superintendent or to the Inspector-General. I don't see how the Inspector-General can very well know the men all over the Presidency, and the retention of these appointments on a presidency basis probably leads to lots of intrigue. However this is purely a matter for my Honourable colleague who has practical experience and I merely throw out the suggestion for his consideration.

3. I presume that orders on this case will be issued at once, as it seems to be quite a distinct matter from all other possible questions affecting the Special Test examinations.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—17-11-17.

Regarding paragraph 3, examine; also in the case of other subsidiary rules, see if piecemeal orders can be issued.

Submitted to the Honourable Member (Judicial).

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—17-10-17.

H. F. W. GILLMAN—17-11-17.

HOME (JUDICIAL) DEPARTMENT.

With reference to the Honourable Member's orders in the margin ante, an extract of the relevant portions of these notes will be taken for further action and the point submitted for orders separately.

The file may now be transferred to Educational for issue of orders on other points.

R.V.S.—20-11-17.

C.V.—20-11-17.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—21-11-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Please draft at once.

C.R.—21-11-17.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

It has been decided by the Judicial department that the Police department may altogether be omitted from the schedule to the Special Test notification. The question of amending the existing Police Departmental test so as to provide for an examination in accounts will have to be disposed of by the Inspector-General of Police.

2. A draft order is submitted. The Secretary's instruction as to issue of piecemeal orders has been noted. The case has not been seen by His Excellency.

E.A.V.—21-11-17.

T.K.—22-11-17.

C.R.—23-11-17.

R.R.—24-11-17.

[G.O. No. 1492, Home (Education), dated 26th November 1917.]

TO PRESS, MADRAS COTY.

A
Please send proof in duplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.

B
Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.

C
As the matter is clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (b) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated.
Type may be released after usual interval.
Type may be released after usual interval.

Reference.
Clerk.

Reference.
Clerk.

Supdt.

Supdt.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

C.F. 73.

ed
Dined
191

No.

C. No.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.....	
First proof furnished on.....	
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	
Final copies supplied on.....	

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.	Special E.T. edition
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....				
" " " Issue.....				
" " " for Extra E.T. copies to supply requisitions for sale to the public.				4
For Volumes.....				
For supply to newspapers and institutions admitted to the privileges of the E.T.				
Total ...				

GOVERNMENT.

A A A A A A A

GOVERNMENT.

GOVERNMENT.

ED BY BEING KEPT FOR DEPT.

Copy in full.
to be supplied.
only.