Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

Financial (1898) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 615

DATED 16-7-98

INDEXED. 19/19

[Despatch Abstract.]

Lieu or permanent appointments

Considering that no change is necessary in the existing rules as regard the extension of ——— in the case of officers in temporary services in other depts.

1
14-7-98

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 {1898} of Madras.

FINANCIAL.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 615, 16th July 1898.

JULY.

Lien on Permanent Appointments.

Considering that no change is necessary in the existing rules as regards the extension of — in the case of officers in temporary services in other departments.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers :—

G.O., No. 1516, Revenue, dated 4th September 1871.

Abstract.—Grant of leave without pay to clerks to enable them to take up other employments prohibited, and Revenue Board to issue certain instructions on the subject.

G.O., No. 1320, Financial, dated 22nd September 1885.

Abstract.—Directing that G.O., No. 2311 of 11th December 1880, on the subject of *employés* being allowed long terms of leave without pay to enable them to do duty in other departments, be reprinted and distributed to heads of departments for information and guidance.

G.O., No. 382, Financial, dated 18th June 1896.

Abstract.—Sanctioning the recommendation of the Board of Revenue that the Clerk and the Revenue Inspector who have been permitted by the Collector of Anantapur to take up appointments as Police Inspectors on probation for two years be allowed a lien on their permanent appointments for their period of probation ; but declining to extend to all cases the period of three months' lien prescribed in paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 1516, Revenue, dated 4th September 1871.

G.O., No. 546, Financial, dated 7th September 1896.

Abstract.—Directing that applications for lien on permanent appointments be disposed of, in future, in the administrative department of the Secretariat concerned.

G.O., No. 768, Financial, dated 13th November 1896.

Abstract.—Informing the Accountant-General that the rule regarding the retention of three months' lien on permanent appointments by officers appointed on probation to other posts does not apply to officers holding on probation higher appointments in the same office or department.

G.O., No. 609, Financial, dated 3rd August 1897.

Abstract.—Empowering the Board of Revenue to extend up to six months the period of lien allowed to officers who seek transfer to other departments.

G.O., No. 1455, Judicial, dated 7th October 1897.

Abstract.—Stating that the existing arrangements in regard to the probationary period for Police Inspectors should continue for the present.

G.O., No. 885, Financial, dated 3rd November 1897.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Hon'ble the Judges of the High Court, with an expression of concurrence, letter from the Accountant-General stating that G.O., No. 382, Financial, dated 18th June 1896, regarding lien on permanent appointments relates to cases in which officers of one department are appointed on probation to permanent vacancies in another, and that, as the process-server of the District Munsif's Court, Kurnool, has been employed on temporary duty in famine-relief works, he may be regarded to be on deputation until the temporary duty ceases.

Read—also the following papers :—

G.O., No. 282, Revenue, dated 18th May 1898.

Read—the following paper :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 365, dated 1st November 1897.

Read—the following letter from W. S. MEYER, Esq., I.C.S., on Special duty, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Camp, Nellore, 12th October 1897, No. Extra B.—Tour :—

* * * * *

29. *Lien on their permanent appointments allowed to officers who have obtained temporary employment in other Departments.*—Under Government Order, No. 1516, * Revenue, dated 4th September 1871, all cases of this sort lasting over three months were to be referred to Government for orders. In Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 1979, dated 30th April 1896, the Board asked for a re-consideration of this order, pointing out that in the Police Department, for example, the period of probation was two years ; but the Government saw no reason to modify the order (Government Order, No. 382 † Financial, dated 18th June 1896). Latterly (Government Order, No. 609, Financial, dated 3rd August 1897), the Board has been allowed to extend the period of lien up to six months, a concession which will, however, be of no use in respect to police probationers. I venture to think that if the head of the department in which a probationer or temporary officer is serving desires the continuance of his services in that capacity it should be open to the authority by which the man's permanent post would be filled up, if vacant, to decide whether his lien thereon shall still continue.

* In Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4420, dated 18th October 1871.

† In Board's Proceedings, No. 246, dated 7th July 1896.

* * * * *

Resolution—No. 365, dated 1st November 1897.

The Board resolves to submit, for the orders of Government, the suggestions which Mr. Meyer has embodied in the letter read above. The various questions therein dealt with have been discussed at a meeting of the Full Board at which Mr. Meyer was present.

* * * * *

Paragraphs 28 *to end of* 39.—The Board accepts all the remaining proposals, and resolves to submit them for the favourable consideration of Government.

* * * * *

Order—No. 282, Revenue, dated 18th May 1898.

* * * * *

(16) *To allow the power of extending the lien on his permanent appointment in the case of an officer who is in temporary service in another department to be exercised by the authority who would fill up the permanent post if vacant (paragraph* 29 *of ditto).*—The matter will be considered in the Financial Department.

* * * * *

From the Revenue Department, dated 6th July 1898, Erratum No. 150.

ORDER—No. 615, Financial, dated 16th July 1898.

His Excellency the Governor in Council does not consider that any change is necessary in the existing rules as regards the extension of lien on permanent appointments in the case of officers in temporary service in other departments.

(True Extract.)

G. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue Department.
„ all other Departments of the Secretariat.
„ the Accountant-General.

Exd. P. Seetharam.

Financial Dept

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

R 595 : 23-5-98
1485 Jud : 7-10-97
1243 " : 27-8-97
609 Jud : 3-8-97
768 " : 13-11-96.
546 " : 7-9-96.
515 " : 26-8-96.
382 " : 18-6-96.
1157 Jud : 5-7-89 File.
955 Jud : 5-7-97

Recd. 4/6/98
Regd. 6-6-98
} 1898.

Enclosures —

Spare copies —

Postmaster writes

G.O., No. 282, 18th May 1898.

MAY.

Public Servants.

Passing orders on Mr. Meyer's proposals regarding the appointment, leave, &c., of —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 365, dated 1st November 1897 :—

Read—the following letter from W. S. MEYER, Esq., I.C.S., on Special duty, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Camp, Nellore, 12th October 1897, No. Extra B.—Tour :—

With reference to paragraph 7 of Government Order, No. 1243, Judicial Department, dated 27th August 1897, I have the honour to address the Board on certain questions relating to the appointment, leave, &c., of public servants and returns connected therewith.

2. *List of persons qualified to be Deputy Collectors.*—Under the existing orders on this subject, which are noted in the margin, the Board has to maintain and submit to Government, on information furnished by Collectors from year to year, two lists—(*a*) of all persons who, by reason of having passed the necessary tests, are qualified to be Deputy Collectors and (*b*) of those persons whom Collectors actually consider fit for the high office in question.

Government Order, No. 1123, Revenue, dated 6th December 1891, in Board's Proceedings, No. 11, dated 7th January 1892.
Government Order, No. 922, Revenue, dated 2nd September 1892, in Board's Proceedings, No. 552, dated 1st October 1892.
Board's Proceedings, No. 665, dated 21st November 1892.
Board's Proceedings, No. 164, dated 18th April 1894.

3. (*a*) is a large and useless list, for under present circumstances it includes an immense number of persons, *e.g.*, junior clerks, who are technically qualified but whom nobody would dream of appointing, and it is, I understand, made no use of in the Government office.

(*b*) on the other hand may in times of stress, such as the present, be found too small for actual requirements.

I would therefore abolish (*a*) and make (*b*) more comprehensive and valuable by including therein the name of every person in Government employ on a permanent or sub. *pro tem.* pay of Rs. 150 and upwards (Rs. 150 being the pay of the junior Tahsildar), who has passed the Deputy Collector's tests, with remarks on his fitness or otherwise for appointment to that office. Each Collector would submit this list for his own district, obtaining the names of qualified persons in other departments (*e.g.*) Police and Salt, from the local head of that department, *e.g.*, Superintendent of Police and Assistant Commissioner of Salt, and would enter his remarks on each name. The Board would do the same for the head-quarter offices in Madras and would then send its own list and those of Collectors to the Revenue Secretary, while information in regard to employés in Government Secretariats would be communicated to the same authority by the Secretary concerned. The Revenue Secretary would thus be in possession of a list which would be ample for all practical purposes. This list would, it is true, not cover persons not already in Government employ or men in positions such as that of Deputy Tahsildar; but cases in which such men are appointed Deputy Collectors are very rare, and if the occasion arose, the initiative would always be taken by His Excellency the Governor, or by the Revenue Secretary.

4. Even if the present system be maintained, it is clear that the Collector can, of his own accord, furnish information in regard to all men in Revenue and Local Fund employ in the district, from the district establishment lists and the list of new passes in the necessary subjects furnished to him by the Board of Revenue under paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings, No. 665, dated 21st November 1892.

But at present lists of qualified men are furnished in several districts from each Taluk and Divisional office, and even from the Local Fund Engineer. These statements are superfluous and should be done away with.

5. *Leave applications of Deputy Collectors and Covenanted Civilians.*—The Board can grant privilege leave to officers subordinate to it for a period not exceeding one month provided the absentee's work can be carried on without its being necessary to appoint a substitute. But at present *all* leave applications from Civilians and Deputy Collectors come up through the Board before or after going to the Accountant-General. The Board is, in general, a mere post office in this matter, and can only send on the application, which has to be treated as urgent, to the detriment, perhaps, of more important business. I would suggest that, except in the case of the one month's leave above referred to, all leave applications from Deputy Collectors and the Collector's covenanted subordinates should go straight from the Collector to the Accountant-General and from him to Government, for if there should be any objection on public grounds to the grant of the leave, the Collector is the officer who is in the best position to state it. The Board would learn of the grant of leave by the Gazette, as it does in the case of appointments and transfers. In a case in which Government refused leave for special reasons, a copy of its order would go to the Board for information.

Paragraph 3 of Government Order, No. 44, Financial, dated 11th January 1887, in Board's Proceedings, No. 262 of 10th February 1887.

6. *Appointment of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars* *.—Under present orders this rests with the Board subject to the proviso that a Deputy Tahsildar whose appointment has once been sanctioned by it for a period exceeding three months may be re-appointed by the Collector to a subsequent vacancy without further reference—*vide* page 7 of Board's Proceedings, No. 459, dated 16th December 1895, in Government Order, No. 142, Revenue Department, dated 24th March 1896.

* I use the word Deputy Tahsildars in this and the following paragraphs to include Stationary Sub-Magistrates.

As an old Board's Secretary I am aware that to give Collectors full power of appointment in regard to these officers would be dangerous, for cases not unfrequently arise in which a week-kneed Collector is induced by office influence or intrigue to nominate a man of the old school, whose qualifications are of the most meagre description. At the same time the Board's power of check must nearly always rest not on personal knowledge of the nominee, but on general considerations such as his age and educational qualifications.

7. It seems to me therefore that Collectors might be given a freer hand, and the Board's power of check preserved, where it has been found necessary by the adoption of the following system. Let the Collector have power of appointment to a Tahsildary or Deputy Tahsildary without reference to the Board in the case of a graduate who has passed the necessary tests, put in the qualifying period of service where this is required, and who does not labour under the stigma of previous reduction, suspension, or grave censure. But when the nominee is a non-graduate, or a graduate who does not fully satisfy the above conditions, let the Board's sanction be required as heretofore. Such a system would, besides giving relief to the Board and larger discretion to Collectors, encourage the appointment of graduates, a result which would, I submit, be in the general interests of the public service.

8. A further suggestion I would make is that in the case of appointments to the above posts which will still require the Board's sanction, Collectors should, instead of applying therefore as each individual vacancy arises, send up to the Board at the beginning of each year a list of men whom they think they may have occasion to appoint during its course. The Board would then pass its orders on this list and those men who were definitely approved by it would be appointed whenever occasion arose without further reference. This would save trouble not only to Collectors but to the Board's office where all applications for appointment to Tahsildaries, &c., have at present to be treated as urgent.

I would not, of course, debar a Collector from recommending to the Board later on in the year an individual candidate whose name he thought had been omitted from the general list when it should have been included there; but such instances would not be very frequent if the general list were drawn up with proper care.

9. In connection with the appointment of Tahsildars, I may notice as an instance of an exceedingly futile return one that figures on page 7 of the list of taluk forms drawn by the Committee of Huzur Sheristadars appointed in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3991, dated 29th August 1896. According to this each Tahsildar should send up to the Collector every year a list of persons in his taluk qualified for the post of Tahsildar! The list of persons qualified by tests and service can be easily compiled from the district establishment list in the Collector's own office, and it is obviously for the Collector himself to determine which among these are actually fit for the position.

10. *Personal grading of Tahsildars within each district.*—In Board's Proceedings, No. 504, dated 22nd August 1891, the Board, while successfully opposing a proposal of the Honourable Mr. Garstin that all Tahsildars in the Presidency should be brought on a general list and promoted with reference to their position therein, expressed a strong opinion (paragraph 8 of the Proceedings) that the pay of Tahsildars should be made personal and not territorial, as it now is; in other words, that instead of possessing particular first, second and third grade taluks and so on, a district should have the same number of first, second or third grade, &c., Tahsildars who would be employed wherever their services were deemed most useful. It should, the Board admitted, "of course be the ordinary rule that the Tahsildar drawing most pay shall administer the taluk of the highest revenue;" but it pointed out that there were a variety of reasons which would justify an occasional departure from this principle, viz.—

(1) That the work of a taluk is not always in necessary proportion to its revenue.

(2) That deserving men could be promoted without moving them from taluks where they have done and can still do good work.

(3) That senior Tahsildars who had previously done good service but were getting past heavy work could be given light taluks to which they might still do justice.

(4) That under the present system where, as often happens, there is only one taluk of a particular grade in the district, the Tahsildar of such a taluk could not be moved, if such a step became advisable, without promoting or degrading him.

To these considerations I would add the fact that, with the rapid changes of *personnel* which now occur among the Divisional officers, it is more than ever important that the Tahsildar should be a person of large local knowledge. But under our present system this is made very difficult, for there is a constant "general post" going on from one end of the district to the other. The Tahsildar of a first grade taluk takes leave; and if a second grade taluk officer has worked well you feel bound to reward him by giving him a step which unhappily involves a move. His former taluk is filled on similar considerations and so on all down the line. It may be said that for a short vacancy such considerations should be overlooked and the vacant first grade taluk given to the man selected for promotion as Acting Tahsildar in the arrangement. But short vacancies often devolope into long ones and such a course would provoke legitimate discontent among the senior men. Under the personal system, on the other hand, each Tahsildar deemed deserving of promotion would obtain it without the necessity of moving for a short time into another taluk.

In Board's Proceedings, No. 659, dated 16th November 1892.

11. The Government negatived the Board's proposal (Government Order, No. 142,* Revenue, dated 13th February 1892), on the grounds:—

(1) That seniority promotion would be introduced in nearly as aggravated a form as in the general grading scheme.

(2) That if the pay of Tahsildars is to be personal it would logically follow that they should be placed on a graded list for the whole presidency; and

(3) That if an officer owing to advancing years "becomes incapable of a heavy charge, the proper course is to transfer him to a lighter one, although such transfer may involve some loss of pay."

The Government therefore contented itself with ordering a re-grading of taluks (which was afterwards carried out) in which other matters than the mere amount of revenue collected should be taken into consideration, and with ruling (paragraph 3 of the Government Order) that the promotion of a Tahsildar without actual transfer might be allowed where it was particularly desirable under the special orders of Government.

This concession has, however, been hardly ever acted on, for it was clear from the Government Order that it would be only granted with reluctance and Collectors have therefore hesitated to make out "a very special case" with the risk of a rebuff after all.

12. I venture very respectfully to submit that the arguments of the Government of 1892 were not very strong and that the present Government should be asked to reconsider them.

(1) In the first place I fail to see what necessary connection there is between the present proposal and the general grading scheme of Mr. Garstin. The latter arrangement would necessarily, as the Board remarked, weaken the hands of Collectors; put the promotion of Tahsildars in the hands of a central body, the Board, which would have very little personal knowledge of the men concerned, and would therefore have to proceed as a rule on considerations of mere seniority; and would in the Board's words "render Madras the head-quarters of an intrigue as wide as the Presidency." The former would leave arrangements with the Collector as at present, but would strengthen his hands by giving him a wider discretion in the matter of posting his Tahsildars.

Board's Proceedings, No. 504, dated 22nd August 1881.

(2) Nor would the system involve mere seniority promotion as the Government apprehended. An inefficient Tahsildar could and would be passed over just as he is now; while on the other hand the existing system often leads to a deserving man losing a turn of promotion because he cannot be spared for the time from the taluk in which he is.

(3) Again the third argument referred to in paragraph 11 above ignores the fact that many native officers who have done excellent work in their prime begin to decline from their zenith at an age when the ordinary European is still in full mental and bodily vigour. It would be very hard, I submit, to punish such a man by reduction for falling under a physiological law which is common to so many of his country men, whereas under the system I propose he could be utilised in charge of a difficult taluk while at his best, and in easier ones as his powers of work began to decline. It is moreover extremely difficult to get a Tahsildar reduced unless he can be proved guilty of some very gross and flagrant misdeeds.

(4) Lastly, the grading of taluks even as it at present stands is necessarily a somewhat rough one and circumstances may easily be conceived in which what is ordinarily a light taluk becomes for the moment one in which a strong hand is required.

13. In view of these considerations, I would therefore ask the Board to move Government to reconsider its former orders and to allow the personal grading of Tahsildars within the district. The Collector is rightly held responsible for the administration of the district as a whole, and he should therefore, I submit, have full discretion to post his taluk officers where he may consider them most useful without at the same time mulcting them in actual or prospective pay.

14. *Appointment of Huzur Sheristadars.*—If my proposal in paragraph 7 regarding the appointment of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars by Collectors be accepted, I would likewise extend their powers in regard to their Huzur Sheristadars, and allow them to appoint without reference to the Board a person of good character who has put in, say, not less than two years' service in the post of Tahsildar. For first appointment to a Tahsildary or Deputy Tahsildary it is desirable to lay stress on a man's educational qualifications, and if this be done all that will be necessary in the case of the Sheristadar is to require him to have had actual experience in the management of a taluk.

15. *Grant of leave to Tahsildars, Deputy Tahsildars and Huzur Sheristadars.*—At present, as pointed out by the Board on page 7 of Board's Proceedings, No. 459, dated 16th December 1895, Collectors can only grant privilege leave to these officers on their own authority. Leave of all other description has to be sanctioned by the Board which has therefore very often two applications in each case, one for the leave, the other regarding the appointment of a successor.

The Government (paragraph 2 I (*g*) of Government Order, No. 142, Revenue, dated 24th March 1896), approved the Board's suggestion that Collectors should have power to grant leave of every kind to non-gazetted officers subordinate to them and applied to the Government of India for the necessary modification of the Civil Service Regulations. The Government of India, however (Home Department's letter * No. 1293, dated 15th August 1896), objected on the ground that "the proposal is opposed to the general rule that the authority which appoints an officer shall grant him leave, which rests on the fact that such authority is usually alone competent to say whether the applicant for leave can be relieved. Under the arrangement suggested by the Madras Government it seems possible that cases might occur in which the Board might inform a Collector who has granted leave to a subordinate officer that there is no substitute available."

* Government Order, No. 535, Financial, dated 2nd September 1896.
Board's Proceedings, No. 349, dated 12th September 1896.

16. Now even under the present rules of appointment, it appears to me that the case is covered by the first sentence of article 915 (*a*) of the Civil Service Regulations in the new edition of 1897. That sentence runs as follows :—

"In the case of an officer who is not gazetted leave may be granted by the authority whose duty it would be to fill up his appointment if vacant."

I submit that the duty of filling up a Tahsildary, &c., rests, even under present circumstances, with the Collector. He submits his nomination and all the Board does is to approve or veto it, in which latter case he sends up another name. The Board, that is, may object to A but does not tell the Collector to appoint B instead ; it leaves further proposals to him. The Government of India in their letter above quoted obviously misapprehended the position, for the case they imagine of the Collector granting leave and the Board then saying that it could spare no one to act, could not possibly arise. The Collector would not grant the leave unless he was prepared with a suitable nominee and in the very rare event of the Board's disapproving that nomination and his having no one else to recommend, he would cancel the leave.

17. Further, if my proposals in paragraphs 7 and 8 above be adopted, there will be no difficulty whatever ; for the case will come under the second sentence of article 915 (*a*) as it now stands. That sentence allows a local Government to "confer the power of granting leave on any officer who in its opinion can judge of the expediency of granting the leave and who can without reference to higher authority make the necessary arrangements for carrying on the absentee's duties." Under my scheme the Collector will in nearly every case be able to appoint at once to a Tahsildary or Deputy Tahsildary either a graduate who has passed the necessary tests, or, a non-graduate whose name figures in a list already approved by the Board, while as regards Huzur Sheristadars he will have the power proposed in paragraph 14. It follows therefore that the Government would be able to give him power under this sentence and I would suggest that this be done.

18. *Taluk Head Accountants and Revenue Inspectors.*—The appointment of these officers rests, and has long rested, entirely with the Collectors. But in paragraph 7 of Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3096, dated 20th June 1895, which was approved in Government Order, No. 461, Revenue Department, dated 20th July 1895, the Board called for an annual return from each Collector of the persons so appointed with their qualifications, in order that it might judge whether Collectors were exercising their power of patronage properly. (The return would, I presume, also cover the appointment of Taluk Sheristadars where these still exist). I submit that this is a return which can serve no really useful purpose. If a man is fit to be a Collector at all he ought to be trusted to fill these minor appointments properly, and if he makes mistakes the Board cannot discover them from a mere return which I venture to think is generally pigeon-holed. I recommend therefore that this return be abolished.

19. *Appointment of Revenue Inspectors.*—In Board's Proceedings, No. 227, dated 8th July 1897, it has been proposed by the Board that Sub-Collectors should have the full power of appointing Revenue Inspectors within the sub-division. I am not prepared to propose the extension of this power to other Divisional officers ; but I think that they should have a freer hand in the matter of the posting of Revenue Inspectors than they possess at present. At present the general practice is for the Collector not only to appoint the Revenue Inspector but to post him to a particular firka and the result is that the Divisional officer is apt to take little interest in the work of men with whose movements he has nothing to do. What I would suggest is that the posting of the Revenue Inspector should be left entirely in the hands of every Divisional officer, *i.e.*, working on the number of Revenue Inspectors sanctioned for each of his taluks, the Divisional officer would have a list for his division, and the Collector would fill vacancies therein, appoint new men to the division, and if he thought fit transfer men from it. But while a man was serving in the division his location would be altogether in the hands of the Divisional officer. Further, I would allow the Divisional officer to grant privilege leave to his Revenue Inspectors and to fill up the vacancy by temporary appointment provided that the man he nominated had been duly trained in survey. My own experience as a Collector has shown me that there is nothing more worrying and less satisfactory than to fill up short vacancies of this sort at a moment's notice and I am sure that the Divisional officer would be in a much better position to deal with them.

20. *Fining of Revenue Inspectors.*—At present Tahsildars have no disciplinary power over Revenue Inspectors. I venture to think that this is a mistake. The Tahsildar can of course report an erring Inspector to the Divisional officer for punishment, but he naturally hesitates to do so unless he has something serious to allege and the result is that the Revenue Inspector may be led by immunity for small *laches* on to gross negligence which involves him in serious consequences. I think that it would not only increase discipline in the taluk, but would be beneficial in the long run to the Inspectors themselves, if Tahsildars had the power of checking them by a small fine, not in excess of one rupee as in the case of his clerical establishment.

21. *Appointment of clerks on Rs.* 20 *and under.*—This at present vests in each division with the Divisional officer "subject to report to or veto by the Collector" (appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 527, dated 11th September 1893). If, however, the proposals in Board's Proceedings, No. 227, dated 8th July 1897, be accepted the Sub-Collector will enjoy the full power of appointing all clerks in the sub-division except his own head clerk "subject only to the Collector's general powers of revision and control."

In the case of other Divisional officers I content myself with suggesting that the powers they now have be more clearly defined. I believe that in certain districts, Chingleput, for example, the Collector's right of veto has been twisted into his making alternative appointments over the Divisional officer's head. The Divisional officer, for example, sends up the appointment of A as a taluk gumasta for the Collector's confirmation and finds in the next District Gazette that B has been put in. I submit that the intention was to give the Divisional officer the free right of appointment to these minor officers in his division, subject merely to the Collector's being able to cancel, on appeal, or, on his own motion, any obviously unjust or improper exercise of the Divisional officer's power, and I think that this should be clearly and definitely affirmed. It is in fact already well understood in several districts where the Divisional officer sends his nomination straight to the District Gazette for publication.

22. *Appointment of unpasssd candidates.*—Under Board's Proceedings, No. 322, dated 27th July 1894, and Government Order, No. 287,* Educational, dated 8th May 1896, Collectors can sanction the temporary employment of unpassed candidates up to a period of three months, after which the Board's sanction has to be obtained

* In Board's Procs., No. 191 of 2nd June 1896.

and under Board's Proceedings, No. 335, dated 9th August 1894, and No. 115, dated 24th March 1896, a return showing the extent to which they have exercised their power is submitted to the Board quarterly by Collectors.

I think the Board will admit that the educational circumstances of some of our districts, *e.g.*, Ganjám, Vizagapatam, the Ceded districts, and the Niligris, are such that it is very difficult to obtain passed men for acting appointments in Taluk, Divisional and even occasionally in Collector's offices, with the result that the Collector has either, to constantly trouble the Board with applications or to evade the rule by appointing a man for periods of three months with little intervals in between. I would frankly recognize that these districts are behind the rest of the Presidency in the supply of educated men for subordinate Government employ, and would allow their Collectors to sanction the entertainment of an unpassed candidate for six months (Mr. H. A. Stuart of Bellary suggests a year for the Ceded districts) and their Divisional officers to exercise a similar power up to three months. In other districts I would keep the three months limit now imposed on Collectors; but would allow a Divisional officer to exercise the same power with regard to taluk offices in his division when he has duly advertised for passed candidates and failed to procure them. There are frequently short vacancies in these offices for which passed men cannot be obtained, and where reference to the Collector either causes undue delay, or is not made till after the appointment has been already filled in anticipation of sanction. The Collector must after all generally accept the Divisional officer's assurance that a passed candidate is not procurable.

23. As to the periodical return prescribed in Board's Proceedings, No. 335, dated 9th August 1894, and No. 115, dated 24th March 1896, I think it would be sufficient to make its submission annual by the Collectors to the Board and quarterly by Divisional officers to the Collector, if my proposals above-mentioned be accepted. I may mention in this connection that the Huzur Sheristadars' Committee referred to in paragraph 9 above have provided that this return should come from each taluk. The only object I can see in the proposal is the saving of trouble to the Collector's office. Under present circumstances all information in regard to these appointments must be available in that office, where a register could easily be kept, while if my proposals above made be adopted a similar register can be kept in the Divisional office also from which a yearly return to the Collector can be prepared.

24. *Exemption from the twenty-five years' rule.*—This is at present in the hands of the Board. I would allow Collectors to exercise it in the case of graduates of over 25 years whom they or their Divisional officers may wish to appoint.

25. *Curtailment of right of appeal.*—I need not dwell on the important place which must be occupied in any scheme for the reduction of unnecessary official correspondence by the material reduction of the practically unrestricted right of repeated appeal which subordinate Government servants are now allowed to exercise against any orders of a punitive nature. The arguments in favour of a material curtailment of the right of second and even third * appeal which these officers now enjoy were fully set forth in paragraph 12 of Board's Proceedings No. 675, dated 27th November 1893, and the Government, agreeing with the Board (Government Order, No. 49, Revenue, dated 22nd January 1894), addressed the Government of India in the sense of its proposals which were that, following the analogy of the Government of India Petition rules, under which no second appeal lies to the Imperial Government in the case of an officer drawing Rs. 100 or under, no second appeal should lie to the Local Government in the case of an officer drawing less than Rs. 50, or to the Board in the case of an officer drawing less than Rs. 25. The latter rule, the Madras Government added, could be applied according to circumstances to the heads of other departments also—*vide* Government of India letter communicated to the Board in Government Order, No. 2557, Revenue, dated 3rd July 1894, recorded in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3780, dated 11th July 1894. The Government of India preferred (*loc cit*) to postpone the consideration of the question;

* *e.g.*, a taluk gumastah dismissed or suspended by a Divisional officer can appeal (1) to the Collector, (2) to the Board, and (3) to Government.

but it has again been pressed upon them by the Madras Government with reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 294, Confidential No. 96, dated 3rd August 1896—*vide* paragraph 8 of Government Order, No. 59, Revenue, dated 30th January 1897.

26. I would now suggest that the important main principles above enumerated should be supplemented by the following minor suggestions, the first three of which are applicable to all departments:—

(1) No second appeal should be allowed in any case except against an order of dismissal, suspension, or reduction. If, for example, a Divisional officer fines a Tahsildar, he should have only one appeal to the Collector.

N.B.—In Board's Proceedings, No. 441, dated 28th July 1893, it has already been laid down that in the case of all public servants whose appointment rests with him, the Collector's orders on appeals from fines imposed by his subordinates are final, but this would not apply, under present circumstances, to a Tahsildar or Deputy Tahsildar since the final appointment rests with the Board.

(2) In the case of petty fines no appeal at all need be allowed. They are small disciplinary punishments which a competent officer ought to be able to impose without question, just as, for example, a first-class Magistrate is allowed (section 413, Criminal Procedure Code) to pass final sentences of a petty nature. I would not allow an appeal against fines which in the course of a month do not exceed Rs. 5 or two days' pay of the officer fined whichever is less. I make the proposal in this way to meet the objection that if the appealable limit were fixed on an individual fine, the provision might possibly be abused by the infliction on the same man of a large number of fines, each of an unappealable amount.

(3) Nor where the black mark system prevails—*e.g.*, in the Salt and Police Departments—should there be, as at present, the right of appeal against each individual black mark as it is given. The individual black mark is meant as a warning rather than as a punishment. It is true that an accumulation of them involves suspension, or even dismissal, but the right of appeal against these punishments will allow of the justice of the previous black marks being then challenged. The present system merely wastes the time of the officers concerned.

(4) Nor again should a second appeal ordinarily be allowed against jamabandi orders. Where the Collector is himself the settling officer it is right and proper that a man prejudiced by his order should be able to have recourse to the Board; but where, as ordinarily happens, a taluk has been settled by the Divisional officer and his orders in regard to remissions, water-rate, second-crop charge, penal assessments, &c., have been confirmed by the Collector, I would not allow a further appeal to the Board except where the order in question involved the payment by an individual of a considerable amount, say over Rs. 200.

27. I should add that the first two proposals made in the last paragraph relate to ordinary Government servants. Village officers have under section 23 of Act III of 1895 a single appeal against all punishments, while village headmen and accountants have a second appeal to the Board against dismissal. Personally I should be inclined to hold that a Collector should be fully and finally competent to decide on the merits or demerits of a village officer, and that no appeal should lie against trifling fines imposed upon them. But to carry this out would require the amendment of an enactment that it took some trouble to pass into law; and the distinction between village servants and others may perhaps be justified on the ground that the former hold offices which are as a rule hereditary and to a large extent honorary also, their duties being often quite out of proportion to their emoluments; and it is desirable therefore to give them a privileged position to which the ordinary subordinate servants of Government cannot lay claim.

28. *Power to sanction extra expenditure involved by restoration with arrears of pay of dismissed or suspended public servants.*—Under article 215 of the Civil Service Regulations, the sanction of the Local Government is required for any expenditure in excess of what would have been incurred if the officer had remained on duty, which

is caused by (*a*) the grant of subsistence allowance during suspension to a suspended officer; (*b*) the restoration with full or partial back pay of an officer who has been suspended or dismissed but who is reinstated on appeal.

Cases falling under head (*b*) are of not infrequent occurrence, and as, when an officer's suspension or dismissal has been cancelled on appeal, his restoration with arrears of pay follows in general as a matter of equity, the result is a number of unnecessary references to Government. The Board recommended the delegation of the necessary powers to itself (though it only mentioned the case of the restoration of suspended officers) in item 5 of appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 459, of 16th December 1895; but the Government in paragraph 2 I. (*c*) of its order, No. 142, Revenue, dated 24th March 1896, held that the matter was not of so much importance as to justify an application to the Government of India for the amendment of the Civil Service Regulations. Now that the matter of reduction of unnecessary correspondence is again absorbing attention, I venture to ask for a reconsideration of this order on the ground that the amendment of article 215 of Civil Service Regulations would avoid a considerable number of needless references all over India. The appellate authority which reinstates a suspended or dismissed officer ought to be able to do what nearly always follows as a necessary corollary, viz., to give him the back pay, of which he has been found to have been deprived without due cause. The Local Government cannot equitably go behind such a decision and the reference to it is therefore an irritating formality, while as there are always savings under the budget provision for "establishments," the necessary funds are readily available. Similarly, where an officer is suspended, I would allow the suspending authority to decide whether or no he shall draw subsistence allowance.

29. *Lien on their permanent appointments allowed to officers who have obtained temporary employment in other Departments.*—Under Government Order, No. 1516,* Revenue, dated 4th September 1871, all cases of this sort lasting over three months were to be referred to Government for orders. In Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 1979, dated 30th April 1896, the Board asked for a reconsideration of this order, pointing out that in the Police Department, for example, the period of probation was two years; but the Government saw no reason to modify the order (Government Order, No. 382,† Financial, dated 18th June 1896). Latterly (Government Order, No. 609, Financial, dated 3rd August 1897), the Board has been allowed to extend the period of lien up to six months, a concession which will, however, be of no use in respect to police probationers. I venture to think that if the head of the department in which a probationer or temporary officer is serving desires the continuance of his services in that capacity it should be open to the authority by which the man's permanent post would be filled up, if vacant, to decide whether his lien thereon shall still continue.

* In Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4420, dated 18th October 1871.

† In Board's Proceedings, No. 246, dated 7th July 1896.

30. *Power to deal with insolvent Government servants.*—The present rules on this subject are set forth in articles 39 to 47 of the Public Servants' Manual (1897 Edition) and there are two classes of cases:—

(*a*) *When an officer takes the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors Act.*—In this case a preliminary report is submitted by the head of the office to the "controlling authority" (the Board in the case of Revenue officers), which decides whether the officer should be placed under suspension pending the adjudication of his case (article 43). Then when the Insolvency Court has passed its orders, the case has to be reported to Government, with the opinion of the head of the office as to whether the insolvency was or was not due to the bankrupt's personal extravagance; and the Government decides whether the man should or should not be retained in the public service (article 45).

(*b*) *When an officer does not apply to the Insolvency Court but is in a chronic and hopeless condition of indebtedness, as defined in article 40 of the Public Servants' Manual.*—In this case a full schedule of the man's debts is obtained by the head of the office and submitted with a report to the Board of Revenue or other controlling departmental authority. If the man be a non-gazetted officer, the Board (or other controlling authority) decides whether he shall be retained in public service or not, while if he be a gazetted officer the case is further submitted for the orders of Government (articles 40 and 41).

31. It appears to me that in both these cases the authority which has the power to dismiss a Government servant for ordinary misconduct should also have the power of deciding whether he should be removed therefrom by reason of the failure of efficiency and temptations to dishonesty likely to be caused by pecuniary embarassments. It seems absurd, for example, that whereas a Divisional officer can under ordinary circumstances dismiss a taluk gumastah, he should have to go through the Collector to the Board, or to Government in insolvency cases, when it becomes a case of money difficulties. I would allow him full power to deal with the man in these cases also, subject, of course, to the right of appeal which accompanies a dismissal for ordinary misconduct. The present rules are, moreover, subject to the anomaly that, whereas in ordinary circumstances only the Government can dismiss a Tahsildar, such an officer could for being habitually in debt have his services dispensed with by the Board of Revenue (article 40, Public Servants' Manual).

The power to suspend, pending the result of an application to the Insolvency Court (article 43, Public Servants' Manual), I would vest in the hands of the authority by whom the applicant is appointed, which may, as in the case of Tahsildar, be of a somewhat lower grade than the authority which has power to dismiss.

32. *List of lands acquired by public servants.*—Under articles 12 and 13 of the Public Servants' Manual every Government officer in superior service is bound to submit a detailed yearly statement of the landed property possessed, acquired or relinquished by himself, his wife or any other closely connected member of his family within the year; and under article 4 he must submit a further special report whenever he becomes possessed of fresh land or is transferred to a district in which he already owns landed property. The information thus prescribed, and regarding which further instructions are given in articles 14 and 15 of the Manual, ought to be quite sufficient for all purposes; but, nevertheless, a further statement of lands newly acquired by public servants in each *fasli* is prepared for every taluk at jamabandi and figures as taluk account No. 51. This latter return is, I submit, useless with reference to the more elaborate information required by the Public Servants' Manual and I recommend its abolition.

33. *Statement of fines imposed on public servants.*—With reference to Board's Standing Order No. 263 (Old Edition) and Board's Proceedings, No. 489 of 17th August 1891, four statements of this description have to be submitted quarterly from all revenue offices.

(*a*) *For village officers.*—(1) An individual statement of fines showing the name of each officer fined during the quarter, the amount of fine imposed and the reason justifying it.

(2) An abstract statement showing the total number of village servants fined, the aggregate amount of the fines, and the proportion of this to the total pay of the officers punished.

(*b*) Two similar statements for all other public servants whose pay exceeds Rs. 10 a month. All these statements go up to the Collector, while the abstract of fines imposed on village officers goes on to the Board in a statement compiled for the district.

I submit that it is only the abstract returns that are necessary, as evidence whether Divisional officers or Tahsildars are abusing their fine powers. The individual statements are not required, for at present an appeal lies against every fine imposed and any cases of injustice to individuals will thus be brought to notice. [Even if my proposal in paragraph 26 (2) be accepted, the right of appeal will only be taken away in regard to trifling fines imposed on persons other than village officers, and the too frequent infliction of them would appear from the abstract statement.]

34. I would further suggest with reference to the village officers' fine abstract that the Collector's check is sufficient so far as his subordinates are concerned, while he should be trusted to exercise his own fining powers with discretion. If he should fail to do so, the right of appeal to the Board (which I only propose to abrogate in petty cases) will set matters right.

35. *Returns of suspensions and dismissals of village officers and other public servants.*—These are quarterly returns which formerly [under paragraph 17 of Standing Order No. 244 (Old Edition)] went up to the Board of Revenue, but now stop at Collectors'. I submit that they are not required, as every public officer suspended or dismissed will always have the right of at least one appeal and at present is generally competent to make several; and cases of individual injustice, or of abuse by an officer of his punitive powers, will easily come to notice in this way.

I may add as an instance of the way in which unnecessary work is now thrown on subordinate offices that at present these returns are generally submitted by the Tahsildar, whereas the punishments to which they relate cannot be exercised by any one lower than a Divisional officer and the information is therefore available in the latter's office.

36. *Return of persons dealt with under Regulation IX of* 1822.—Under Standing Order No. 176 (New Edition), as modified by Board's Proceedings, No. 275 of 9th June 1892, a quarterly return of all such persons was submitted by each Collector to the Board; but under paragraph 4 (2) of Board's Proceedings, No. 459, dated 16th December 1895, approved in Government Order No. 142, Revenue, dated 24th March 1896, the return now stops with the Collector. I think that its submission even to him is unnecessary, as the cases which fall under this regulation are few and far between and any person aggrieved has, under Regulation VII of 1828, the right of appeal.

37. *Power to order the prosecution of village magistrates for acts done in that capacity.*—Under Standing Order No. 244, paragraph 11 (Old Edition) this is now vested in Collectors. I would suggest that the power be extended to Divisional-officers. It may be said that this would debar a Divisional officer from trying (in the first instance or on appeal) an officer whose prosecution he had ordered; but the same remark applies to the present state of things, for in the great majority of cases the Collector orders the prosecution on the Divisional officer's initiative, and if the latter be held to have committed himself to a particular view of the case by sanctioning the prosecution, the same reasoning would apply to his preliminary recommendation.

38. Lastly, I beg to submit that the *half-yearly return of horses and saddlery* prescribed in Board's Proceedings, No. 470, dated 15th December 1896, in which has to be entered the description, condition, &c., of every horse and article of saddlery owned by every district officer from the grade of Tahsildar upwards *plus* remarks by the Collector on the capacity of each officer (himself included?) to ride and the fitness of his horse and accoutrements is regarded by those Collectors and Divisional officers, whom I have had the opportunity of consulting, as an inquisitorial statement, which bears on its face distrust of the Collector's capacity to see that his officers ride about their charges properly, and will lead to very little good. The number of horses a man possesses is no adequate criterion of the amount of real touring that he does, for the officer who keeps the most animals may use them for racing purposes or to rush about from one favourite spot to another. Let there, by all means, if the Board deems fit, be general rules as to the number of horses which each Revenue officer is required to maintain, such as have been prescribed under the sanction of Government in the appendix to Board's Proceedings, No. 170, dated 20th May 1897; but I submit that the enforcement of these rules should be entrusted to the Collector, and that all that need further be required is a certificate to be appended to each officer's pay-bill to the effect that he has maintained the number and description of horses prescribed. If he cannot sign such a certificate, he will, of course, have to explain matters.

39. As to the rules themselves, I submit that a non-civilian Divisional officer might be allowed to substitute for his single regulation animal of 13·3 or upwards two ponies of smaller size. The best animal I ever had as a Divisional officer was a little country-bred of 12·2, and I suggest that a pair of such ponies, or of Pegus, which

could use the same saddlery or harness and relieve each other on a long march, would be much more serviceable than a single horse. Similarly I would allow a Collector or a Civilian Divisional officer to substitute two ponies for the 13·3 animal now demanded from him.

I may note also that the rules as they stand do not cover the case of an Assistant Collector not in charge of a division. He would, I presmue, be put on a level as regards horse maintenance with the uncovenanted Divisional officer.

40. To sum up, my proposals are—

(1) That for the present lists of persons qualified to be appointed Deputy Collectors should be substituted a list of qualified Government employés on Rs. 150 and upwards with remarks as to the fitness or otherwise of each for actual appointment (paragraphs 2—4).

(2) That except in the case where the Board itself has power to grant the leave, leave applications from Deputy Collectors and the Collector's civilian subordinates should go straight from the Collector, through the Accountant-General to Government (paragraph 5).

(3) That Collectors should have full power to appoint to the post of Tahsildar and Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate qualified graduates of good conduct; and that in the case of other men the reference which will still have to be made to the Board should ordinarily be in the form of a list of those men whose appointment may be desirable, to be submitted at the commencement of each year (paragraphs 6—8).

(4) That the return of persons qualified for appointment as Tahsildar should no longer be submitted by Tahsildars and others to the Collector since he has the information available in his own office (paragraph 9).

(5) That the pay and promotion of the Tahsildars should hereafter be personal instead of territorial as at present (paragraphs 10—13).

(6) That Collectors should have full power to appoint as Huzur Sheristadars men who have put in not less than two years' service as Tahsildars, making a reference to the Board (as is now always done) in other cases (paragraph 14).

(7) That Collectors be invested with full power in regard to the grant of leave to their senior non-gazetted officers, viz., Huzur Sheristadars, Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars and Sub-Magistrates (paragraphs 15—17).

(8) That the return now submitted to the Board by Collectors of persons whom they have appointed to the post of Taluk Head Accountant and Revenue Inspector be done away with (paragraph 18).

(9) That the posting of Revenue Inspectors within their divisions should be left to Divisional officers, and that they should also have the power of granting a Revenue Inspector privilege leave and of filling up the vacancy by the appointment of a man who has passed in survey (paragraph 19).

(10) That Tahsildars should be empowered to fine Revenue Inspectors up to a limit of one rupee in each case (paragraph 20).

(11) That the Divisional officer's power of appointment to clerkships on Rs. 20 and under in his division should not be interfered with by the Collector unless the appointment so made is clearly an improper one (paragraph 21).

(12) That in Ganjám, Vizagapatam, the Ceded Districts and Nilgiris the Collectors should have power to sanction the entertainment of unpassed candidates up to a period of six months and the Divisional officers up to three months; that in other districts the three months' power of sanction, which the Collectors now enjoy, should be extended to Divisional officers so far as their taluk offices are concerned, provided they have duly advertised for passed candidates and failed to obtain them; and that the quarterly return of the entertainment of these men now submitted by Collectors to the Board should be made annual (paragraphs 22 and 23).

(13) That Collectors be given the power to exempt graduates from the 25 Years' Rule for appointments within their control (paragraph 24).

(14) That in addition to the main proposals in regard to the entertainment of appeals, which are already before the Government of India, the following subsidiary principles be acted on, viz., to admit—

(*a*) no second appeal except against dismissal, suspension or reduction;

(*b*) no appeal against petty fines or individual black marks;

(c) no second appeal, except in special cases, against jamabandi orders (paragraphs 25—27).

(15) To allow an officer, who suspends a subordinate, to decide whether he shall be granted subsistence allowance under Article 215 (Civil Service Regulations); and to give authority to admit back pay under that article to a Government servant who has been suspended or dismissed but is reinstated on appeal to the reinstating appellate authority (paragraph 28).

(16) To allow the power of extending the lien on his permanent post in the case of an officer who is in temporary service in another department to be exercised by the authority who would fill up the permanent post if vacant (paragraph 29).

(17) That the decision as to whether an officer who has gone through the Insolvency Court, or is shown by other evidence to be in a state of helpless pecuniary embarrassment, shall or shall not be retained in the Government service, should rest with the authority who has power to dismiss such officer for ordinary misconduct; and that the preliminary question whether an officer who applies for the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors' Act shall be suspended pending the adjudication of his case by the Court, should be left to the authority by whom he is appointed (paragraphs 30 and 31).

(18) That the fasliwar statement of lands newly acquired by public servants (taluk account No. 51) be abolished (paragraph 32).

(19) That the detailed quarterly statements of fines imposed on village servants and other public officers be done away with, and that the abstract statements of fines should, in no case, go beyond the Collector (paragraphs 33 and 34).

(20) That the quarterly statements of suspensions and dismissals of village officers and other public servants be discontinued; and that the same step be taken with respect to the quarterly return of persons dealt with under Regulation IX of 1822 (paragraphs 35 and 36).

(21) That the power of sanctioning the prosecution of village magistrates as such be extended to Divisional officers (paragraph 37).

(22) That the present "horses and saddlery return" be done away with, and that the rules as to the number of horses to be maintained by Revenue officers be modified by allowing the substitution of two smaller ponies for a single animal of not less than 13·3 (paragraphs 38 and 39).

41. I may add that I have some further proposals to make as to extending the powers exercised by Tahsildars in regard to village officers, their own office establishments, and menial servants out side thereof; but this will form the subject of a separate communication.

Resolution—No. 365, dated 1st November 1897.

The Board resolves to submit, for the orders of Government, the suggestions which Mr. Meyer has embodied in the letter read above. The various questions therein dealt with have been discussed at a meeting of the Full Board at which Mr. Meyer was present.

2. *Paragraphs* 2—4 *of the letter—List of persons qualified to be Deputy Collectors.*—If the present system of making Deputy Collectors' appointments is to be continued, the Board has no objection to raise to the proposed alterations in the method of drawing up the annual lists. It would, however, appear to be unnecessary to enter in the list, furnished by departments other than that of Land Revenue, the names of all qualified officers drawing Rs. 150 and upwards. In such cases it would probably be sufficient to give the names of men specially recommended by the head of the department concerned.

Paragraph 5 *of letter—Leave applications of Deputy Collectors and Coven nted Civilians.*—The Board accepts the proposals.

Paragraphs 6—9 *of the letter—Appointments of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars.*—The taluk lists of persons qualified for the post of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars (paragraph 9) may be abolished. As regards the proposals for simplifying the procedure in making appointments to the above offices, the Board considers that Collectors may be required to submit at the beginning of each year a list of *all* men,

not already serving as Tahsildars or Deputy Tahsildars whom they are prepared to appoint to vacancies in those grades as occasion arises. A list of Deputy Tahsildars whom the Collector proposes to promote to Tahsildaris should also be furnished. Mr. Meyer suggests a general exemption from report in the case of all graduates who are otherwise qualified for such appointments. The Board has discussed this matter fully, and is of opinion that it would be better to make no such distinction between graduates and non-graduates. The submission of an annual list of non-graduates, fit for promotion, might in some cases prejudice graduates who were equally well, or even better, qualified, for the fact that the name of the non-graduate was on record might influence the selection, especially when a Collector was new to his district. On the other hand to allow a Collector to appoint graduates without sanction from higher authority, and to require a report in all other cases would seriously handicap the non-graduate, for a Collector would ordinarily prefer the simplicity of making a selection within his own powers, to the somewhat cumbrous method of reporting his nomination for approval.

The Board would therefore recommend an annual list of *all* persons whom the Collector considers fit for nomination in the coming year. The preparation of this list would not give much trouble, and could, as Mr. Meyer points out, be added to or altered during the year, if necessary. The Collector would simply take his establishment lists, and would mark the names of all the upper subordinates whom he considered fit for promotion to a Deputy Tahsildari, and would note down the names of such other persons, not on his own establishment, as he might wish to bring into the said grades of the revenue service. Appointments to the grade of Tahsildar are usually made from that of Deputy Tahsildar, and the Collector would have merely to mark the names of all Deputy Tahsildars whom he wished to select for early promotion.

The Board is fully alive to the importance of the control which the law vests in it in these matters. The selection and posting of the higher taluk officials are duties which demand the exercise of the most careful discretion. The Tahsildar, the Deputy Tahsildar and the Revenue Inspector may be regarded as the principal portions of the framework on which the revenue machinery of the district rests, and it would be bad policy to abolish any check which practically conduced to the selection of the best qualified candidate. It is now proposed to entrust to Collectors larger powers in this, as in other matters, and the Board would respectfully impress on Government the supreme importance of carefully selecting, for the charge of districts, officers who are fully qualified for posts of such ever-growing importance. The Standing Orders already require (Standing Order No. 316 (New Edition No. 1) that "when a Collector is absent on privilege leave, all appointments to the grade of Huzur Sheristadar and Tahsildar, made by the officer who acts for him", should be considered as subject to the approval of the permanent Collector; but it is believed that this rule is very generally overlooked. The Board considers that, if Mr. Meyer's proposals are accepted by Government, the above rule must be fully enforced, but with this restriction, the Board would leave the results of the proposed change to the test of actual experience.

Paragraphs 10—13—*Personal grading of Tahsildars.*—The Board very strongly supports Mr. Meyer's proposals. In the Board's opinion it is essential to the efficiency of the revenue administration that the present system of grading by taluks should be replaced by personal grading within each district.

Paragraph 14—*Appointment of Huzur Sheristadars.*—The Board accepts Mr. Meyer's proposal. The importance of using all possible care in the selection of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars attaches also to the case of Huzur Sheristadars, but the Board is willing to waive its control over individual appointments, if it is clearly understood that selections made by officers holding charge in privilege leave arrangements are subject to revision by the permanent Collector, or by the officer who acts as Collector in a long acting arrangement. This restriction should not, however, apply to a senior officer of the standing of permanent Collector who happened to be officiating for a short time in a district other than his own.

Paragraphs 15—17—*Grant of leave to Tahsildars, Deputy Tahsildars and Huzur Sheristadars. Paragraph* 18—*Return of appointment of Taluk Head Accountants and Revenue Inspectors.*—The Board agrees with Mr. Meyer.

Paragraph 19—*Appointment of Revenue Inspectors.*—The Board accepts Mr. Meyer's proposals on the understanding that the Divisional officer's powers of first appointment are confined to temporary vacancies. The Divisional officer has very often but small scope within his division for selection of persons qualified for a revenue Inspector's post, and it is most important that the general recruitment of these officers should be in the hands of the Collector. The posting of Revenue Inspectors within the division may well be left in the hands of the officer who is primarily responsible for its administration.

Paragraph 20—*Fining Revenue Inspectors.*—The majority of the Board doubts the expediency of this proposal. There are two objections thereto; first that the system of petty fines is bad in itself and should not be encouraged, even by implication; and second that the change would very possibly lead to an increase in scriptory work, for the right of appeal would undoubtedly be utilized.

Paragraph 21—*Appointment of clerks on Rs.* 20 *and under by Divisional officer.*—Under the existing Standing Order, the power of making these appointments is vested in the Divisional officer "subject to report to, or veto by the Collector." The Board considers that, under ordinary circumstances, these appointments should be left in the hands of the Divisional officer, who, if he knows his division well, is more likely to know the qualifications of the men in subordinate appointments and of applicants therefor. It is necessary that the position should be made absolutely clear, and with this object the Board would amend the Standing Order by declaring that the Collector's interference should usually be confined to disallowing his Divisional officer's selections, and requiring the submission of revised appointments. It is, however, competent to the Collector to withdraw the said powers from any Divisional officer whom he may consider unfit to exercise them. The question of amending the position of Sub-Collectors is now under the consideration of Government—*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 227, dated 8th July 1897. The Third Member dissents from the above recommendation and has recorded a minute of dissent.

Paragraphs 22 *and* 23—*Appointment of unpassed candidates.*—The Board is aware that extreme caution is required in dealing with this subject. Any undue relaxation of the Examination rules would be sure to lead to complications in the near future, and the district establishments would again be overwhelmed with unpassed men. It is indeed understood that in some districts the proportion of clerks not duly qualified under the Examination rules, is at present unduly large, and any measure which tends to aggravate this evil must be deprecated. But the Board is prepared to support Mr. Meyer's proposals provided that the Collector or Divisional officer appends to every such appointment, whether made under his own authority or not, a certificate that endeavours have been made without success to obtain a passed candidate.

Paragraph 24—*Exemption from* 25 *Years' Rule.*—The Board concurs.

Paragraphs 25—27—*Curtailment of right of appeal.*—The Board accepts Mr. Meyer's proposals. It must, however, be clearly understood that the *general* powers of administrative control, which are vested by statute in superior authorities, are not withdrawn by departmental rules of procedure. In the case of appeals from jamabandi orders, the Board would add to the monetary limit suggested by Mr. Meyer the proviso that an appeal should lie in cases where some substantial civil right is involved.

Paragraphs 28 *to end of* 39.—The Board accepts all the remaining proposals, and resolves to submit them for the favourable consideration of Government.

3. The omission brought to notice in paragraph 39 of Mr. Meyer's letter has already been rectified in paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings, No. 3826, dated 12th October 1897.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
,, W. S. Meyer, Esq., I.C.S.

Read—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 4550, dated 29th November 1897:—

Read—the following letter from ALAN BUTTERWORTH, Esq., Acting Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 26th October 1897, R.O.C. No. 580-Rev.:—

I have the honour to request that the Board of Revenue will favour me with orders as to whether persons appointed under section 10 (4) and (5) of the Hereditary Village Officers Act, 1895, to hold village offices temporarily are to be allowed the privilege of an appeal to the Board of Revenue against orders of suspension, dismissal, &c., passed by Divisional-officers and confirmed by the Collector.

2. Such persons, commonly called gumastahs, being possessed of no hereditary right to the offices which they temporarily hold, cannot, in my opinion, be regarded as the "holders of village offices" within the meaning of section 7 and stand altogether outside the scope of the enactment. If this view is correct, it is open to the Board to pass such orders as it likes to check appeals from this class of persons.

If they are to be treated as ordinary Government employés, then they will possess the same rights of appeal as Government employés enjoy, but I submit that there is no reason why they should be so treated, inasmuch as they are mere temporary occupiers of offices and possessed of no claim for pension. At present, if an appeal addressed to the Board comes to me, I am bound to send it on, and, before doing so, must prepare a statement of the case for the Board's information and often, in addition, call for a report from the Divisional-officer. After this the Board has to consider the petition. All this, I submit, involves an expenditure of time and trouble altogether disproportionate to the importance of the matter at issue.

3. I venture to go further and suggest that the Board should disallow any appeal even to the Collector from a Divisional-officer's order punishing gumastah village officers. Their tenure of office being purely temporary, there can, to my mind, be no reason for granting them any concession in the way of appeal. They are appointed by the Divisional-officer, because they appear to possess suitable qualifications and, if he finds on experience that he has made a mistake, he should, I submit, be allowed a perfectly free hand to appoint somebody else.

Resolution—Mis. No. 4550, dated 29th November 1897.

The question of curtailing the right of appeal in the case of Government servants of subordinate grades is now under the consideration of Government (*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 365, dated 1st November 1897). The present letter will be submitted to Government in continuation of the Proceedings just quoted.

2. The Collector rightly points out that persons appointed temporarily to the charge of village offices do not come within the scope of section 7 of Act III of 1895, which applies only to the holders of hereditary offices. An order of suspension or dismissal passed upon such person cannot, therefore, be held to be passed under the Act, and the provisions of section 23 do not, of course, apply. Such orders are departmental orders, and the Board's power of supervision is derived from the earlier regulations. The question of curtailing the right of appeal for temporary village officers stands therefore on the same ground as in the case of other Government servants, the only difference being that the former are not serving in a pensionable service.

3. It is clear that the appointment and punishment of these temporary hands must be left almost entirely in the hands of the local officers, and that the supervising authorities will rarely, if ever, exercise their right of interference. No harm will

therefore be done by ruling that no second appeal shall lie from a Collector's order, but the Board is not prepared to fetter the Collector's discretion in the control of his Divisional-officers.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with the Collector's letter, in original,
to be returned.

Order—No. 282, Revenue, dated 18th May 1898.

Miscellaneous.

In the first of the papers read above the Board submits, for the orders of the Government, the proposals made by Mr. Meyer in pursuance of the instructions of G.O., No. 1243, Judicial, dated 27th August 1897, with regard to the appointment, leave, &c., of public servants and the returns connected therewith. The proposals will be dealt with *seriatim*.

2. (1) *That for the present lists of persons qualified to be appointed Deputy Collectors should be substituted a list of qualified Government employés on Rs.* 150 *and upwards with remarks as to the fitness of each for actual appointment* (*paragraphs* 2—4 *of Mr. Meyer's letter*).—The Government approves of this proposal but agrees with the Board that, in the case of departments other than Land Revenue, the names of those qualified officers only who are specially recommended by the head of the department concerned and who draw Rs. 150 per mensem and upwards, need be entered in the lists furnished by these departments.

(2) *That except in the case where the Board itself has power to grant leave, leave applications from Deputy Collectors and Collectors' Covenanted Civilian subordinates should go straight from the Collector through the Accountant-General to Government* (*paragraph* 5 *of ditto*).—The Government approves of the proposal. The Board should, however, be careful to keep the Government informed of all circumstances which may affect its discretion in granting leave.

(3) *That Collectors should have full power to appoint to the post of Tahsildar and Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate qualified graduates of good conduct; that in the case of other men the reference which will still have to be made to the Board should ordinarily be in the form of a list of those men whose appointment may be desirable to be submitted at the commencement of each year* (*paragraphs* 6—8 *of ditto*).—The Board would prefer a complete list to be submitted annually for its approval, of all persons, graduates and non-graduates, whom the Collector thinks may be promoted to Tahsildaris or Deputy Tahsildaris.

The Government accepts the proposal as modified by the Board, but considers that no separate list of Deputy Tahsildars whom the Collector proposes to promote to be Tahsildars is required; the names of such Deputy Tahsildars will appear in the list of nominees for the post of Tahsildar.

(4) *That the return of persons qualified for appointment as Tahsildar should no longer be submitted by Tahsildars and others to the Collector* (*paragraph* 9 *of ditto*).—The Government agrees that there need not be a prescribed return. The Collector may procure the information in any way he pleases.

(5) *That the pay and promotion of the Tahsildars within a district should hereafter be personal instead of territorial as at present* (*paragraphs* 10—13 *of ditto*).—This is an important question of principle; and the Board, if it desires it to be re-opened, should submit it separately for consideration.

(6) *That the Collector should have full power to appoint as Huzur Sheristadars men who have put in not less than two years' service as Tahsildars making a reference to the Board (as is now always done) in other cases* (*paragraph* 14 *of ditto*).—The Government approves of this proposal subject to the condition stated by the Board, that selections made by officers holding charge in privilege leave arrangements are subject to revision by the permanent Collector; and there is no reason why this condition should not apply to a senior officer of the standing of a permanent Collector who happened to be officiating temporarily in a district other than his own.

(7) *That Collectors be invested with full power in regard to the grant of leave to their senior non-gazetted officers, viz., Huzur Sheristadars, Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars and Sub-Magistrates* (*paragraphs* 15—17 *of ditto*).—Mr. Meyer's third and sixth proposals as indicated above have been approved. It will now be the duty of Collectors to fill up the appointments of Huzur Sheristadar, Tahsildar, Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate in their districts. Under article 915 (*a*) of the Civil Service Regulations, therefore, Collectors will in future have the power to grant such officers leave.

(8) *That the return now submitted to the Board by Collectors, of persons whom they have appointed to the post of Taluk Head Accountant and Revenue Inspector be done away with* (*paragraph* 18 *of ditto*).—The abolition of the return is sanctioned.

(9) *That the posting of Revenue Inspectors within their divisions should be left to Divisional-officers and that they should also have the power of granting a Revenue Inspector privilege leave and of filling up the vacancy by the appointment of a man who has passed in survey* (*paragraph* 19 *of ditto*).—The proposal is approved. If the Divisional-officer is unable to select a suitable person from his division for such vacancies, it will always be open to him to apply to the Collector.

(10) *That Tahsildars should be empowered to fine Revenue Inspectors up to a limit of one rupee in each case* (*paragraph* 20 *of ditto*).—The Government agrees with the majority of the Board in considering the proposal inexpedient.

(11) *That the Divisional-officer's power of appointing to clerkships on Rs.* 20 *and under in his division should not be interfered with by the Collector unless the appointment so made is clearly an improper one* (*paragraph* 21 *of ditto*).—The Government agrees with the Board that the Standing Order on the subject should be amended as proposed in order to prevent misconstruction of the nature instanced by Mr. Meyer.

(12) *That in Ganjám, Vizagapatam, the Ceded Districts and the Nilgiris the Collector should have power to sanction the entertainment of unpassed candidates up to a period of six months and the Divisional-officers up to three months; that in other districts the three months' power of sanction which the Collectors now enjoy, should be extended to Divisional-officers so far as their taluk offices are concerned, provided they have duly advertised for passed candidates and failed to obtain them; and that the quarterly return of the entertainment of these men now submitted by Collectors to the Board should be made annual* (*paragraphs* 22 *and* 23 *of ditto*).—The Government fully agrees with the Board that great caution is necessary in the matter. Collectors are continually being pressed to appoint unpassed men and it is necessary for the Board, therefore, to exercise a careful check over the appointment of such men. The Government resolves, however, to accept Mr. Meyer's proposal, provided that the return from Divisional-officers to their Collector and from Collectors to the Board is made every half-year, and that, as recommended by the Board, the Collector or Divisional officer appends to every appointment of an unpassed man, whether made under his own authority or not, a certificate that *bonâ fide* endeavours have been made without success to obtain a passed candidate.

(13) *That Collectors be given the power to exempt graduates from the* 25 *years' rule for appointments within their control* (*paragraph* 24 *of ditto*).—The Government considers that the power of exemption should be retained by the Board.

(14) *That in addition to the main proposals in regard to the entertainment of appeals which are already before the Government of India, the following subsidiary principles be acted on, viz.:—*

(*a*) *to admit no second appeal except against dismissal, suspension or reduction;*
(*b*) *to admit no appeal against petty fines or individual black marks;*
(*c*) *to admit no second appeal, except in special cases, against jamabandi orders (paragraphs 25 to 27 of ditto).*

The main proposals for curtailing the right of appeal by Government servants are still under the consideration of the Government of India who have recently invited the views of the Local Governments and Administrations on the subject.

The Government, however, considers that proposals (*a*) and (*b*) should be acted upon, provided that they are not applied to officers of or above the rank of Deputy Tahsildar. The care of the reputation of these important officials is in an especial degree with the Board, and should be vigilantly exercised.

The proposals thus modified will apply to all departments under the Board of Revenue. The question of adopting proposal (*b*) in the Police Department will be separately considered in the Judicial Department. The Government agrees with the Board in its view expressed in the second of the papers read above that persons temporarily in charge of village offices should be treated on the same footing as ordinary Government servants.

As regards proposal (*c*) relating to second appeals against "Jamabandi" orders the Government considers that the proposal as put forward is too vague to be dealt with, for the term includes orders of many different kinds. But even if the phrase is applied to matters appertaining exclusively to the settlement of the land revenue, the Government is not disposed to place any further restrictions on the liberty which the ryots have hitherto enjoyed of access to the Board in such cases.

(15) *To allow an officer who suspends a subordinate to decide whether he shall be granted subsistence allowance under article 215 (Civil Service Regulations); and to give authority to admit back pay under that article to a Government servant who has been suspended or dismissed, but is reinstated on appeal to the reinstating appellate authority (paragraph 28 of ditto).*—The Government of India has been recently addressed on the subject and its orders have been communicated to the Board in G.O., No. 1395, Revenue, dated 19th March 1898.

(16) *To allow the power of extending the lien on his permanent appointment in the case of an officer who is in temporary service in another department to be exercised by the authority who would fill up the permanent post if vacant (paragraph 29 of ditto).*—The matter will be considered in the Financial Department.

(17) *That the decision as to whether a public servant who has gone through the Insolvency Court, or is shown by other evidence to be in a state of helpless pecuniary embarrassment, shall or shall not be retained in the Government service, should rest with the authority who has power to dismiss such public servant for ordinary misconduct; and that the preliminary question whether a public servant who applies for the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors' Act shall be suspended pending the adjudication of his case by the Court should be left to the authority by whom he is appointed (paragraphs 30 and 31 of ditto).*—The Government considers that the danger to the public interest in such cases is not so much that the public servant concerned will be improperly dismissed, but rather that he will be improperly retained in the public service when his indebtedness or previous behaviour makes it impossible or very improbable that he will serve the Government efficiently. The power to remove such a person from the service may be exercised by the authority who has power to dismiss the officer for ordinary misconduct; and were such authority is of opinion that the indebted officer should not be retained in the public service, no report to higher authority will be required. But where it is proposed to retain the officer it is desirable that the decision should rest not with the local authority having the immediate power of dismissal, but with the controlling authority, the report being made to the Board or other controlling authority in the case of non-gazetted public servants and to the Government in the case of gazetted officers. This procedure should be adopted whether the indebtedness be proved by the fact of resort to the Insolvency Court or by other evidence. The Government agrees that the preliminary power of suspension may be entrusted to the authority who has the power of appointment. The necessary alterations in the Government Servants' Manual will be carried out in the Public Department.

(18) *That the fasliwar statement of lands newly acquired by public servants be abolished (paragraph 32 of ditto).*—The abolition of this account is sanctioned.

(19) *That the detailed quarterly statements of fines imposed on village servants and other public officers be done away with, and that the abstract statements of fines should, in no case, go beyond the Collector (paragraphs 33 and 34 of ditto).*—The Government agrees with the Board that the detailed quarterly statements of individual fines may be discontinued. The abstract statements should be submitted half-yearly instead of quarterly. A column should be added to show the number of fines inflicted in order that the imposition of numerous fines on the same person may be checked. The half-yearly abstract statement of fines on village servants should still be submitted by Collectors to the Board. The Board's check in this matter is valuable.

(20) *That the quarterly statements of suspensions and dismissals of village officers and other public servants be discontinued; and that the same step be taken with respect to the quarterly return of persons dealt with under Regulation IX of 1822 (paragraphs 35 and 36 of ditto).*—The quarterly return of persons dealt with under Regulation IX of 1822 may be discontinued. But the Government considers that the returns of suspensions and dismissals of village officers and other public servants submitted to Collectors are useful and should be continued.

(21) *That the power of sanctioning the prosecution of village magistrates as such be extended to Divisional officers (paragraph 37 of ditto).*—The Government considers that it would be inexpedient to make the proposed delegation.

(22) *That the present "horses and saddlery return" be done away with, and that the rules as to the number of horses to be maintained by Revenue officers be modified by allowing the substitution of two smaller ponies for a single animal of not less than 13·3 (paragraphs 38 and 39 of ditto).*—The Government agrees that the present horses and saddlery return may be done away with. In order, however, to ensure that the attention of all officers is periodically drawn to the matter, the Government considers that Divisional-officers should submit half-yearly to their Collectors and Collectors to the Board a declaration to the effect that the number and description of horses prescribed have been maintained. No certificate in the pay bill is necessary.

As regards the latter part of the proposal, viz., to substitute smaller ponies for a single animal of not less than 13·3, the Government is not prepared to make a general rule on the subject, but will deal with each case as it arises.

(True Extract.)

for Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
" W. S. Meyer, Esq., I.C.S.
" the Judicial Department.
" the Financial "
" the Public "
Copy to the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
" " " (Revenue Settlement,
" " " Land Records and Agriculture).

Exd. C. M. Thumbuswamy.

100 Copies.

[F. 23] 1,000—11-6-97.

Correct July 1909

Financial (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1909

From The Rev: Dept

Order

Lodged

Errata No. 150

Recd.

Dated 6
Received 11
Registered 13
} July 1898

Enclosures –

Spare copies –

SUBJECT.

Note

The necessary addition will be made in Cul. 1597 when it returns to Dept, this will be stitched with the G.O. on it.

AJ 13/7/98

stating that "G.O. No. 192 Financial, dated 28th February 1898 Recorded in" should be inserted in line 6 of para 2 of G.O. no. 282 Rev: dated 18th May 1898.

Where is the G.O. I think. Cul. 1597 contained in 2 slips

12.2 c/c

Corrected 16/7/98

For C Put this up with Cul. 1597 Bnl when it returns from Circ AJ 16/7/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Gol. 1597/98			
192:	28.2.98		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Current No. 1909

Revenue Department.

ERRATUM No.150.

1597. In line 6 of para 2 (15) of G.O. No.282 Revenue, dated 18th May 1898, between the words "in" and "G.O." insert the following:-

"G.O. No.192 Financial, dated 28th Feby. 1898

recorded in".

Ootacamund, A. Russell

6th July 1898. For Secretary to Government.

To the Bd. of Revenue, L.R.
,, W.S.Meyer Esq. I.C.S.
,, Judicial Dept.
,, Financial Dept.
,, Public Dept.
,, Bd. of Revenue, Sep. Revenue.
,, do Revenue Sett.
,, Accountant-Genl.

8.7.98

Read 11/7/98

[G./25]
1,500 -22-11-97.

Slip C 11.7.98 C 14.7.98
R 15.7.98 Financial DEPARTMENT

C. No. 1597

SUBJECT.

3. HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR. ✓
1. THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E. ✓
2. THE HON'BLE MR. ~~CROSE, C.I.E.~~ Arundel ✓

Lien on their permanent appointments to officers seeking appointments in other departments.

FOR ORDERS.

A

Please see note in G.O. No. 382, Financial, dated 18th June 1896.

2. In the current read above the Revenue Dept. passes orders on Mr. Meyer's suggestions relating to the appointment, leave &c. of public servants. The only suggestion which the Financial Dept. has to deal with is that as regards the lien on permanent appointments allowed to officers who have obtained temporary employment in other depts.

3. In 1871 Govt. expressed its strong disapproval of the practice of allowing officers of one department ~~being retained~~ remaining for indefinite periods in other departments and to retaining their lien on their substantive appointments. It was then definitely ruled that ~~such~~ men might be allowed to act in posts of higher pay for temporary duty, retaining their lien on their substantive posts or on probation for terms of not more than three months in other depts.

in

Para. 29 of Mr. Meyer's letter in the current, and para. 2(16) of the Revenue order.

G.O. No. 1516, Rev., d/ 4-9-71 B

in which permanent vacancies need to be filled ~~in~~, at the end of which period if not confirmed in their new posts, they would revert to their substantive employment. In 1896, it was once more laid down that this limit of three months was not to be exceeded except with the sanction of Govt; such sanctions ~~should~~ to be granted in the administrative dept. of the Secretariat concerned. In a later order Govt. agreed with the Accountant-General that this rule of three months did not apply to officers appointed on probation to higher posts in the same office or dept. In 1897 the Board of Revenue was allowed to extend up to six months the period of lien, and the existing arrangements in regard to the probationary period for Police Inspectors (about 2 years) were ordered to continue for the present.

4. Mr. Meyer points out that the power of extending the lien to six months granted to the Board of Revenue is of no use in respect to Police probationers and suggests that if the head of the department in which a probationer or temporary officer is serving desires the continuance of his services in that capacity it should be open to the authority by which the man's permanent post would be filled up, if vacant, to decide whether his lien thereon shall still continue. In other words Mr. Meyer proposes that the period of lien shall be regulated according to the pleasure and convenience of the officer in whose hands is the filling of the permanent post of the officer

G.O.No.382,Finl.,d/18-6-96. A

,, 546 ,, 7-8-96 (para.2) C

,, 768 ,, 13-11-96, also H
,, 885 ,, 3-11-97 V

,, 609 ,, 3-8-97 D

,, 1455,Judl.,d/ 7-10-97 C

I do not see sufficient reason for any alteration. The cases which occur are not many.

HS
11/7/98

13.7.98

A.S.M.
15.7.98

officer concerned.

This suggestion, which has the support of the Board of Revenue, would save some correspondence.

Orders are solicited.

Cur.S 8.7.98 In point of fact the Surgeons proposal is to retain the Status quo ante. It often times makes much difference in filling up an appointment whether the first appointment can be offered or only a bet for the working incumbency and though perhaps a longer time may in some cases be allowed than under the present rule. I think some stronger reason than that it will have correspondence will be found before the existing rule under which a definite limit is in force is swept away altogether.

11/7/98.

Note
All the rest appear to be printed

4

26

Financial Depts

Read again

F.O. No 1576 Rev. of 4.9.71.
— No. 1320 Amd of 27.9.85
— 382 Amd of 18.6.96
— 526 Amd of 7.9.96
— 768 Amd of 13.11.96
— 885 Amd of 3.11.97.
— 609 Amd of 3.8.97
— 1453 Amd of 7.10.98

Read C. No. 1597 (portions marked in pass 2.10.14.16. 18 & 20 in blue chalk = A)
— C. No. 1909 = B

Order No. 615. of 16th July 1898.
P.S. That the Governor in Council does not consider that any change is necessary in the existing rules as regards the extension of leave on permanent appts in the case of officers on temporary service in other depts. Thereason

(From Orders)

Cons
15/7/14

16/7/18.

The Rev. Dept.
— all the Depts of the Secty (including Chs)
- Accountant
Ref Copy to Stock File

despd 24-7-18

First copy sent to Press. 20/7/18

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

Number of copies required. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter.

Read again G.O., No. 189 , , Dated

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No.

Order of Government " " "

Letter of Government.

Statement with ditto.

Papers not filed up, being meant for despatch as original.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.