

REPORTS

ON THE

RE-ORGANIZATION

OF THE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

1945-46

By R. TOTTENHAM



(Second Imprint, 1955)

OKDISCD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Terms of reference	ii
2. Report No. I. Reorganization of Departments—Defence Department ...	1
3. Report No. II. Interim Proposals for the re-organization of the Government of India.	7
4. Summary of Report No. II.	18
5. Report No. III. Bifurcation of Labour Department	24
6. Report No. IV. Re-organization of Secretariat	26
7. Appendix I. (Proposed Distribution of Business between Departments) to Report No. IV.	54
8. Appendix II. (Office Procedure) to Report No. IV.	70
9. Summary of Report No. IV.	87
10. List of Important Recommendations in all four reports	99

OKDISCD

OKDISCD

TERMS OF REFERENCE

- (a) Organisation of Departments and possible re-allocation of departmental business ;
- (b) whether, owing to the difficulties reported by Provincial Governments in lending officers to the Centre and their desire for the return of some of the officers already lent, any early reduction is possible in the number of officers now on deputation from the provinces ;
- (c) the question raised in the tentative scheme prepared by a Committee of Secretaries for the re-organisation of the Secretariat System ;
- (d) question of providing as far as practicable for temporary Government servants who will have to be retrenched now that the war has come to an end including arrangement for finding them employment in non-Government occupation.

NOTE

I took up my special duty with effect from November 1st, 1945. As the terms of reference had been drafted some months earlier and the Home Department had made considerable progress with the last of them in the interval, the Home Member informed me on the 14th November that I need not pursue it for the present.

R. TOTTENHAM.

~~Organisation & Methods
Division.
LIBRARY
Accession No
Class No
Book No (2)~~

Organisation & Methods
Division
LIBRARY
Accession No. 152
Class No.....
Book No.....

OKDISCD

✓ V. 2, 86N 45 E 1: (V/S)

J5

✓
Accession 152

REPORT NO. I

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTS—DEFENCE DEPARTMENT

1. The Defence Department was created in 1942 to take over—

- (a) the functions of the old Defence Co-ordination Department, which consisted mainly in co-ordinating the *war* activities of all Departments, especially in the field of war legislation ; and
- (b) certain items of, at that time, comparatively unimportant work, which had hitherto been in the War Member's portfolio, but which it was deemed desirable to transfer to a Defence Member. This was done not with any idea of increasing efficiency, but in order to give effect to the offer made for political reasons at the time of the Cripps' proposals to allot certain War subjects to an Indian Defence Member.

Since its inception the Defence Department has also taken on the remnants of the old Civil Defence Department (A. R. P.) and a few further items of a miscellaneous character, largely because they did not obviously belong to any other Department.

The staff of the Department (apart from Assistant Secretaries) now consists of a Secretary, a Joint Secretary, a Deputy Secretary and one Under Secretary. Sanction exists for a second post of Under Secretary, but it has remained unfilled since May 1945, when Mr. Kaiwar was promoted as Deputy Secretary. In addition, there are a number of officers on special duty for various purposes, who, if the Department were abolished, would carry their subjects over to the Departments to which they were assigned.

2. The transfer of the War Department items (see Appendix) to the Defence Department involved the anomaly of placing certain Branches of the Commander-in-Chief's Staff, which remained responsible to him in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief, under the control of a Member of the Government other than the Commander-in-Chief in his capacity as War Member. Some of the subjects - *e.g.*, postwar reconstruction and demobilisation—have now become of the first importance ; and I have no doubt, after consultation with all concerned, that all these items ought to go back to the War Department as soon as possible. Any political value that the constitution of the Defence Department may have had will, no doubt, be lost ; and the abandonment of the experiment now that the transferred items have become important may provoke some criticism. This, however, must be faced.

The work involved has occupied *part* of the time of all the four Secretariat Officers in the Defence Department ; but, so far as I can judge, it should not require the *full* time of more than one senior and one junior officer. The War Secretary, who is averse to increasing his staff, is prepared to accept this provisionally. It will be for him to settle ultimate requirements in the light of experience and the future set up of his own Department, which I understand is under consideration ; but to begin with there would be obvious advantages in his taking over the Joint Secretary and Under Secretary who have actually been handling the more important subjects. In addition there would also be transferred the relevant officers on special duty, including Sir Malcolm Darling (Land Re-settlement), the Petroleum Officer (Mr. Sinclair) and his assistants, and the officer who deals with "Estates of deceased officers" (Major Basden).

3. If this recommendation is accepted, there remains the more difficult question of the distribution of the remaining work of the Defence Department and the disposal of its remaining officers. These, if the recommendation made above is accepted, would be the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary and a few special officers. The various groups of items and my views with regard to them are set forth in the succeeding paragraphs.

4. *Old Defence Co-ordination Department items —*

(1) War Legislation including the Defence of India Act and Rules and War-time Ordinances ;

(2) all questions concerning defence which involve co-ordination of policy and action between the Civil Departments and the work of the War Member ;

to which may be added (because they are similar in character)

(3) the summary for the Committee of Council ; and

(4) the co-ordination of the "War Histories" prepared by Departments. of these items No. (2) could disappear. The War Department can resume the ordinary methods of co-ordination provided by the Rules of Business and we have in addition the new Co-ordination Committee of which Sir Eric Coates is Secretary. He should, I think, take over the old duty which was laid upon the Defence Department of settling, as far as possible, inter departmental disputes as to which Department should deal with a particular case. He should also take over No (3) which is important and must continue. The main work under No. (1) is the winding up of our emergency War Legislation and its replacement by more lasting powers where necessary. The original suggestion was that this should go to the Home Department. That Department is not, however, concerned with a great many of the powers in question, especially those in the economic field which may have to be continued. Each Department should accept responsibility for the subjects with which it is concerned. Some co-ordination will, however, be required and I think this function must be assumed by the *Legislative Department*. That Department has already initiated discussions and held an inter-departmental conference about the repeal of certain Ordinances. Once general policy had been laid down, I do not think that the volume of co-ordination work would be great.

The present procedure, under which all proposals for new Ordinances are submitted to his Excellency by the Defence Department, may be discontinued. The number of new Ordinances is not likely to be great and the Departments, concerned can well submit their proposals independently.

The co-ordination work connected with item No. (4), the Departmental "War Histories", cannot be great, but this is essentially a matter that should not be allowed to drag on. I think that *S. G. G. (Public)* should take it over and, if he considers it necessary, ask for a suitable officer on special duty to push the matter through and have it completed within the next three or four months.

5. *Old Civil Defence Department work.*—This is now practically dead. The Director of Civil Defence will be vacating his appointment at the end of this month, and all that will remain to be done is to wind up the accounts. The subject should, I think, go back to the *Home Department*, where it started, together with the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Raman, who, I understand will be competent to deal with most of the remaining work without troubling higher authorities. The actual disposal of A. R. P. equipment will be done by the Disposals Organization in the Supply Department.

6. *Man Power items, including—*

(1) the administration of the National Service Act ;

(2) the release of European British subjects from the Defence and other Services ; and

(3) the registration of women.

Item (3) is practically dead already, and item (1) will be dead when a decision is reached on the question of policy which is under active consideration. Item (2) still gives a good deal of work, which is done by an officer on special duty (Major Hendry). Where there is a dispute the case is brought before a Committee, which requires a neutral Chairman at Secretary's level to decide between the conflicting claims of the Services on the one hand and the commercial interests or Civil Departments on the other. The obvious Department to take over this item is again the *Home Department*. The meetings of the Committee, though they are likely to decrease in number, will entail some

extra work either for the Secretary or Joint Secretary of that Department, for which neither of them will find it easy to spare time.

7. *Requisitioning, de-requisitioning and compensation.*—This is a complicated subject which has given a great deal of work. A special officer, Mr. Khambata, has been dealing with the compensation side of it and I understand that it is now proposed to drop the very detailed legislation, which was circulated to Provincial Governments for their opinions, and to replace it by a briefer Ordinance which will cover the main requirements. The general policy regarding the disposal of surplus lands and buildings has also been laid down in a Supply Department Memorandum of September 11th and the Defence Department addressed all Provincial Governments on the subject in a letter dated September 10th. The Department mainly concerned is the War Department. It will take over the Lands and Hirings Directorate, which has hitherto functioned under the Defence Department. As soon as the Compensation Ordinance has been settled, I do not think it will be necessary to retain co-ordinating activities in any one Department. Each Department will deal with its own cases in the light of the policy laid down and the powers provided ; but the Lands and Hirings Directorate under the War Department may be able to help certain other Departments of the Government of India. The whole of this subject may, therefore, be regarded as a wasting tem, so far as the Defence Department is concerned and it is merely a matter of selecting some suitable Department to take over Mr. Khambata until he has finished the work. I think this would have to be the *Legislative Department*.

8. *Passages.*—This gives a great deal of work and, I understand, is likely to continue to do so for some time. Mr. Dalgarno and his staff dispose of most of it ; but inter-departmental conferences at Secretaries' level are not infrequently required and, apart from these, the Defence Secretary has a fair amount of work with Mr. Dalgarno on points that arise from day to day. Since the *Home Department* is intimately connected with many aspects of this subject and already spends a good deal of time on it, it would again be the most suitable department to take it over. The transfer would, however, involve a substantial addition to the labours of its already over-worked Joint Secretary. This would tend to decrease, but may be heavy for some time yet.

9 *Miscellaneous items.*—These are :

- (a) a small number of cases relating to enemy trading, which may go over to the *Commerce Department* ;
- (b) the allotment of accommodation for civil officials in Bombay and Calcutta, which is now dealt with by a Committee run by the Defence Department and which obviously must go over to the *Labour Department* (which is already represented on the Committee) unless it can be taken over by the Accommodation Advisory Committee.

10. It will be seen that—

- (1) the heaviest work connected with the non-War-Department items will have to go to the Home Department ;
- (2) most of this work is of a kind that must be done at Secretary's level;
- (3) the remaining items, which might be handled by an officer of below Secretary's level, will have to be divided between the Legislative, Labour and Commerce Departments and S. G. G. (Public) ; and
- (4) the only officer available below Secretary's level cannot be split up between all these different departments and would therefore be surplus to requirements.

In view of these difficulties, an alternative to winding up the whole Department at once, and one that I am inclined to recommend, is

- (a) that the War Department items should be transferred as soon as possible, and

- (b) that the remaining items should remain in the Defence Department, with its Secretary and Deputy Secretary and any special officers concerned, for a strictly limited period of two months from the date of the surrender of the War Department items.

By the end of such a period, some of the items should have disappeared altogether ; the work connected with others should have decreased ; the work of other departments may also have fallen off ; and I myself should have had time to review the whole field and be in a better position to fit the remaining subjects into the future set up of the Government of India. During the two months of his continued existence the Defence Secretary might also be able to relieve other Departments by taking over certain "odd jobs" of a temporary character and finishing them off. The name of the Department would not matter for a brief period, unless the War Department-wishes to resume its old title.

11. I have not throughout this note mentioned either the Assistant Secretary in the Defence Department, who deals with the administration of the Department and the offices attached thereto, or its clerical staff. Their disposal or distribution would have to be settled departmentally when the abolition or split up of the Department takes place. I would only say—

- (a) that the opportunity should be taken to get rid of any temporary employees who are obviously unfit to secure permanent appointments in the Government of India as a whole, and
- (b) that every effort should be made to safeguard the interests of those permanent employees, including the Assistant Secretary, who have been borrowed from other Departments.

Dated the 15th November 1945.

R. TOTTENHAM,
Officer on Special Duty.

APPENDIX

War Department items—

- (i) Post-war reconstruction and demobilisation.
- (ii) Amenities for and welfare of troops—British and Indian—and their dependants, including welfare and amenities of the Royal Indian Navy and the Air Forces in India.
- (iii) Canteen organisation.
- (iv) The Lawrence Schools, King George's Royal Indian Military Schools, and the Prince of Wales' Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun.
- (v) Prisoners of war in enemy countries.
- (vi) The estates of deceased military officers,
- (vii) Co-ordination of the provision, storage, location and transport of petroleum products of all kinds, including those required by the Defence Forces
- (viii) Indian Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Board.
- (ix) Cantonments and military lands.
- (x) Acquisition, custody and relinquishment of land vested in the Crown for purposes of defence.
- (xi) Compilation of War Lands Registers.
- (xii) Control and supply of printing, publications, stationery, forms, type-writers and duplicators for the Defence Services.
- (xiii) Compilation and distribution of Indian Army List.
- (xiv) Medal Section.
- (xv) War Crimes Commission.
- (xvi) War Book.

NOTE

The foregoing report was submitted to the Home Member on November 15th. While expressing no opinion on the proposal in para. 10(a), he agreed that for the time being the Defence Department should continue on the footing proposed in para. 10(b). The proposals were next submitted to the Defence Member, who was on tour, and his agreement to them was received on November 21st. They were then submitted to His Excellency, who accepted them on November 22nd, but ordered that the war subjects should be transferred to the War Department by the end of November and the Defence Department closed down entirely by the end of December. His Excellency also asked that some other arrangement should be made to deal with departmental "War Histories", as S.G.G. (Public) and Reforms Commissioner was likely to have a great deal of work to do. The Departments were informed accordingly and it was arranged that the Home Department should take over the War Histories.

2. Subsequently the Legislative Department represented that the co-ordinating functions assigned to them in connection with (a) the winding up of war legislation and (b) the undertaking of fresh legislation, where necessary to take its place would involve them in more work than they were equipped to undertake, especially at a time when they would be very busy with the forthcoming session of the new Central Legislature. After a meeting with all concerned it was agreed that each Department requiring new legislation would have to sponsor it in accordance with the ordinary procedure laid down by the Rules of Business and that co-ordination by the Legislative Department would not be necessary. As regards the winding up of War legislation, including the Defence of India Rules, it was decided, in order to reduce the amount of co-ordination work to the minimum, to submit certain proposals to His Excellency, which would involve the immediate repeal of a certain number of the Defence of India Rules and an extension of the life of the Defence Department about a fortnight from the beginning of the New Year. His Excellency for agreed and the Defence Department was finally closed down on January 16th, 1946 [see Home Department File No. 320/45-Pub. (c)].

REPORT No. II
INTERIM PROPOSALS FOR THE RE-ORGANIZATION OF THE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PART I

1. My first three terms of reference are as follows—

- (a) Organization of Departments and possible re-allocation of departmental business ;
- (b) whether, owing to the difficulties reported by Provincial Governments in lending officers to the Centre and their desires for the return of some of the officers already lent, any early reduction is possible in the number of officers now on deputation from the provinces ; and
- (c) the question raised in the tentative scheme prepared by a Committee of Secretaries for the re-organization of the Secretariat System.

Put more briefly, what these terms of reference amount to is making proposals for the future set up of the Government of India, the system on which it is to work and the means of providing it with officers of the type and in the numbers required.

2. One way of tackling the problem—and in theory perhaps the right way—would be to start at the bottom by assessing the volume of work to be done and so building up the number of clerks, officers, Departments and Members (in that order) required to do it. Such an assessment would, however, be so speculative and so difficult and involve so much detailed work that it would take a very long time to reach even provisional conclusions. If quick results are required, the only practical method will be to begin at the top by procuring a decision, which may be provisional, as to the sort of number of Members needed to form a Government of a reasonable size ; then to allocate their portfolios from a general knowledge of the amount of work involved ; and finally to make proposals as to the strength of the staff required according to the system of work to be adopted. The order in which my terms of reference are drafted suggests that this is in fact the intention.

3. On that assumption and after personal discussion with most of the Secretaries concerned, I think I am in a position to make certain broad proposals under my first term of reference. Without general and provisional approval of these proposals I cannot usefully proceed to an examination of my second and third terms of reference.

4. I start by assuming that the kind of Government for which I am to plan—

- (a) will have to work under the present Constitution Act, minus Federation, but with the continuance of certain economic controls, which may involve some invasion of the provincial field for several years ;
- (b) may consist of party politicians, except for the Commander-in-Chief ; and
- (c) will be committed to spending large sums of money on post-war reconstruction and development.

5. As regards the character of the Government, I assume that it will be desirable—

- (a) as I have seen it put elsewhere, “to renounce the old conception of Government as a regulatory, policing and taxing mechanism, and openly to adopt the conception of Government as the nation’s common instrument for expanding its social and economic welfare in all those spheres where individuals or private associations cannot achieve equally effective results” ; and
- (b) while maintaining the principle of collective responsibility, to ensure that each Member accepts as complete responsibility as possible for every aspect of the administration of the subjects allotted to his portfolio.

6. As regards the size of the Government, the ideal, though it may not be realisable, would be an Executive Council large enough to deal with all the more important issues that will confront it and to represent Government adequately in both Houses of the Legislature, but small enough to be able to co-ordinate the main activities of its Members without resort to any very elaborate supplementary machinery. The largest number of persons that can co-ordinate efficiently is, I should say, eight. If the Council exceeds that number, some additional machinery for co-ordination will be required.

7. As regards the structure of the Government machine, I should like, without going into any detail at present, to have certain fundamental principles settled, My idea is—

- (a) that any form of governmental organization must be based on three essential components—
 - (1) The Member ;
 - (2) the Secretary ;
 - (3) the Executive Head ; and
- (b) that the respective functions of these three components can and should be broadly distinguished and defined.

At the risk of over-simplification, I would say that the function of the Member is to decide policy ; of the Secretary to provide the material on which to reach such decisions ; and of the Executive Head to carry the decisions into effect. On the analogy of the human machine, the Member would represent the Will, the Secretary the Brain and the Executive Head the Hands. I do not for a moment suggest that no Member or Executive Head should be expected to think and no Secretary to take a decision or see that it is followed up. All three parts of the machine must obviously work in the closest touch with each other. My point rather is that the duties of the Secretariat should correspond broadly to those of the Staff in the Army Organization and that, just as the Staff Officer does not himself conduct operations in the field, so the Secretary should not ordinarily be charged with executive duties

Incidentally, the respective charges of the Member, the Secretary and the Executive Head are all now referred to as "Departments", although the word bears at least two quite different meanings. I propose, in order to avoid confusion, to speak of the "Portfolio" of a Member, the "Department" of a Secretary and the "Service" or "Directorate" of an Executive Head, whether called a Director General or by any other title. ["Ministry", "Office" (cf. War Office, India Office, etc.) and "Department", respectively, might be better terms, but we cannot yet use the first of them.]

These points will be important when I come to consider ways and means of relieving the higher Secretariat Officers of unnecessary work. I am aware that the point about the functions of the Secretary is controversial ; and I realise that during the War many new problems have arisen that have made it *necessary* for Secretaries to assume certain "executive" as well as "policy" functions. This makes it all the more necessary that I should know, before proceeding further, how far the distinctions I have drawn above are accepted.

8. Turning now to the more practical aspects of the problem, I take it that the main factors in favour of reducing the size of the Government of India are—

- (1) the cessation of hostilities and in consequence the immediate or ultimate disappearance of many items of "war" work ; and
- (2) the ever present need for economy and "workability".

The main factors that operate as checks to any process of reduction are—

- (1) the necessity for the continuation of certain war-time controls for a temporary, but not precisely ascertainable, period ;
- (2) the programme of post-war reconstruction and development ; and

- (3) the possibility of constitutional changes and the need for providing a political Government of the future with a well-staffed Secretariat competent to serve its needs both in the national and inter-national fields.

9. The broad conclusions that I reach from all these premises are -

- (a) that we should aim towards a smaller, more compact and, for that reason, more efficient governmental organization than at present; but

(b) that the process of contraction will have to be gradual.

Since personal and other factors, which I cannot foresee, may be involved in the process of contraction, I think it would be best for me to confine myself to the final set-up and make no recommendations as to the stages by which it should be reached.

PART II

10. A background of facts will give some idea of the dimensions of the problem.

- (a) In 1919 (Para. 69 of the Llewellyn Smith Report) there were 9 Secretariat Departments (omitting the Railway Board and the Indian Munitions Board, but including the Political side of the Foreign and Political Department) These were -

- (1) Army
- (2) F. & P.
- (3) Finance
- (4) Home
- (5) Legislative
- (6) Education
- (7) Commerce and Industries
- (8) Revenue and Agriculture
- (9) P. W. D.

Nos. (8) and (9) were included in one Portfolio. The Governor-General-in-Council therefore consisted of His Excellency and seven Members. There were 9 Secretaries (omitting one of the two in the F. & P.), one Additional Secretary, no Joint Secretaries, 5 Deputy Secretaries (omitting one of the two in F. & P.), 8 Under Secretaries and 6 Assistant Secretaries.

At the close of World War I the total officer strength of the 9 Secretariat Departments was therefore 29. [The Railway Board and the Indian Munitions Board accounted for 17 more officers].

- (b) In 1939 (Para. 5 of the Wheeler Report and para. 28 of the Maxwell Report) there were still 9 regular Secretariat Departments (omitting Political, Legislative Assembly, S G G Public, S. G. G. Reforms, the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and the Railway Board).

These were—

- (1) Defence
- (2) External Affairs
- (3) Finance
- (4) Home
- (5) Legislative
- (6) Education, Health and Lands
- (7) Commerce
- (8) Labour
- (9) Communications.

Nos. (7) and (8) were included in one Portfolio. The Governor-General-in-Council therefore still consisted of his Excellency and 7 Members. There were 9 Secretaries no Additional Secretaries, 8 Joint Secretaries 12 Deputy Secretaries and about 16 Under or Assistant Secretaries.

Just before World War II the total offices strength of the 9 Departments was therefore under 50.

(c) At the present time the 9 pre-war Departments have expanded into 19 (omitting Civil Defence, which has come and gone, but including Defence, which is going). The development may be most simply presented in the following diagram, which shows the off-shoots from the main parent Department in each case :—

Pre-war				Post-war			
1. Defence	1. War			
				2. Defence			
2. External Affairs	3. External Affairs			
3. Finance	4. Finance			
4. Home	(Civil Defence)			
				5. Home			
				6. Information and Broadcasting			
5. Legislative	7. Legislative			
6. Education, Health and Lands			...	8. Commonwealth Relations			
				9. Agriculture			
				10. Health			
				11. Education			
				12. Supply			
7. Commerce	{ Supply	13. Food			
	{ Commerce	14. Industries and Civil Supplies			
		15. Commerce			
8. Labour	16. Labour			
9. Communications	17. War Transport			
				18. Post & Air			
Nil				19. Planning and Development			

At the moment Nos. 2 and 18 ; Nos. 9, 10 and 11 ; Nos. 6 and 14 are in one Port-folio each. The Governor-General-in-Council therefore consists of His Excellency and 14 Members. There are 19 Secretaries, 6 Additional Secretaries, 26 Joint Secretaries, 51 Deputy Secretaries 42 Under Secretaries and 61 Assistant Secretaries, not to mention a certain number of officers under various titles who appear actually to do the work of Secretariate officers. (The figures given above must be regarded as approximate)

At the end of World War II therefore the total officer strength of the 19 Secretariat Departments is something over 200. In other words, during the War the number of Members has doubled, and the number of Departments more than doubled, while the officer staff has more than quadrupled.

11. A preliminary survey seems to indicate that in any future Government there will have to be separate portfolios for

- (1) Defence—War
- (2) External Affairs
- (3) Finance
- (4) Home
- (5) Legislative

None of these can be suitably amalgamated and the only new Department which could, and I think should, be added to any one of them is Commonwealth Relations. This Department still has a certain amount of "war" work connected with "evacuation" and "repatriation", but it should clearly be included in External Affairs as soon as that Portfolio is relinquished by His Excellency and given to a separate Member. This step would not reduce the size of the Government since His Excellency would then remain without a Portfolio.

To these 5 Portfolios a 6th will have to be added if it is decided to retain Information and Broadcasting as a separate Department. I do not see how it could be suitably included in any other Portfolio except possibly, though not very appropriately, that of the Education Member.

I thus arrive at a nucleus of His Excellency plus six Members.

12. It is when one comes to the economic or "nation building" activities of Government that the main difficulty arises. The three pre-war Portfolios comprising the four pre-war Secretariat Departments of —

- (1) Education, Health and Lands,
- (2) Commerce,
- (3) Labour and
- (4) Communications,

have expanded into no less than 8 Portfolios comprising 11 Departments as follows—

Portfolios	Departments
1.	{ 1. Agriculture 2. Health 3. Education
2.	{ 4. Commerce 5. Industries and Civil Supplies (now under the Information Member)
3.	6. Supply
4.	7. Food
5.	8. Labour
6.	9. War Transport
7.	10. Posts and Air
8.	11. Planning and Development

It is in this group (and of course in the War and Finance Departments) that the main "war" expansion has occurred and it is here too that the main post-war developments must take place. What is the smallest suitable frame work into which the 11 Departments can be fitted back? It has already been decided to amalgamate Industries and Civil Supplies with Supply under a single Member. This will not reduce the number of Members, since I & C.S. has never formed a separate portfolio. The removal of I. & C.S. from the Portfolio of the Commerce Member has however given that Member some relief and might justify a re-examination of the business allotted to the Commerce Department with a view to seeing whether any additional items could appropriately be added to it. But, even if this proved impossible, I think it is obvious that there will have to be two Portfolios for Commerce and Industries and Supply. Similar considerations apply to the Labour Portfolio. There is an urgent need for dividing the subjects allotted to it into two, or even three, Secretariat Departments, namely :—

- (1) Labour proper (including Labour Welfare and Legislation),
- (2) Works, and perhaps,
- (3) Mines (including Coal) and Electricity.

The correct allocation of (3) is a difficult matter on which I have received very conflicting views; but the general opinion seems to be that there is hardly a case for a separate Portfolio for Mines and Electricity. The main point I am here concerned with is that the Labour Portfolio, however it may be rearranged, is certainly not too small for one Member. That leaves us with five members and seven Departments as follows :—

Portfolios	Departments
1.	{ 1. Health 2. Education 3. Agriculture
2.	4. Food
3.	5. War Transport
4.	6. Posts and Air
5.	7. Planning and Development

Leaving aside Planning and Development, to which I shall return later, the above Departments seem to me to fall into three natural Groups providing three suitable Portfolios. The first Group is Health and Education, which deal with the physical and mental development of the individual.

The second is Agriculture and Food, which deal in one sense with the prime necessities of life and in another with India's largest industry.

The third is War Transport and Posts and Air, which deal with Communications, or, more properly, Transport and Communications.

It has been suggested to me that the Departments of Agriculture and Food should not be combined because the interests of the producer and the consumer, with which they are respectively concerned, are mutually incompatible. An alternative suggestion, therefore, is that Food should be combined with Health and Agriculture with Education. The conflict of interests referred to above is not peculiar to agricultural products. It occurs also in the sphere of Industries and Supply which, on the argument adduced, ought to be separated. I have little doubt myself that Food and Agriculture ought to go together; but here again my main point is that Food cannot be combined with Agriculture *and* Health *and* Education. The resulting Portfolio would be too much for one Member. Indeed there may well be a demand for a separate Portfolio for Health alone. I doubt whether such a demand need be met; but I would definitely have two Portfolios for the four subjects of Health, Education, Agriculture and Food. This means that the amalgamation of Food with Agriculture (or any other Department) will not reduce the number of Members.

There remains the Communications Group. Here, I think, an early reduction can be made by abolishing the Portfolio of Posts and Air and restoring the pre-war Portfolio of Communications (or, more properly, Communications and Transport). I recognise that the War Transport Portfolio (including railways) is already a heavy charge, especially with all the "Railway Priorities" work that is still necessary; but the justification for the proposal lies in the fact that the amount of really important work requiring the attention of the Member in charge of Posts and Air is not large enough to make a very material addition.

It has been represented to me that, if the old Communications Portfolio is restored, a place in some other Department should be found for "Railway Inspection" (now in Posts and Air), because the public demand an unbiased verdict on railway accidents and think it might not be ensured if the Inspectorate were under the Communications (Railway) Member. I would not myself accept the validity of this argument, which would seem to contain embarrassing implications if generally applied.

13. Putting the conclusions reached in para. 11 along with those reached in para. 12, the position arrived at is a Government consisting of His Excellency (with or without a Departmental Portfolio) and 13 Members, including separate Portfolios for Information and Broadcasting and Planning and Development. In fact the only net reduction secured is that of the Posts & Air Portfolio, since the other amalgamations proposed do not affect the total number of Members. If any further reduction is considered necessary or if it is thought that provision should be made for at least one Member without Portfolio in addition to His Excellency, the desired result can only be achieved either by amalgamating some of the lighter Portfolios, irrespective of the connection between the subjects contained in them, or by adopting some new basis of classification under which the necessity for certain Portfolios will disappear. The lighter Portfolios in the list indicated above would undoubtedly be those of Law and I. & B. The question may also be examined whether a separate "Department" for Planning and Development is intrinsically desirable or necessary.

14. Law, Information and Broadcasting, Planning and Development, and, of course, Finance, are all Departments the activities of which cut across the fields of other Departments, or in which, to put it another way, the line is drawn horizontally rather than vertically. [Labour and Communications are not horizontal Departments in this sense, even though they do serve the needs of other Departments, because their main function is to supply services to the public]. Would there be any advantage in extending the principle of horizontal

Departments? The Maxwell Report (Annexure A to the Maxwell Report), for instance, suggested a "Scientific Department", in which would be grouped such widely diverse activities as Medical and Agricultural Research, the Botanical, Zoological and Geological Surveys of India, Meteorology and Broadcasting. More recently it has been suggested that all Research Agencies of every description should be united under a single Member. There has also been talk of a Department of Statistics; and at one time there was a proposal—adopting yet a different basis of classification—to constitute a separate Department to deal with all the activities of Chief Commissioners' Provinces.

15. My own view, as will be clear from Part I of this note, is that it would be wrong to divide the business of Government according to the character of the work (*e.g.* whether it is scientific or non-scientific) or according to geographical areas. It is far better to group allied activities together and make the Members and Secretaries to whom they are allotted responsible for every aspect of their subjects. This is not to say either

- (a) that the whole business of Government is not inter-related, as it obviously is, or
- (b) that it may not be convenient to provide certain common agencies, either
 - (1) to meet the requirements of all Departments in certain special matters (*e.g.* legal advice or publicity), or
 - (2) to co-ordinate the activities of a group of Departments in some special aspect of their work (*e.g.* planning as opposed to execution)

The question rather is whether it is wise to split the responsibility of individual Departments and risk giving the impression that the credit for the success (or blame for the failure) of particular aspects of their work may be allocated elsewhere. My conclusion is that, so far from extending the principle of horizontal Departments, we should consider the possibility of converting some of them from separate Departments into "common agencies" or Bureaux.

16 No one would suggest for a moment the abolition of the Finance Department; but in support of the view advanced above it might well be argued that the present system of day to day control by that Department tends to blunt the financial conscience of the spending Departments and that better results, combined with a great decrease of work, would be obtained by putting financial responsibility more squarely on the shoulders of the latter; by demanding of them a more intelligent forecast of their future financial requirements and a greater interest in the economical expenditure of their grants; and by providing them with Financial Advisers of their own for these purposes. The view that our present system of financial control is too meticulous is undoubtedly held by most Secretaries to Government, but I doubt whether this very controversial matter falls strictly within my terms of reference. I would only add that there was a great deal to be said, in my opinion, for the principle of the "contract budget" experiment, which was tried in the old Defence Department before the war. Something analogous would appear to be essential if plans for reconstruction and development over a series of years are to be carried out successfully.

17. As to the Legislative Department, it might be argued that what the other Departments require is not a separate Department under a separate Member to take charge of their legal consciences for them. They seek legal advice not because they are required to do so by rule, but because it is in their own interests to get it. Their purposes would be served either by having legal advisers of their own, as is the case in the U., K. though this is a course I would certainly not recommend, or by setting up an Office or Bureau under an officer corresponding roughly to the Attorney-General in England, to which all Departments could apply for legal advice whenever they wanted it. Such an Office would no doubt absorb both the Solicitor's Branch of the Legislative Department and also the Drafting Branch whose business it is, like that of Parliamentary Counsel in the U. K., to draft Bills Ordinances, etc. An arrangement of this kind would necessitate the distribution among other Departments of certain items of work now done by the

Legislative Department, such as that connected with the Council of State, the holding of elections for the Central Legislature, the "Judicial" items taken over during the war from the Home Department, the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal transferred from the Finance Department in 1942, and a few other items. Some of these changes would be intrinsically desirable, especially, I think, the setting up of a small Council of State Department corresponding to the Legislative Assembly Department. On the other hand, the disappearance of the Law Member would terminate a distinguished tradition dating back to the days of Macaulay and would leave the Government without any special representative to speak with authority on the legal aspects of various questions that may arise either in Council or in the Legislature. It is also a fact that the present arrangements work well. I put the suggestion forward not because I am particularly in favour of it myself, but as one practicable method of reducing the size of the Council or providing in it space for some more essential Portfolio.

18. Turning now to the Information and Broadcasting Department, it may be conceded that good expert advice about publicity and propaganda is nowadays as much in the interests of Departments, and almost as essential as good legal advice. There is therefore a need for a "common agency" both to stimulate and advise Departments on the technical aspects of publicity and to provide the machinery for giving effect to it as required. But it seems to me much more doubtful whether a separate Department with a separate Member is needed for this purpose. The volume of "policy" work that need come up to the Member in charge of an established Department of this character must be small; there is no tradition behind the appointment; and the most that can be said is that it may be useful to have such a Member to serve as the mouth-piece of Government on sundry occasions. It may also be argued that it would be desirable to keep a separate Information Department for some time longer until the other Departments have developed a greater "publicity sense" than some of them now possess. I am aware that a suggestion has been made that the Department of Information should also assume responsibility for various aspects of the cultural development of the country, by taking over such items as archaeology, museums libraries, exhibitions, etc., by providing Government scholarships in various branches of art and by pursuing other constructive activities in the cultural field. The idea of a Government Department of Art repels me. The field is eminently one in which real success can only be achieved by private enterprise and the most that Government should aspire to is a liberal patronage of the Arts by suitable grants to deserving Institutions. This can be done just as well through the Education Department. In any case the proposal to tack on "Art" to "Information" does not, in my opinion, greatly increase the justification for a whole time Member or materially weaken the case for a Bureau, as opposed to a Department, for Information and Publicity. If the Bureau idea is pursued, as I recommend it should be, it would presumably be necessary to convert A. I. R. into a Corporation on the B. B. C. analogy. This, I think, would be intrinsically desirable.

19. There remains the Planning and Development Department. Here we have a new Department presided over by a separate Member, which does not simply provide other Departments with some specialized or technical form of service like those already mentioned, but would appear, at any rate from its name, to be responsible for a part—and perhaps the most important part—of all other Department's activities, namely planning. The name, however, is misleading. As I understand the position, this Department does not plan for other Departments, nor does it simply co-ordinate the plans of other Departments. Its function is to arrive after consultation no doubt with all the Central Departments concerned and with Provincial Governments, at a complete post-war development policy for the whole country. This is a function which, with a small Government, might conceivably be performed by the Executive Council itself, in which case the necessary correspondence with Provincial Governments would be carried on by one or other of the existing Departments (perhaps the Finance Department) and no separate Member or Secretary would be required. Owing to the size of the Government, and the magnitude of the task itself, there may be justification, at any

rate for a limited period, for a separate Member with a separate Portfolio and a separate Secretary to perform this function. In that case, I would prefer to speak of a Development Department rather than a Department of Planning and Development. But even when its task has been completed, the need for co-ordination will remain; and I do not think there should ever be a separate Department of Co-ordination. Here again what is wanted is a "common agency" rather than a separate Department, but a "common agency" of a different character from those already discussed. Its function would be to co-ordinate the activities of all the Departments concerned, within the frame work of the accepted policy of development, not to supply them with specialized information or advice.

20. What all this has been leading up to is the propositions

- (a) that the distribution of the business of Government should be based as far as possible on vertical rather than horizontal divisions;
- (b) that the list of Portfolios towards which we may aim provisionally should be—
 - (1) Defence—War
 - (2) External Affairs Commonwealth Relations
 - (3) Home
 - (4) Commerce
 - (5) Industries—Supply
 - (6) Transport and Communications (including Railways, War Transport and Posts & Air)
 - (7) Labour (or some new title depending on the splitting up of the work now done by this Department)
 - (8) Food—Agriculture
 - (9) Education—Health, to which *must* be added
 - (10) Finance, to which probably *should* be added
 - (11) Law, to which again *may* be added for a limited period
 - (12) Development, and finally, perhaps,
 - (13) A spare Member; and
- (c) that a place should be found preferably not under the wing of any particular Department, for a number of "common agencies" for the purpose of—
 - (1) co-ordination, and
 - (2) the supply of specialized information or advice to all Departments.

21. The problem would be where to provide the "place" referred to above. The "co-ordination" requirement has already been recognised by the constitution of the Co-ordinating Committee of Council with its whole time Secretary. The main functions of this organization at present are to concentrate attention on the most vital issues confronting the Government as a whole and to render every possible assistance in expediting the disposal of important business. Such functions are, perhaps, most satisfactorily performed at Secretary's level—that is to say before Departments have been committed by their Members and before disputes have reached a point where the authority of Government as a whole is required to settle them. This does not however mean that there is no need for co-ordinating machinery at a higher level without bringing in the full Council. There are several spheres in which I suggest that such machinery, in the form of Standing Committees of Council presided over, if possible, by a non-departmental chairman, is likely to be required in a Government of the size contemplated, especially if it assumes a "political" complexion. Apart from the field of post-war Development, there is the field of Defence, which touches on so many aspects of the work of the Civil Department; the field of Scientific Research; and, in times

of internal unrest, the field of Law and Order. The ultimate development of the existing machinery for co-ordination may, indeed, well be something in the nature of the "Cabinet Office" in England. Under a Ministerial form of Government such an Office would no doubt be presided over by the Chief Minister and might provide a "place" not only for Standing Committees of the kind suggested above, but also, possibly for some of the "common agencies" which I have in mind. An example would be a Bureau of Economic and Statistical Advice, which would settle the question whether the present Economic Adviser should be attached to the Commerce Department or the Finance Department and which, besides giving economic advice would co-ordinate the statistical work of a number of different Departments. Other examples might also be found, but need not be specified at this stage. I am thinking of the sort of "common agencies" which would supply expert advice of one kind or another, but which would not perform executive functions or require "administration".

22. This, however, is looking some way ahead. For the moment, the practical question is where to find a "place" for such "common agencies" as the Government's publicity machine, if my view is accepted that a separate Portfolio of Information and Broadcasting is not necessary. A big organization of this kind requires a great deal of administration. Some Department, it may be argued, must therefore administer it and must be responsible for providing the funds required and carrying on the correspondence with Provincial Governments, or answering the questions in the Legislature, which may arise in connection with its activities. At this point I would like to bring in another idea that has occurred to me. This is that we should set up a Central Administrative Office on the analogy of what has already been done on the Army side to take over as much as possible of the work connected with the internal economy of the Secretariat which is now apt to flood the different Departments. I refer to such matters as the provision and allocation of office accommodation, the supply of office equipment, the maintenance and enforcement of rules of office procedure (most important), the training of clerks and possibly also junior officers, hours of work and holidays, the administration of the messenger staff, security arrangements, the welfare of the ministerial and menial establishments (canteens, etc.) and perhaps certain other functions which are now assigned to the Public Section of the Home Department, such as arrangements for ceremonies of various kinds. I believe that a common organization of this kind would relieve Departments of a mass of work that should not really occupy the time of senior officers (and sometimes even of Council itself) and thus enable them to devote their energies more completely to their legitimate public duties. The set up of such an office would require further study. The chief requirement is that it should be accepted as important and therefore be manned by really suitable officers with a big man at its head. He might have outposts in Departments or groups of Departments, or the Departments might have administrative officers of their own, whose activities he would superintend and co-ordinate. In either case these officers should be well paid and selected for special aptitude for the work. The present idea that the routine internal administration of a Department can be left largely to an Assistant Secretary, and that anything above that level may have to go up to the highest authorities, is to my mind entirely wrong.

If an office of this kind were set up, I should like to put the publicity organization in with it. If both these organizations must be put under the wing of some Member and some department, that is where my 13th Member (para 20) would come in. The Department might be called the "General Department". The Member might also suitably preside over some of the Standing Committees referred to in para 21 and thus pave the way to a Chief Minister's Department or Cabinet office of the future.

23. Finally there is a matter of some delicacy, but of great importance, to which I must refer because it forms part of my general scheme for clearing the ground and leaving the higher officers of Government free to devote practically the whole of their energies to their public functions. Much of the time of officers, from the highest to the lowest, is at present occupied with the

affairs of their own employees—their recruitment, appointment, pay, promotion, transfer, discipline and conditions of service generally, as well as with the “grievances” of individuals. It is necessary work; there are aspects of it which are of great importance and must remain the direct concern of Government, especially at a time when so much is heard about corruption in the Services; but much of it can hardly be called “public” business. The evils that may flow from “patronage” under any form of popular or party Government have been recognised. These dangers are probably greater in India than elsewhere owing to the communal problem. To meet them we have our own Selection Board and Establishment Officer (who is at present located in the Finance Department); and also the Statutory Public Service Commission set up by Chapter III of Part X of the Constitution Act. The former handles certain appointments in the Government of India; the latter deals with the recruitment of certain Services and with “all disciplinary matters” affecting certain classes of officers “serving His Majesty in a civil capacity in India, including memorials and petitions relating to such matters”. The Commission cannot however cover the whole field; and there is thus a large residue of “personal cases” which have to be dealt with departmentally. I fully realise that those Members of Council who represent a particular community are compelled to take a special interest in appointments and disciplinary cases as they affect that community. Their representative character would be largely impaired if they did not do so. At the same time it is no good laying down the general principle that Members and Secretaries should confine themselves mainly to matters of policy, if in fact much of the time of the former, and therefore also of the latter, has to be devoted to such cases. Both of them would, I imagine, welcome relief from such work, if they could reasonably disclaim responsibility for it; and the only way in which that could be done, so far as I can see, would be by an extension of the Public Service Commission idea. The independence of the existing Commission has won public recognition over a limited field; as at present constituted it could hardly be expected to take on a much wider one; but everything possible should be done to develop the principles on which it works; and, if these propositions are generally approved, I would like to consider further the possibility either of enlarging the existing Commission or, perhaps, of setting up separate bodies of the same independent character to serve the needs of those Departments (*e. g.* Railways and Posts and Telegraphs) which have very large numbers of employees.

R. TOTTENHAM.

Dated the 1st December 1945.

SUMMARY OF REPORT NO. II

PART I

1. I take it that my first three terms of reference mean briefly that I am to make proposals—

- (a) for the future set up of the Government of India,
- (b) for the system on which it is to work, and
- (c) for the means of providing it with officers of the type and in the numbers required.

If I am to begin with the first of these, as seems inevitable, it would appear necessary to secure agreement to certain fundamental principles so as to ensure that I am building on acceptable foundations.

2. I make the following assumptions.

- (1) The kind of Government for which I am to plan
 - (a) will have to work under the present Constitution Act;
 - (b) may consist of party politicians, except for the Commander-in-Chief; and
 - (c) will be committed to spending large sums of money on post-war reconstruction and development.
- (2) While maintaining the principle of collective responsibility, the object should be to ensure that each Member accepts as complete responsibility as possible for every aspect of the administration of the subjects allotted to his Portfolio, the general conception of Government being that it is the Nation's common instrument for expanding its social and economic welfare in all spheres in which individuals or private associations cannot achieve equally effective results.
- (3) While the Executive Council should be large enough to deal with all the more important issues that will confront it and to represent Government adequately in both Houses of the Legislature, the ideal would be that it should be small enough to co-ordinate the main activities of its Members; but the largest number of persons that can co-ordinate efficiently is, probably, 8 and, if that number is exceeded, some additional machinery for co-ordination will be required.

3. What the actual size of the Government should be must depend on the character of the functions of its three main component parts

- (1) the Member,
- (2) the Secretary, and
- (3) the Executive Head.

Very broadly speaking I suggest that the function of the Member is to decide policy; of the Secretary to provide the material on which to reach such decisions and to see that they are followed up; and of the Executive Head to carry the decisions into effect. [In order to avoid confusion about the word "Department", I propose to speak of the "Portfolio" of a Member, the "Department" of a Secretary and the "Service" or "Directorate" of an Executive Head]

4. While the cessation of hostilities and the ever present need for economy and "workability" point towards the reduction of the size of the Government, the necessity for continuing for an indefinite period certain war time controls, the programme of post-war reconstruction, and the longer term possibility of constitutional changes would appear to operate as checks to any such process. My general conclusion therefore is that the target to be aimed at is a smaller governmental organization than at present, but that the process of contraction will have to be gradual. Since personal and other factors, which I cannot foresee, may be involved in such a process, I think I should

confine myself to the final set-up and make no recommendations as to the stages by which it should be reached.

5. I should like to know how far the assumptions I have made above are accepted.

PART II

6. Before the war the Government of India consisted of His Excellency and 7 Members. There were 9 Departments—Defence, External Affairs, Finance, Home, Legislative, Education, Health and Lands, Commerce, Labour and Communications. Commerce and Labour were in one Portfolio. There were 9 Secretaries and about 40 other Secretariat officers.

7. The Government of India at present consists of His Excellency and 14 Members. The 9 pre-war Departments have expanded into 19—War, Defence, External Affairs, Finance, Home, Information and Broadcasting, Legislative, Commonwealth Relations, Agriculture, Health, Education, Supply, Food, Industries and Civil Supplies, Commerce, Labour, War Transport, Posts and Air, and Planning and Development. At the moment Defence and Posts and Air are in one Portfolio; there is also one Portfolio for Agriculture, Health and Education; and another for I. & B. and I. & C. S. There are 19 Secretaries and nearly 200 other Secretariat officers. In other words, during the war the number of Members has doubled and the number of Departments more than doubled, while the officer staff has more than quadrupled.

8. It has already been decided to abolish the Defence Department and to amalgamate I. & C. S. with Supply. Neither of these changes will reduce the number of Members. It seems obvious that Commonwealth Relations should be amalgamated with External Affairs as soon as that Portfolio is relinquished by His Excellency and given to a separate Member; but this again would not reduce the size of the Government since His Excellency would then remain without a Portfolio. The main increase has taken place inside the three pre-war Portfolios comprising the four pre-war Departments of E. H. & L., Commerce, Labour, and Communications. These have expanded into eight Portfolios and 11 Departments—Agriculture, Health and Education (one Portfolio), Commerce and I. & C. S. (originally one Portfolio, but I. & C. S. now under Information Member), Supply (one Portfolio), Food (one Portfolio), Labour (one Portfolio), War Transport (one Portfolio), Posts and Air (one Portfolio) and Planning and Development (one Portfolio). Apart from the decisions already reached, other fairly obvious possibilities are—

- (a) The combination of Food and Agriculture, and
- (b) The re-amalgamation of War Transport and Posts and Air.

As regards (a), the amalgamation of Food and Agriculture is opposed by the latter on the ground that the interests of the consumer and the producer, with which they are respectively concerned, are mutually incompatible. An alternative suggestion is that Food should be combined with Health and Agriculture with Education. I do not accept the validity of the argument mentioned above and consider that Food and Agriculture should be combined; but I do not think that this step would reduce the number of Members since two Portfolios would be required for the four subjects of Health, Education, Agriculture and Food

As regards (b), the re-amalgamation of Posts and Air with War Transport in the pre-war Portfolio of Communications I regard as practicable at an early date. The Communications, or, more properly, Transport and Communications, Portfolio (including Railways) would no doubt be heavy, but the amount of work at Member's level in the Posts and Air Department is not, I think so great as to make a very material addition. This step would result in a reduction of one Member.

The resulting position if these changes are made, would be a Government consisting of His Excellency (with or without Portfolio) and 13 Members :—

- (1) War—Defence.
- (2) External Affairs Department—Commonwealth Relations,

- (3) Home,
- (4) Information and Broadcasting,
- (5) Finance,
- (6) Legislative,
- (7) Commerce,
- (8) Industries—Supply,
- (9) Communications—War Transport—Posts & Air.
- (10) Labour,
- (11) Food—Agriculture,
- (12) Education—Health, and
- (13) Planning and Development.

I recognise that Labour is at present a very large and unwieldy Department, which may have to be divided into—

- (a) Labour proper,
- (b) Works, and
- (c) Mines, Fuel and Power.

The last of these might more appropriately be transferred to the Portfolio of Industries and Supply, although the matter is controversial and will require further discussion. I do not think there is a case for a separate Portfolio of Mines, Fuel and Power.

9. If any further reduction is considered necessary, or if it is thought that provision should be made for at least one Member without Portfolio in addition to His Excellency, the desired result can only be achieved either by amalgamating some of the lighter Portfolios, irrespective of the connection between the subjects contained in them—a course which is not recommended—or by adopting some new principle under which the necessity for certain Portfolios would disappear. The Departments which may come under consideration from this point of view are, I suggest, Law, I. & B. and Planning and Development.

10. The three Departments mentioned above, and, of course, Finance, are all Departments the activities of which cut across the fields of other Departments and which to that extent offend against the principal that each Member should accept as complete responsibility as possible for every aspect of the administration of the subjects allotted to his Portfolio. They may be called “horizontal” Departments. Proposals for an extension of the horizontal principle have been made in the past. The Maxwell Report suggested a “Scientific Department”. More recently it has been suggested that all Research Agencies should be united under a single Portfolio. At one time there was a somewhat different proposal to constitute a separate department to deal with all the activities of Chief Commissioners’ Provinces. I adhere to the view that it is better to group allied “subjects” together in “vertical” divisions; but I recognise that it may be desirable to provide certain “common agencies” to meet the requirements of all Departments in certain special matters and also that, in a Government of the size contemplated, some supplementary machinery for “coordination” will be necessary. So far from extending the principle of horizontal departments, the possibility of converting some of the existing horizontal departments, into “common agencies” or Bureaux should be considered.

11. Applying these considerations to the Departments mentioned, I reach the following conclusions—

- (a) Finance Department. There can be no question of abolition; but the general opinion is that the present system of day to day financial control is too meticulous and tends to blunt the financial conscience of the spending departments. The possibility of putting financial responsibility more squarely on the shoulders of the latter should be pursued.
- (b) Legislative Department. Departments seek legal advice because it is in their interest to do so. Their purposes would be served

by having legal advisers of their own (though this is not recommended) or by setting up a Bureau of legal advice to which all Departments could apply. There is no absolute necessity for a Law Member, but there are historical and other reasons for not abolishing the appointment. The suggestion is mentioned merely as one practicable method of reducing the size of the Council or providing space for some more essential Portfolio, if it is desired to do so.

- (c) I. & B. Department. The need for a "common agency" both to stimulate and advise Departments on the technical aspects of publicity and to provide the machinery for giving effect to it as required is admitted; but the requirements of Departments in this respect could be met by having a Publicity Bureau rather than a separate Department under a separate Member. The volume of "policy" work that need come to the Member in charge of an established Department of this character must be small. The justification for a separate Member would not be materially increased by tacking on the subject of "Art" to "Information", as has recently been suggested. I am opposed to the idea of a Government Department of Art on the ground that this is a field in which individuals or private associations can achieve equally effective results [see Part I, para. 2 (2)].

I recommend that the idea of creating a "Bureau for Information and Publicity" should be pursued, though not necessarily at once. As a corollary it would be necessary also to pursue the proposal (already under consideration) to convert A. I. R. into a Corporation on the B. B. C. analogy.

- (d) Planning and Development. As I understand the position, this Department does not (as its name might suggest) plan for other Departments nor does it simply co-ordinate the plans of other Departments. Its function is, after consultation with all concerned including Provincial Governments, to arrive at a complete post-war developments policy for the whole country. For this purpose a separate Member and Department are justified, although perhaps only for a limited period. If, however, the Department were to disappear, the need for co-ordination in the sphere of development would still remain.

12. My net conclusion is that it would be possible, and also desirable, to reduce the figure of 13 in para. 8 above to 12 by abolishing the Portfolio of Information and Broadcasting and that a further reduction to 11 might follow after some years by abolishing the Portfolio of Planning and Development. On the other hand, if either of these steps were taken, it would be highly desirable to create a spare Member for the purposes described below. This would bring the number back again to 13 or, perhaps, eventually to 12.

13. The need for a spare Member is based on the following considerations—

- (a) There will probably always be a need for standing Committees of Council to co-ordinate various groups of activities. The present Co-ordinating Committee of Council, with its whole time Secretary, may eventually develop into a Chief Minister's Department or, possibly, something in the nature of the "Cabinet Office" in England. For the present such Standing Committees as may be necessary would be better presided over, if possible, by a nondepartmental Chairman.
- (b) If the idea of setting up a Publicity Bureau, instead of a Department of Information, is to be pursued, a place must be found for it under some Member, since it will require to be administered and will have to carry on correspondence with Provincial Governments, etc. It would be better not to attach such a Bureau to any existing Department.
- (c) Publicity is not the only sphere in which a central bureau may be desirable. Another suggestion I should like to pursue is that a "Central Administrative Office" (on the analogy of what has

already been done on the Army side) should be set up to take over as much as possible of the work connected with the internal economy of the Secretariat, which is now apt to flood Departments. The provision and allocation of office accommodation, the supply of office equipment, office procedure, security and welfare arrangements and many other items of work could be allotted to such an office, thus leaving Secretariat officers more time to devote to their legitimate public duties. The importance of the Office would have to be recognised by placing a big man at its head, and it might also come under the wing of the spare Member.

14. Finally, as a further means of "clearing the ground" and leaving the higher officers of Government free to devote their energies to their public functions, I recommend further examination of the possibility either of extending the scope of the present Federal Public Service Commission or of setting up separate Commissions of this kind in those Departments which have a very large number of employees. The object would be to relieve Members and Secretariat officers of much of the work at present involved in dealing with the affairs of their Staffs and Services in the matter of recruitment, promotion, discipline and so on.

15. I should like to know whether I may.

- (a) work to the scheme of 12 or 13 Members as set forth above, and
- (b) pursue the subsidiary proposals related to the setting up of a Central Administrative and Publicity Office and the development of the Public Service Commission idea.

Dated the 1st December 1945.

R. TOTTENHAM.

NOTES

In para. 14 of the summary above Sir Richard Tottenham asks for instructions on matters which have to be decided as a foundation for his further work.

2. I have discussed this with him. I think it would be suitable that he should be instructed to go ahead on the assumptions stated by him. That would not be understood as committing either His Excellency or me when a final decision is to be made.

3. A fuller statement of his proposals will be found in the Report above the summary.

His Excellency may perhaps wish to discuss the matter with Sir Richard Tottenham.

J. A. T. [HORNE].

Dated the 16th December 1945.

H. E. has considered Sir Richard Tottenham's summary. He finds it impossible to give any guidance at present as regards the probable number of Members of a new Executive Council. But he thinks that Sir R. Tottenham will be able to go ahead without such guidance. What is important is that the Departments themselves should be properly organized, and H. E. hopes that the grouping under Members of Council can be settled later. On the specific proposals that I. & B. Department and Legislative Department might function without Members, H. E. does not propose to express an opinion at present.

2. So long as the present constitution continues in force, H. E. thinks that the Co-ordination Committee of Council should be extra-departmental, *i.e.* under himself. The position would be completely changed if there were a Prime Minister.

3. H. E. thinks the proposal for a Central Administrative Office should certainly be pursued. He would also like Sir R. Tottenham to pursue the proposal in paragraph 11 of his note that Departments should be given greater financial responsibility. He also agrees that it is well worth looking into the question whether the Public Service Commission principle could not be given wider application so as to relieve senior officers of duties connected with staff problems.

4. H. E. hopes that this provides the guidance that Sir R. Tottenham needs in order to go ahead. He would of course be glad to see Sir R. Tottenham if discussion is considered advisable.

G. E. B. ABELL.

Dated the 24th December 1945.

INTERIM REPORT No. III

BIFURCATION OF LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The present Labour Department is, by common knowledge reinforced by such statistics as I have been able to obtain, the largest Department in the Government of India outside the Finance Department and, for the present, the War Department. In my earlier report (No. II), I expressed the opinion that it would have to be split up into, possibly, three Departments, viz.—(1) Labour proper ; (2) Works and (3) Mines, Fuel and Power.

I doubted, however, whether more than one Member's Portfolio would be required.

2. Since then the matter has been discussed with all concerned and I reproduce here the record of a meeting on the subject, which was held on January 3rd and which was attended by the Secretaries of the Labour, Agriculture and Planning and Development Departments, a representative of the Supply Department, the Secretary Co-ordinating Committee of Council and myself :—

- “1. It was agreed that the subjects of “power,” (from whatever source) and “water” must go together and that they should be allotted to a department (which for the time being may be called Department X) which was not itself a prime user of water or power for agricultural or industrial purposes. It was noted that the Supply Department considered that some time would have to elapse before they could hand over the production and distribution of coal, for which they are at present responsible.
2. The general view was that any Department which was responsible for power and water should also take over (a) mines and minerals, and (b) works, including buildings, roads, irrigation and hydro-electric schemes ; the former because minerals such as coal and oil are sources of power and it would be administratively inconvenient for some mines and minerals to be under one Department and others under another ; the latter because of the intimate connection between all branches of civil engineering and the practical impossibility of putting works connected with water under one Department and other works under another Department. The Supply Department did not agree as regards works.

It was further agreed—

- (a) that with mines and minerals should go safety provisions in mines, but not labour welfare ;
 - (b) that it would be preferable for all mines, including the railway collieries and salt, to be included in Department X, but that these points would have to be finally decided after further consultation with the Railway and Finance Departments ;
 - (c) that petroleum products of all kinds, whether produced in India or obtained by import, should be included, with the proviso that the co-ordination of control at present exercised by the War Department would have to continue for some time longer (Note.—Supply, War Transport and Industries and Civil Supplies are each exercising control at present over certain items under this head) ;
 - (d) that, while Department X, under the heading of mines and minerals, would be primarily concerned with production, it would also have to deal with the distribution of certain products including oil, coal and mica, and with the distribution, although not the production, of power alcohol ;
 - (e) that gas, explosives and boilers should all be included under the heading of power.
3. It was agreed that the subject of “Labour” would have to form a separate Secretary's charge, whether it was eventually included in the same Portfolio, as Department X or not. Some doubt was felt whether Department X would not itself constitute too heavy a charge for a single Secretary, and whether it would not be better to divide it into two charges. Mr. Prior held that this would not be necessary if there was a proper definition and allocation of functions between the Secretariat on the one hand and the executive Services and advisory bodies concerned on the other, and if, as was the intention, the Secretary was relieved of “estate” work (provision and allocation of office and residential accommodation) and, possibly, of “printing and stationery”. A final decision on the point whether Department X should form a single Secretary's charge might, however, be postponed until a closer assessment had been made of the work involved.”

3. It will be seen from the above that general agreement was reached, although the representative of the Supply Department did not agree to “works” being combined with “power and mines”, and the points whether “salt” (now in Finance Department) and “Railway collieries” (now in the Railway Department) should be transferred to the proposed Department X were left over for further discussion with the Departments concerned. The Finance Department are opposed to the transfer of salt, pointing out that the connection between power and salt is extremely remote ; that salt is also derived from sources other than mines ; and that salt, being a Government monopoly, may well continue to be administered as at present. The Railway Department have not yet sent their final views, but have stated that they would prefer to retain control of their coal mines after the present emergency has passed, on the ground that it would be difficult to implement a consistent policy based on commercial considerations if an important part of the assets were controlled by some other Department.

I have little doubt myself that railway collieries should go into the new Department. There is no reason why it should not administer these collieries in the interests of the railways and the whole country just as well as, or perhaps better than, the Railway Department itself. I would not, however, press for the transfer of salt. The welfare of the labour employed on salt extraction can remain with the Labour Department and, if necessary, expert advice on the mining aspects and safety provisions in salt mines could be obtained from the new Department X.

4. It will be seen that my original proposal to divide the Labour Department into three has been modified into a bifurcation, although there is still some doubt whether the work of Department X—which may be called the Department of Works, Mines and Power—will not prove too heavy for a single Secretary. Further relief would be afforded if, as I intend to propose, the subjects of office and residential accommodation and also, perhaps, printing and stationery (with the Government Presses) are taken away and placed in my suggested Central Administrative Office.

5. I had intended to make these proposals in my final report covering the whole ground. I have been informed, however, that His Excellency attaches importance to securing an early decision in this matter; and I understand that the present Secretary in the Labour Department is likely to be going shortly and it would no doubt be desirable to make use of his experience in organizing the new arrangements. I therefore recommend that the present Labour Department should be divided into two as early as possible. The new Labour Department would deal over the whole field, except in regard to Indian seamen, which is the concern of the Commerce Department, with labour welfare; employers liability and workmen's compensations; health insurance including invalidity pensions; and old age pensions. It would also deal with unemployment insurance; trade unions and industrial and labour disputes; various schemes for technical and vocational training in India and abroad; the movements of population within India; and post-war resettlement and labour exchanges. It would also, of course, attend to international labour matters. There is also still some war work connected with the administration of the National Service (Technical Personnel) Ordinance; unskilled labour supplies; and the Civil Pioneer Force. I think this would give quite enough work for a single Secretary.

6. The new Department of Works, Mines and Power would take all civil engineering relating to buildings, roads, irrigation, flood control, drainage and hydro-electric schemes. It would take over all mines, except salt mines, and safety provisions therein; the Geological Survey of India; and the Indian School of Mines. Under the heading of power would come electricity, boilers, gas, explosives and all aspects of petroleum and petroleum products. For some time it may be necessary for coal production to remain with the Supply Department; for the co-ordinating work relating to petroleum products to remain with the War Department; and for petrol rationing to remain with War Transport. The Industries and Supply Department also at present deals with diesel and furnace oil, road tar and bitumen, kerosine etc. These would all go eventually into the new Department. The work connected with the distribution of oil, coal, mica and power alcohol will also need departmental adjustment. For all these reasons it is desirable that an experienced officer should be placed in charge of the organization of the new Department and that his opinion should be obtained in due course whether it is likely to form too heavy a charge for a single Secretary.

R. TOTTENHAM,—26-1-46.

H.M. Home.
P.S.V.

Note.—The Home Member expressed general agreement with these proposals and His Excellency thereafter remitted them to the Co-ordinating Committee of Council for consideration. The Committee, at a meeting held on the 21st February, accepted the principle of the proposals and considered that it would be better, at any rate to start with, not further to sub-divide the proposed Department of Works, Mines and Power. The allocation of Railway collieries was left over for further examination.

The final orders of Government have not yet been received.

R. TOTTENHAM, 26-2-46.

REPORT No. IV

RE-ORGANIZATION OF SECRETARIAT

PART I—GENERAL

1. *Introductory—Nomenclature of officers and their charges—Nature of their functions.*—I start by making three suggestions.

(a) In this report I shall have to refer frequently to the various grades of officers in the Secretariat and also to the scheme mentioned in my third term of reference for the introduction of the United Kingdom system, with its entirely different grade names. The use of this unaccustomed nomenclature has already caused considerable confusion and my first plea is that it should be dropped altogether. Our own grades of officers are—

- (1) Secretary,
- (2) Additional Secretary.
- (3) Joint Secretary,
- (4) Deputy Secretary,
- (5) Under Secretary, and
- (6) Assistant Secretary ;

below which comes the "Office" consisting of—

- (a) Superintendents,
- (b) Assistants, and
- (c) Clerks.

We may recognise that the permanent Under Secretaries of State in England corresponds roughly to our Secretary, the Deputy and Assistant Under Secretaries of State to our Additional and Joint Secretaries ; the Principal Assistant Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries to our Deputy Secretaries ; and that the Principals and Assistant Principals do the work that is done by our Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries plus our Superintendents and Assistants. But let us adhere to our own terminology. If we were to convert our Superintendents and Assistants into "officers", they would thus be the only grades for which it might be necessary to adopt new titles.

(b) I also suggest that a stereotyped nomenclature should be adopted to describe the different units in the Secretariat. I shall myself refer to the Department of a Secretary, the Wing of an Additional or Joint Secretary (where these must remain), the Division of a Deputy Secretary, the Branch of an Under Secretary and the Section of a Superintendent or Assistant in charge (or whatever officer may replace these). It does not matter much what words are used to denote these "charges", so long as there is uniformity. At present there seem to be none.

(c) It is important that there should be an agreed conception of the respective functions of our own present grades of officers. The general system is that of the "filter". It is the duty of each grade of officer to dispose of as much work as he can and see that only the most important cases reach the top officer. In my opinion there is, or should be, no distinction of function, but only of pay, between a Joint and an Additional Secretary. In both cases their correct function is to relieve the Secretary of a block of work and to deal direct with the Member so far as that work is concerned. They should only be required in those Departments, such as Finance and War, which are too large for a single Secretary, but which cannot be divided because their work does not fall into separable divisions. The justification for giving an Additional Secretary more pay than a Joint Secretary is that he is, or should be, an officer of such seniority as to render it inappropriate to give him the pay of the latter. The justification for giving both of them more pay than a Deputy Secretary is that they are supposed to exercise a much higher degree of responsibility. Where they are correctly employed, as above, they take decisions at the same level as a Secretary and the nature of their responsibilities is not so different as the gap between their emoluments and those of a Secretary would imply. Where they are incorrectly employed as glorified Deputy Secretaries and submit their cases through the Secretary to the Member—and I am afraid this is often the case at present, perhaps for unavoidable reasons—the nature of their responsibility differs little from that of a Deputy Secretary. They can always share it with an officer above them and there is no real reason to pay them more. Additional and Joint Secretaries should not be either cheap Secretaries or expensive Deputy Secretaries.

The grade of Deputy Secretary is at present debased—again perhaps for unavoidable reasons. Many Deputy Secretaries now are doing the kind of work that Under Secretaries should do if Under Secretaries were available ; but their paper "status", I think, deters them from exercising that personal control over the office which is one of the proper functions of an Under Secretary. In my opinion the Deputy Secretary should be an officer of considerable seniority competent to dispose of a very large amount of work on behalf of the Secretary and able, as his title implies, to deputise for him when the need arises. He should, in fact be nearer to the present incorrect conception of a Joint Secretary.

There is, or should be, little, if any, real difference between the functions of an Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary, and both should be of a rather better type than we are getting at present ; I would like to abolish one of these terms altogether—preferably the latter. We should then be left with three broad grades of officers :—

- (1) Top grade—Secretary, with Additional or Joint Secretary (in the few cases where they are justified) on only a slightly lower level ;

(2) Middle grade—Deputy Secretary ;

(3) Lower grade—Under Secretary.

Whether a fourth officer grade should be added in place of our Superintendents and Assistants is one of the main points for consideration. If these suggestions are accepted, it would always be possible, and might be desirable, to revise the pay scales of the different grades of officers so as to avoid too marked a gap between any of them. Personally I would be in favour of incremental scales for each grade, including that of Secretary, and I would lessen the difference between the pay of Secretariat and District Officers. If the former are to get more pay than the latter, it should be based much more than at present on the increased cost of living at Headquarters, though I realise that, so far as Indian Officers are concerned, Headquarters with their education facilities may be little more expensive than the mufassal.

2. *Statement of problem—The scheme for a Central Civil Service.*—Assuming that we are to have a Government containing X Portfolios and that a Portfolio may contain more than one Department, the next step is to determine the number of Departments and the sort of Secretariat staff that will be required to man them, on the broad assumption that the main function of the Secretary is to provide the Member with the Material on which to reach policy decisions, to communicate these decisions to the Executive Heads and to ensure that they are followed up. Much will depend on the system on which the secretariat is to work and how it is to be staffed. I must, therefore, now take up the proposal for a Central Civil Service which was placed before the Committee of Secretaries referred to in my third term of reference.

3. *The existing system.*—The main features of our existing system, which is well enough understood, are as follows—

(a) the officers are supplied mainly by borrowing from the Provinces, to which most of them are expected to return after a spell of work in the secretariat. There is no separate cadre of permanent Secretariat officers.

(b) The permanent element is provided by the "office"—a Central Service (Class II) known as the Imperial Secretariat Service. Only a few individuals are promoted from this Service to hold officers' appointments, mainly hitherto in the grade of Assistant Secretary.

(c) Both the officers and the "office" are divided into functional grades. At the bottom are the routine clerks who attend to such work as registering, recording, typing, despatch, etc. Then come the Assistants and Superintendents, who do "case work" and are responsible for putting up files for the orders of an officer in proper form. Finally there are the different grades of officers, each of which is supposed to "screen" the next higher grade.

(d) Each Department is required by rule to consult any other Department that may be interested or concerned before disposing of a case ; and this is generally done by sending the whole file to the Department or Departments concerned.

(e) Our Secretaries are Secretaries to the Government of India as a whole and not to any particular Member of it. It would be a good thing if this could be given more practical recognition than appears to be the case. I confess that I have been somewhat shocked by the intensity of the departmental feeling that I have come across in the course of my investigations.

4. *Advantages of the existing system.*—The advantages of this system, if it is properly worked, are

(a) that it ensures having as officers men who have been, and are likely again to be, in touch with practical administration, who are accustomed to taking decisions, and who are, therefore, more anxious to get things done than to find reasons for not doing them ;

(b) that it provides a fair division of labour and assigns a definite function to each part of the machine ; and

(c) that it provides the simplest possible method of keeping Departments in touch with each other, so long as the number of Departments is not very large.

It is no use belittling the first of these advantages. "The toad beneath the harrow" does know "exactly where each tooth point goes"; and it is of primary importance that those who govern should know what is administratively practicable and what being governed means.

5. *Disadvantages of the existing system.*—The disadvantages of the system can be summed up in the two phrases—"excessive noting" and "file shifting", the combined effect of which is "delay" and inefficiency". These evils have been recognised by every Committee and every special officer who has ever dealt the subject, and probably by every officer who has ever been in the Secretariat. Yet they persist. Why? Partly because they are inherent in the system itself. If consistency and continuity of Government policy are held to be essential (as they must be within reason) and if the element of continuity has to be supplied by the "office" (as it must largely be if the officers are continually changing), the need for the "office note" immediately appears. The "office", if it is to justify its existence (and incidentally, perhaps its expansion), must play for safety. It must put its officers—and especially its newly joined officers—fully into the picture ; and the inevitable tendency is to make "heavier weather" over this business than is really necessary. The newly joined officer, on the other hand, is forced to rely on the "office" for guidance. He gets caught up in the machine; and soon he has so much work to do that he cannot afford the time to reflect whether he is doing it in the best way. The tradition dies hard that a man's career may be made, or marred, by the length of his notes on those collections of paper which have been described as the Kensa! Green of greatness". Moreover there is the rule which the office" is careful to bring to the notice, that other Departments concerned must be consulted, and it is fatally easy to form the habit of

postponing or avoiding a decision by marking the file to some other Department. Finally, with the increase in the number of Departments, the device of sending the file to all who may be interested or concerned ceases to be a simple and convenient process and becomes a source of intolerable delay. These *are* inherent defects—the last only of recent origin; but the persistence of the evils to which they give rise is at least partially due to the disregard of orders designed to reduce them. Many devices to that end have been suggested and accepted in the past—the substitution of personal discussion for further noting; the limit on the number of notes to be recorded at any one stage by the “office” or officers; restrictions on interdepartmental references except under the orders of an officer of a particular rank; and so on. These devices are not panaceas; some of them, in my opinion, are of doubtful value; but the main reason why they are ignored is that we have no really satisfactory Secretariat Instructions and those that do exist are not sufficiently known to the officers who are supposed to enforce them. I shall suggest remedies for this state of affairs at a later stage. For the moment I would only add that it is not a defect of our present *system* that it is difficult or impossible to get officers of the number and type required to work it. The system itself *could*, in course of time, be made to produce them; but it is largely the present shortage that has prompted the new proposal. Nor is it due to any similar defect that Government in the past—if this is true—has only functioned on a “care and maintenance” basis, just keeping the machine ticking over, doing its best to solve the problems presented to it, but displaying little initiative or desire to launch out into new policies.

6. *The case for a change.*—The case for a change of system on the lines of the scheme put before the Committee of Secretaries is that the present machine has broken down under the stress of war (and, presumably also, owing to the comparatively poor quality of the large number of temporary men who have had to be employed during the war) and that it will certainly be unequal to the tasks of post-war reconstruction and development unless it is radically altered and strengthened. This can only be done, it is argued, by creating a Central Civil Service on the White-hall model, which will substitute for the “case-noting” section of the “office” a number of officers (smaller than that of the present Superintendents and Assistants, but much larger than that of the existing Under and Assistant Secretaries) who by long acquaintance with the subjects with which they deal will become “policy experts”. They will be able to dispose of many minor cases themselves and to put up the remainder in a far more businesslike form for the orders of higher officers. Eventually the Service will also provide men for some of the higher posts. The top officers will thus be much more efficiently screened than at present and will be left with practically no case work to do and with sufficient leisure to think out policy. This will get rid of the “office note”. Further, consultation between Departments should take place either by personal discussion or by self-contained written communications. This will eliminate “file shifting”.

7. *Need it be a change of system?*—I would not go so far as to say that our *system* had broken down. It may be said that we have just muddled through the war and that muddle can and should be avoided. Others may say that muddles will occur in any system and, in fact, are more likely to occur as the size of the organization grows. Moreover it has been pointed out by the author of the scheme that the stress of war has, in effect, brought about in many Departments one of the results aimed at—namely, the practical elimination of the “office note”. Finally, I note that opinion is divided as to the merits of the scheme itself. Its more enthusiastic supporters are to be found in those Departments which have had to deal with a new range of war or post-war problems and to trespass in doing so outside the sphere of policy-making into that of executive administration. The main opponents of the scheme are to be found in the older established Departments, which naturally attach more importance to precedent and continuity of policy than their younger brethren. Indeed, I have gained the impression that what the author of the scheme himself has chiefly in mind is the needs of the “development” Departments, the activities of which must greatly increase if the new conception of the function of Government is to prevail. I fully accept the need for this new conception; nor would I deny for a moment that our machine has creaked badly and may have to be replaced by a new one. No can be certain, however, how our old machine would have worked if we had had plenty of good spare parts to put into it during the war. In other words, even admitting the need for a higher-powered model, does it necessarily follow that we must go in for an entirely new make?

8. *General pros and cons.*—Looking at the scheme as a whole, I recognise that at present we have too few officers of the right kind and too many clerks of the wrong kind. There is a strong case—

- (1) for increasing the total number of officers in the Government of India considerably beyond the pre-war scale;
- (2) for improving the quality, while reducing the size, of the permanent element now represented by Superintendents and Assistants; and
- (3) for introducing an entirely new system for interdepartmental references and consultation in view of the increase in the number of Departments.

It is in this last respect only that I would say unhesitatingly that our present *system* had broken down. On the other hand, I start with a prejudice against a Central Civil Service of the White-hall type designed to provide the great majority of the lower, and eventually a considerable proportion of the middle, grades of Secretariat officers; I do not like the idea of a very large Secretariat; I am very doubtful whether a mass of junior secretariat officers would in practice relieve the higher officer of any appreciable amount of work; and I am pretty sure that a great increase in quantity would spell some deterioration in quality.

I would not have the same objection to a material increase in the strength of the executive Directorates and Services outside the Secretariat or to a similar strengthening of the ranks of expert advisers in these executive Services and Directorates.

9. *Objection in principle to a Central Civil Service.*—Developing my objections, I am sure, in the first place, that we must maintain the principle that the architects of policy will be all the better for having lived, and being likely to live again, in the buildings that they and their Firm have designed. The problem is which way to secure this result. From all I have heard and read (e. g., the Report of the Committee on the Training of Civil Servants, 1944,—Command 6525) it is clear that there is a progressive tendency in England now a days towards the acceptance of our notions in this respect. They are getting away from the idea of the permanent Civil Servant who spends the whole of his life in one office and are going in more and more for sending their men *out* to do a turn of “field work”. Here we have always taken men *in* to do a spell of work in the Secretariat. It may be argued that the Finance and Commerce “Pool” is an exception; but that is not so. The officers in that cadre are, or should normally be employed, during the earlier years of their service in both executive and secretariat posts, until they gain that combination of experience which makes them fit for the highest secretariat appointments. Our mistake, perhaps, has been to rely too exclusively on the Indian Civil Service; but that is natural. It contains the best material and also the best general administrative experience. It is said that the work of the Central Departments is becoming more and more specialized and therefore that (a) there is less and less need for officers with general administrative experience, and (b) more and more need for specialists. In my view (a) is not wholly true. Less emphasis, perhaps, need be laid on the word “general”, but the value of “administrative experience” remains. Even, however, if (b) were to be conceded, what it comes to is—“Are you going to get the sort of man you want by setting up a Central Civil Service and sending its members out to learn something about administration, or by the reverse process of taking in people who already possess the practical experience and some of the expert knowledge required?” I have no doubt myself about the answer. The man who comes *in* is of value to the Centre and, when he goes back, he is of increased value to the Province or executive Service from which he came. The man who spends his earlier years in the Secretariat and then goes *out* to do a “practical” job of work for a Province or executive Service merely increases his value to the former and may be of little use to the latter. You may give recruits to a Central Civil Service some training in administration before final appointment; but it is not merely knowledge of how things are done, it is also the actual doing of them, that is required. What must be cultivated is the gift, or habit, of taking decisions; and no amount of ‘training,’ or even attachment to an executive Service, can be a satisfactory substitute for the day to day discharge of the responsibilities of an executive post held over a considerable period of time. This is my main reason for deprecating a Central Civil Service. I would retain our present practice of recruiting officers from outside down to and including most of the Under and Assistant Secretaries, if these two grades are combined. On the other hand, I would in future cast my net for Secretariat officers much wider, than over the Indian Civil Service alone and draw upon all Services (All-India, Central and Provincial) for recruits. I would also make this point. Interchange between the Executive and Secretariat fields, and the tenure system that goes with it, is of great value up to a certain stage in a man’s career. After that stage—and I would put it at anything between 15 and 20 years service—it should be quite clear in which of the two fields that man’s talent lies. If it is in the Secretariat field, he should remain there, and there should be no question of sending him back to his Province, except to serve in the provincial Secretariat. It seems to me to be equally wrong, although exceptional cases may be quoted to the opposite effect, to take into the Secretariat any man with over 20 years service (or possibly rather less) who has had no previous Secretariat experience and has shown that his talent lies in executive administration.

10. *The dilemma between Secretariat and Administrative experience.*—The obvious objection to these conclusions is that they do not help to get rid of the present reliance on the “office”. In other words, even if we draw most of our Secretariat officers from outside, is there not still a case for improving the quality of the permanent element by converting our present Superintendents and Assistants into a better (but smaller) cadre of officers with authority to dispose of certain classes of cases and with the ability to prepare other cases for the orders of higher officers in a much more business-like and efficient manner than at present? If so, will it not also be necessary to provide this cadre with opportunities for promotion up to the highest grades? The answer depends ultimately on which of the two qualifications you regard as the more important—Secretariat or Administrative experience. You cannot combine both in the same individual from the top to the bottom of your organisation. That is the dilemma.

11. *Practical objections from the point of view of relieving higher officers of work.*—Apart from this general difficulty, I do not think that the new scheme takes sufficient account of the following facts.

(a) Policy cannot be framed in vacuo, but only in the light of actual problems; senior officers cannot therefore be relieved of *all* case work; in fact the trouble at present is not so much that senior officers are overloaded with unimportant work as that they have too much important work to do; in other words, their charges are too large.

(b) Quite a considerable part of the detailed work which now occupies the time of Secretaries descends upon them from above and therefore cannot be reduced simply by increasing the number of officers below.

(c) A largely increased number of junior officers, although they may prevent certain items of work from rising, will inevitably increase the net volume of the upward flow.

(d) On whatever scale the officer strength of the Secretariat may be organized, it will never be sufficient for a major emergency, such as war.

12. *The manageability of charges.*—As regards paragraph 11 (a), it is no doubt true that, in some cases and with some officers, a large organization can be run successfully by a single head, if he is well served by subordinates who can be trusted to prepare cases for his orders in such a way that they can be given quite shortly, either in writing, or orally after a brief discussion. Regular meetings with his lieutenants, either individually or collectively, may lead to the effective disposal of a number of cases or at least to directions as to the lines on which they should be settled. The practice is to be encouraged and is probably employed to a greater or less extent already by most Secretaries. But it does not necessarily suit all officers or by any means all types of cases. Where a matter can be brought to one or two sharp issues, where the officers concerned have the gift of clear speaking, and where the Secretary is a man who likes making up his mind quickly, it will work admirably. Where a problem has many facets and there is much room for argument, where the officers concerned can write more clearly than they can speak (and may be no less efficient for that) and where the Secretary prefers to think things over, meetings and oral discussions may, and very often do, actually waste time. Whichever method is followed, there is I think at present too great a tendency on the part of senior officers to accept it meekly as their duty to deal with any case that their subordinates may choose to put up to them. A distinguished past Member of the Government of India is reported (not while he was in India) to have answered a note of prodigious length from one of his subordinates with the laconic minute—"Answer your own (something) questions". The idea is to be commended. A previous Viceroy put it more politely when he returned a complicated file after some time with the remark—"This is a tough nut for somebody to crack". In most Departments it should be possible to specify the grade of officer who would be expected ordinarily to dispose of cases of certain classes. Not only should such cases not rise normally above that level, but they might well be submitted direct to the officer expected to dispose of them, instead of coming up through all the lower grades. These considerations do not, however, affect the cardinal point that each Secretary should have a manageable charge; and my general idea, as will be seen later, is that a manageable charge, on the average, is the amount of work produced by two real Deputies each taking work from two real Under Secretaries.

13. *The work that comes from above.*—As regards paragraph 11 (b), the prevalent feeling is that Secretaries ought to know *everything* that goes on in their Departments. This will persist at any rate so long as permanent officials have to represent their Departments in the Legislature. They must there answer supplementary questions to a far greater extent than is the case in Parliament, just because they are supposed to know the answers and it is regarded as a confession of ignorance to ask for notice as freely as can be done by a political minister. It is "because the matter may attract attention in the Legislature" that many cases of no great intrinsic importance are submitted to Secretaries and by Secretaries to their Members; and the tradition will probably last for some time at least under a Ministerial regime. In addition, Secretaries are required to appear in person before the Public Accounts Committee, a task which requires considerable preparation and knowledge of detail if it is to be performed efficiently. Secretaries too—and the rule is probably salutary, though the appointment of departmental Public Relations Officers may alter the situation—are at present the only officers in Departments who are allowed to give interviews to the Press. They and their Members are continually approached with requests from members of the public who are personally known to them or imagine that they have some special claim on their attention. The law courts may lay it down that certain classes of case require the personal consideration of the Member in charge. The Secretary of State calls for a great deal of information. Secretaries and Members receive many requests for comments or advice from the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy. All this adds to work at the highest level. One of the root causes, perhaps, is that we have attempted to import into the Secretariat the accessibility which is proper to the District Officer; and in a country which still believes as firmly as India in the efficacy of the personal approach and the magic of influence in high quarters, the results are only what was to be expected. We might avoid them—and the creation of a Central Civil Service "divorced from the life of the country" might actually help in this process—by converting "Government" into a much more inhuman machine that ~~is~~ is at present. But even if this task were to be deliberately attempted, it would be one of great difficulty. Whether it would be intrinsically desirable is hardly for me to say. We can certainly mitigate the evil (if it is an evil) by providing Members with Private Secretaries and Secretaries with *real* Personal Assistants—a subject to which I return in paragraph 51 below.

14. *The work that comes from below.*—As regards paragraph 11 (c), there is the view that the more staff you have, the more work there will be, and that the best way of reducing work is to reduce staff. This, of course, can only be true within limits; but I believe that it is much more than a facile generalization. What certainly is true that, if five officers have to work ten hours a day to deal with a certain subject, that subject will not be dealt with by ten officers working only five hours a day. Each new officer, to begin with, will have less work to do and more time to think. Thought produces new ideas, and new ideas produce more work. The fact that some of this extra work may be valuable, or even essential, does not alter this truth. Your ten officers will soon be working six, eight or even ten hours a day and then there will be a demand for a further increase.

15. *The increase in times of emergency.*—As regards paragraph 11 (d), the problem of expansion in time of special emergency can only be met—and then only partially—by maintaining a liberal staff, with an adequate leave reserve, in ordinary times and by giving as many

officers as possible some training in Secretariat work (compare the Army methods of staff training and employment). When the emergency comes, leave can be restricted and some of the trained officers can be called up from executive Services, leaving their places to be filled by recruitment at the bottom. The Experience of this war has shown that it is a mistake to stop leave altogether and, even more, to stop all normal recruitment in an emergency that is likely to last for any considerable period. It must not be overlooked, however, that we have somehow succeeded in procuring the services of at least four times as many officers in the Secretariat as was the case before the war, not to mention many others in Directorate and attached offices, and that the actual work on which many of these officers have been employed will progressively decrease and eventually disappear. Not all of these officers may be suitable; and many of them ought to go back to where they came from. But the fact that we have this nucleus to work on should be borne in mind.

16. *My proposed method of approach and its stages.*—As a result of all these considerations, the lines on which I would approach the problem are briefly as follows :—

(1) I would begin by clearing the ground to the greatest possible extent by cutting out of the Secretariat certain items of work which do not fall within my conception of its proper function and by reducing the amount of work now done on others. By far the most important point here, to my mind, is—

(a) a proper division between Secretariat Departments on the one hand and executive Directorates and Services on the other and a liberal delegation of powers to the Heads of these Directorates and Services.

Subsidiary steps, as mentioned in my previous report, would be—

(b) the setting up of a Central Administrative Office to relieve Departments of as much work as possible connected with the internal economy of the Government of India ;

(c) the provision of various “common agencies” or Bureaux which would serve the needs of all Departments in certain specialized matters (e.g., publicity work and advice) instead of being themselves separate Departments with whom agreement must be reached before action can be taken;

(d) the expansion of the functions of the Public Service Commission with the object of relieving Secretariat officers of as much work as possible connected with “personal” cases ; and

(e) a revision of the relations between the Finance Department and the spending Departments with the object of placing greater financial responsibility on the latter and reducing the number of references to the former.

(2) Having cleared the ground to the greatest possible extent, one would be left with a mass of true Secretariat work and the next step would be to set up a sufficient number of Departments to deal with conveniently sized blocks of allied subjects. I would lay down very roughly what the normal sized Department should be, basing it on the number of subordinates from whom a top officer can be expected comfortably to take work, and then attempt to fit the work into units of this kind.

(3) Having arrived at the number of Departments or units so required, I would then turn my attention to the actual methods of work and the sort of staff required to do it. I would insist on complete compliance with a revised and well thought out “Manual of office Procedure”. It is at this stage that I would reach conclusions on the vexed question of the character and size of the staff required below the level of our present grade of Under Secretary and whether any, and if so what, proportion of it should be converted into a new grade of officers.

(4) Finally, one would be left with the problem of how to obtain (a) immediately and (b) permanently officers of the type and in the numbers required, with due regard to provincial demands for the return of some of the existing officers.

A separate chapter is required for each of these four headings.

PART II—CLEARING THE GROUND

(A) EXECUTIVE DIRECTORATES AND SERVICES

17. *Different types of Departments.*—If all Departments were, or could be, organised on a single broad pattern, the matter would be comparatively simple. Unfortunately this is not the case. There are Departments, or parts of Departments, such as Legislative and portions of Finance, which have no executive functions ; and, of course, in all Departments there is work, such as that connected with the Legislature, which cannot be performed through any executive agency. Where there is executive work to be done, four main types of organization can be distinguished.

Type 1.—Departments the business of which is Central and which employ regular Central Government Services to carry it out—e.g. His Majesty’s Armed Forces or the Posts and Telegraphs Department.

Type 2.—Departments the business of which is Central, but which operate not through large executive Services, but in direct contact with the public through, perhaps, a small Directorate or a number of individual officers—e.g., the Directorate of Civil Aviation, or the Government of India’s Agents in Commonwealth countries, or some of the economic controls set up during the war.

Type 3.—Departments, the business of which lies in those parts of the provincial field in which the executive work is done by Provincial Government Services, but in which, if real progress is to be made, Central financial assistance and expert advice must be provided on a scale sufficient to necessitate the setting up of large central officers—*e.g.*, those of the Director General of the Indian Medical Service, the Public Health Commissioner or the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research.

Type 4.—Departments, the business of which lies in the Provincial field, but in parts of it in which the Provinces do not require financial assistance or expert advice and, therefore, co-ordination of policy is the main requirement—*e.g.*, the Police and Jails Branch of the Home Department.

18. *Type 1 set up—functions of Executive Heads*—Where you have an organization of Type 1, there is an Executive Head (Director General, or whatever he may be called) with a large or small headquarters office containing such deputies and assistants as he may require. He does not carry the authority of "Government". He works partly in a downward direction, administering his Service, and partly in an upward direction, submitting policy proposals to Government and considering similar proposals from above. For administrative purposes he should be given, directly or by delegation from Government, the maximum financial powers considered suitable (on the lines, for example, of paragraphs 266 to 278 of the Rowlands Report) and also powers of appointment and disciplinary control up to the highest possible point in his own Service. Only the appointments of himself and perhaps of his chief lieutenants should be made by Government. Even technical Services should be able to produce their own administrators; but occasionally it may be desirable to import fresh administrative talent and in such cases Government must be free to look further a field for suitable officers—*e.g.*, in the Indian Civil Service. There should be no appeal against the orders of the Executive Head in a wide field of disciplinary cases; and where an appeal must lie to Government it should be referred to the Public Service Commission, whose advice should by convention be accepted—see paragraph 38 below.

For policy purposes there must be the closest possible liaison between "Government" (Member and Secretary) and the Executive Head. The headquarter office of each important executive Service should be located in the same building as the Secretariat Department; and inside this office, rather than in the Secretariat, is the proper place for all the specialists and research groups, etc., whose advice is just as necessary to the Executive Head in carrying out policy as to the Secretariat in framing it. It is this office, perhaps even more than the Secretariat, that should be the repository of precedent and the storehouse of experience; and it is here that you want, and can most easily get—from your Executive Service and perhaps from the new Secretariat Service proposed in para. 58 below—your "permanent element" possessing long experience and expert knowledge. It may be argued that, in that case, there is no need for a Secretariat or that you might just as well combine the offices of Secretary and Executive Head. I do not accept that view. I believe that, even where headquarter offices of this kind can in effect function partly as the workshops of policy, there is advantage in interposing between the Member of Government and the Executive Head a Secretariat, in which can be applied that broader scrutiny of policy proposals, and of their setting in the national or inter-national field, which is required from the point of view of Government as a whole and which can seldom be satisfactorily obtained from the expert or enthusiast in a particular subject. I would therefore not give *ex-officio* Secretariat status to any Executive Head—certainly not merely for the sake of prestige, as is sometimes done at present. On the other hand, where you have, or can set up, an organization of this type, I would entirely agree.

(a) that the Secretariat staff in relation to that particular Service should be small, and

(b) that everything possible should be done to increase the importance of the Executive Head.

If either the Member or Secretary or the Executive Head himself foresaw some particular problem or wished to introduce some reform or new development of importance, the ordinary procedure would be a preliminary discussion between them to decide whether action was necessary and, if so, on what general lines. Thereafter the matter would be remitted to the Executive Head not the Secretariat, to be worked out in the form of a definite proposal. The Executive Head—and this is important—should be responsible at this stage for consulting any other authorities concerned so as to ensure that the proposal eventually reaches "Government" in as complete a form as possible. On arrival in the Secretariat it ought not to be necessary to refer it back to the Executive Head for further information and it should certainly not be required to run the gauntlet of the lower Secretariat batteries. Any further examination that the Secretary considers necessary of any particular aspect of the proposal should be carried out in the Secretariat under his direction and not as a result of suggestions initiated by his subordinates. This does not mean, of course, that the Executive Head or any of his deputies would not be free to make references on matters of less importance to junior officers in the Secretariat whenever they so wished. There would in fact be a large amount of work at such levels.

Where the executive organization is very large (*e.g.*, the State Railways), or where a number of executive Services have a common object (*e.g.*, the raising of revenue), there may be justification for a Board (preferably with a chairman) in place of a single Executive Head. In such cases there might not be any great objection to making the Secretary a Member of the Board; but I would prefer on the whole to avoid this course. Meetings between the Board and the Secretary should, of course, be freely arranged and sometimes it might be advantageous to appoint a junior Secretariat officer as Secretary to the Board.

19. *Type 2 set up. Possible new Services.*—Where you have organizations of Type 2, most of the general principles enunciated in the preceding paragraph still hold good; but the main difficulty

is that you have no regular executive Service from which to draw the officers required, though the new Secretariat Service proposed in para. 58 may help. You either have a Director and a body of experts (as in the Civil Aviation Directorate) with comparatively little executive work down below, or you have individual officers (e.g., the Government's Agents in different countries) performing certain functions in direct relations with the Secretariat Department. In either case more of the spade work in shaping policy will probably have to be done in the Secretariat and the size of the staff there, *vis-a-vis* the executive activity in question, may have to be larger. From this point of view any step that could justifiably be taken to convert organizations of the kind under consideration into something more of the Type I model deserves consideration. There is, for instance, a proposal to create a regular Commerce and Industries Service, in which would be collected together all the various posts in those two Departments, to which *ad hoc* appointments now have to be made. Connected with this proposal, there is the idea of a more regular Diplomatic Service than we have at present, containing both Political and Commercial sides, as in the Foreign Office in England. If these proposals materialize, I presume they will involve some recasting of the Finance and Commerce Departments' cadre, commonly known as "the Pool". No one questions the importance of the objects underlying the creation of this cadre; but it does complicate our Secretariat staffing arrangements as a whole; and it would seem to be simpler, and also more in conformity with the principles here enunciated, if the officers required could be posted to a regular executive Service, from which they could be drawn as necessary for Secretariat appointments, rather than to what is now a sort of miniature Secretariat Service. There is also the idea of a Scientific Service, as in the United Kingdom. If there are, or are likely to be, a sufficient number of posts to warrant Services of this kind, the proposals are, in my opinion, to be welcomed. If they materialise, it would be a question for consideration whether each Service should have a recognised Executive Head, whose relations with the Secretariat would be as described above, instead of leaving the Service to be administered by the Secretariat direct as is now the case in the External Affairs Department.

20. *Type 3 set up—constitution of Boards.*—Where you have organizations of Type 3, the conditions in one respect are more similar to those in Type 1. There are no Central Services to administer downwards and therefore no Executive Heads properly so called. [I omit any reference here to the internal administration of All-India Services such as the Indian Civil Service or the Indian Medical Service, which is an entirely different matter.] What you do require—particularly, I think, in the Departments of Health and Agriculture—is a large head-quarter office, properly organized and manned with experts and specialists of different kinds, but outside the Secretariat, to work out the plans required to implement policy and to give Provinces every possible assistance in giving effect to them. Moreover the plans themselves will be carried out largely by Government agencies in the Provinces and from these Provincial Services it should be possible to borrow most of the officers required in the headquarter organization. Here again the new Secretariat Service proposed in para. 58 may help, or there may be a case, even in Departments of this type, for constituting a regular Central Service. These organizations, I suggest, should be called Boards rather than Directorates. There could be one Board each for Agriculture, Health, Education, Roads and Irrigation (or possibly for Works in general). Under each Board, with its chairman, would be collected and co-ordinated all the different bodies that function at present. You would thus get your proper approach to the Secretariat, between which and the Board the relations would be broadly the same as those between the Secretariat and the Head of an executive Service; and your Secretariat again could be comparatively small.

21. *Type 4 set up.*—Where you have organizations of Type 4—and the law and order side of the Home Department seems to provide the only true example—there is no Executive Head or Directorate or Service and all the work that has to be done must be done inside the Secretariat. The Home Department will no doubt require the assistance, as at present, of the Intelligence Bureau, the relations between the Director of which and the Secretariat being the same as those between any Secretariat and any Executive Head. His advice on policy will be available; but it is in the Secretariat that nearly all the spade work in shaping policy will have to be done. Such a Department will therefore require a larger Secretariat staff than others.

22. *Chief Commissioners' Provinces.*—Even in the Home Department, however—to make a digression—there may be scope for the development of the general idea set forth above. Chief Commissioners' Provinces (except Baluchistan, for which the External Affairs Department is responsible) are at present "nobody's baby", in the sense that no single Department is in general charge of them or responsible for seeing that their interests receive proper attention. The Chief Commissioners correspond with the Department of the Government of India which happens to be concerned. Little practical advantage would be gained by changing that system and placing a single Department in charge, so long as there is no representative of Chief Commissioners' Provinces headquarters. The selected Department would merely act as a post office and add to the delay in dealing with the Chief Commissioners' proposals. The position, however, might be different if there were at the headquarters of the Government of India an organization whose business it was to keep in direct touch with Chief Commissioners' requirements, to visit their charges at frequent intervals and to ensure that everything possible was done both to push their interests at headquarters and to carry out locally the policy of Government. If this idea were pursued, it would presumably be best to leave Delhi as it is. It is already sufficiently on the spot. Whether Baluchistan should be included is also a moot point. The External Affairs Department do not think so and point out that only a very small part of Baluchistan is in fact a Chief Commissioner's Province. Most of it is Tribal area or State territory, in respect of which the Chief Commissioner functions as Agent to the Governor-General or Resident, and the External Affairs Department must remain responsible

for the special problems to which these facts give rise. Even now, I understand, the Baluchistan Administration deals direct with a number of Central Departments; but an interesting development, which bears out the point here in issue, is the increasing extent to which officers of the Administration pay personal visits to Delhi. For Ajmer, Coorg, the Andamans and Panth Piploda it might be preferable to have a single Chief Commissioner located at Delhi and to put Commissioners in charge locally. I doubt whether the size of any of these Provinces, as compared with the size of districts in a Governor's Province, really justifies a separate Chief Commissioner in each. An alternative—for I suppose the other proposals would entail amendment of the Constitution Act—would be to have an Inspector General of Chief Commissioners' Provinces, attached perhaps to the Home Department, who would perform the functions indicated above.

23. *Proper relations between Secretariat and Executive Heads may reduce size of former.*—The main point I wish to make under this general heading is that, if the headquarter offices outside the Secretariat were properly staffed and their relations with the Secretariat properly defined and conducted on the lines proposed, it should be possible—

(a) to relieve the Secretariat of a considerable volume of work, which at present often involves some duplication of effort, and thus avoid making large increases in the Secretariat staffs; and

(b) to secure quicker and better results in the carrying out of policy.

24. *Abolition of distinction between attached and subordinate offices—levelling up of pay.*—At the same time I would abolish the distinction that is drawn at present between "Attached" and "Subordinate" Offices. In the old days the object of this distinction was to justify lower rates of pay for the ministerial staff in Subordinate than in Attached Offices and in both than in the Secretariat. The new rates of pay introduced in 1932 abolished the distinction between the rates in the Secretariat and those in Attached Offices, but it was emphasised at the time that the proportion of Assistants to 2nd division and routine clerks in the former should be higher than in the latter. No one has ever been able to arrive at a really satisfactory definition of an "Attached Office", but there has recently been a suggestion to downgrade some of those now so classified into "Subordinate Offices". I think this would be a step in the wrong direction. The maintenance of different rates of pay for the ministerial establishment in different headquarter offices is always bound to be a fruitful source of discontent and, therefore, inefficiency. There is a better case, in my opinion, for levelling up rather than down in all offices outside the Secretariat which are of sufficient importance to be located at the headquarters of the Government of India; but I would accompany this process by a considerable reduction in the number of Assistants and an increase in the number of officers on the lines suggested in Part IV below for the Secretariat itself.

(B) AND (C) CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE AND COMMON AGENCIES

25. *Statement of points for settlement.*—The suggestion in my earlier report (No. II), which I have been authorised to pursue, was that a Central Administrative Office should be set up—if necessary for the time being under the wing of a spare Member, but ultimately under the Chief Minister—to take over as much as possible of the work connected with the internal economy of the Secretariat. It was left an open question whether a Publicity Bureau, instead of the existing Information & Broadcasting Department, should, or should not, find a place inside this Central Administrative Office. In carrying the matter further, the chief points for settlement (apart from the question of Publicity) seem to be

(a) should the Central Administrative Office have the status of Secretariat Department presided over by a Secretary, or of a Directorate presided over by a Director General or Chief Administrative Officer;

(b) in either case, what items of work should it take over; and

(c) on what general lines should it be organized and manned?

26. *The Bengal model.*—In Bengal the newly introduced "Organization and Methods Branch" is a part of the Chief Secretary's "Office" in the Chief Minister's "Department". It is presided over by an officer known as the "Director of Organization and Methods and Secretary", with whom I have had some personal discussion. It has three main Division:—

(1) Organization and Methods, each under a Joint Secretary;

(2) Establishments under an Additional Secretary; and

(3) Common Services under two Deputy Secretaries, one for residential accommodation and certain other matters and the other for office accommodation and a number of other subjects.

I should add that the Chief Secretary's Office also contains a Branch dealing with the "Constitution", under a Joint Secretary, and Elections, under an Additional Secretary; another dealing with "General Administration" (appointments, postings, leave, etc.) under an Under Secretary; and another dealing with "Publicity" under a "Director of Publicity and Deputy Secretary". There is also a separate Development Office in the Chief Minister's "Department". A chart is attached as an annexure to this part of my Report.

It will be seen that the Organization and Methods Branch is a high-powered organization containing one Secretary, one Additional Secretary, two Joint Secretaries and 16 other officers, all of whom, except the six investigating officers, possess Secretariat status—that is to say, can carry on correspondence and issue orders in the name of Government. Such an organization

may work very well under a *Chief Minister* and a *Chief Secretary*. I am not sure that it would function equally well under a Member and Secretary who carried no greater authority than the others. It might be better therefore to put the whole organization to start with under a Director General, who would serve the needs, and therefore carry the authority, of all Departments and who would merely be "attached" to some Portfolio as a matter of administrative necessity and convenience. The Director General himself should, no doubt, be given at least the same pay and precedence as a Secretary. He would also have to be regarded by convention, possibly by order of His Excellency or of the Governor-General in Council, as the recognised authority whose decisions were normally to be accepted on the matters with which he dealt. This raises the second point in paragraph 25 above, namely what items of work should be assigned to the Chief Administrative Office.

27. *Work of Central Administrative Office.*—In my original recommendation I mentioned the following subjects :—

- (1) the provision and allocation of office accommodation ;
- (2) the supply of office equipment ;
- (3) the maintenance and enforcement of rules of office procedure ;
- (4) the training of clerks and possibly also junior officers ;
- (5) hours of work and holidays ;
- (6) the administration of the messenger staff ;
- (7) security arrangements ;
- (8) the welfare of the ministerial and menial establishments ; and
- (9) (possibly) certain other functions now assigned to the Public Section of the Home Department, such as arrangements for ceremonies of various kinds.

I now suggest that 'residential accommodation' should be added to 'office accommodation', since they are both now dealt with by the Estate Office, and that the following might also be included :—

- (10) printing and stationery, together with the Government Presses ;
- (11) the Cypher Bureau ;
- (12) the Secretariat Library ;
- (13) the move to and from Simla.

28. *Should establishment work and Public Service Commission be included ?*—It will be seen that I have not included "Establishments", under which, in Bengal, come "all establishment cases; provident fund, pension, etc. and interpretation of rules; principles and maintenance of character reports and returns of landed property; cadre, pay, leave and conditions of service and discipline of gazetted officers, including conduct and appeal rules; pay, leave and principles relating to conditions of service and discipline of non-gazetted establishments, including conduct and appeal rules; code corrections and interpretation of rules; communal representation in the Services; Public Service Commission; principles of recruitment; travelling allowances and compensatory allowances; and measures to ensure Service morale." Obviously, if all these items were to be assigned to our Central Administrative Office, it would have to function as a regular Secretariat Department. Practically all of the work now done in the Establishment Branches of the Home Department and much of the work connected with the financial side of service conditions, which is now done in the Finance Department, would be taken out of those Departments and they would assume a more manageable size in consequence. However desirable these changes might be from certain points of view, I can see no chance of being able to relieve the Home Department at present of its responsibility for service conditions in general and questions of policy relating to the Secretary of State's Services in particular. Equally, the Finance Department must retain its responsibility for the financial side of the subject—the rules and regulations governing pay, allowances, leave, etc. in general. The arrangement by which the administrative and financial aspect of service organization are shared between these two Departments is, I think, an improvement on the system in England which assigns both the administrative and financial control of establishments to the Treasury.

There is also the question of the proper location of the machinery, including the Establishment Officer and the Boards with which he now deals for the selection of Secretariat Officers, etc. I am strongly of opinion myself that this should come to the greatest extent possible under the umbrella of the Public Service Commission, as the body expressly provided by the Constitution for the purposes in view. Separate proposals in this respect have, I understand, already been made by the Secretary to the Executive Council. It will be seen, however, from paragraph 38 below relating to the Public Service Commission that I do not recommend bringing that body in any way into the actual field of administration. All of this should therefore remain outside the organization of the Central Administrative Office.

29. *Conclusions re : establishment work.*—In my opinion, the first and main criterion in deciding whether any item of work should be allotted to the Central Administrative Office ought to be whether it can be performed centrally better than, or at least as well as, by separate Departments. I also think it will be important to keep the size of the Central Administrative Office as small as possible. It must not be allowed to run away with us. On these principles I think we should be careful about handing over establishment work; and I would certainly be opposed to the transfer of departmental business connected with the pay and travelling allowance bills of officers and establishments. The most I would do at present—and I find it difficult to make final recommendations under this heading until decisions have

been reached regarding the expansion of the functions of the Federal Public Service Commission—would be to assign to the Head of the Central Administrative Office the internal administration of the Imperial Secretariat Service, including communal representation therein. The precise scope of the functions to be performed would require further examination by a Committee of Secretaries. While the internal discipline of each Department, and particularly the selection of individuals for promotion to selection posts, must obviously remain largely with the Departments themselves, it seems to me that the interests of the Secretariat Service as a whole, its *esprit de corps* and, therefore, its efficiency would be promoted by central supervision under a high authority with the object of securing a more even flow of promotion than is, perhaps, the case at present and maintaining more uniform standards in such matters as confidential reporting, extensions of service and so on. Whatever work might be handed over to the Central Administrative Office under this heading, its functions would still all be "internal"; there would be no actual necessity to make it a Secretariat Department; and I would prefer to call the head of it a Director General. I recognize that the time may come, under a Ministerial form of Government; when it may be highly desirable to concentrate *all* establishment matters in a Chief Minister's Portfolio. Meanwhile the proposals I have made would not, I think, prejudice such a development.

30. *Whitley Councils.*—At this point I would add my recommendation in favour of the introduction of the Whitley Council system in the Secretariat under the general control of the Head of the Central Administrative Office. The Home and Labour Departments have already taken this matter up and are aware of the two points to which I attach particular importance, namely :—

- (a) the rigid exclusion from discussion of individual cases; and
- (b) insistence on the principle that action must depend on agreement between the staff side and the officer side of the Council, without any provision for resolving differences of opinion between them.

31. *Organisation of Central Administrative Office.*—Turning now to the third question in paragraph 25 above, I would recommend the organization of the Central Administrative Office under three main Divisions presided over by Deputy Directors corresponding in status to Deputy Secretaries, namely :—

- (1) accommodation and equipment ;
- (2) office procedure and training ; and
- (3) personnel and general.

To these, if the decision ultimately goes that way, could be added a fourth, namely—

- (4) publicity.

I doubt whether there are any other "common agencies" which could appropriately come under the same umbrella at present ; but I have given my general views on this matter in paragraphs 12 and 13 of my earlier report No. 11.

32. *The Accommodation and Equipment Division.*—This Division would naturally take over the existing Estate Office from the Labour Department. The strength of that office will require re-examination after the present abnormal conditions have disappeared ; but even after things have settled down there will be plenty to do. Much, I am sure, could be done to improve the departmental distribution and the internal lay out of the existing rooms. This is a matter on which the advice of the Bedaux Company might be taken. If new accommodation is to be provided, it will be most important to secure that it is built to a really suitable plan. I suggest also that the existing rules for the allotment of residential accommodation are capable of improvement and simplification. On the equipment side there would be a considerable volume of work connected with the scales, prices and maintenance of office furniture and appliances, including typewriters, telephones, and for the time being, so long as demand exceeds supply, the priority allotment of secretophones. Under this heading I would further be inclined to include printing and stationery. The Division might take over the whole organization under the Director of Printing and Stationery and the Manager of Government Publications. So long as paper scarcity continues, the Industries and Supply Department may have to take a hand in the matter ; and a good supply officer would always be required as the supplies involved are very large. The standards of work in the Government Presses are, I am sure, capable of improvement ; and there is much that could be done in the field of Forms and Stationery, but that will *not* be done until the whole subject comes under the control of an authority specifically charged with responsibility for it. There is also scope for improvement in the use and distribution of office boxes of various grades of secrecy and the proper accounting for keys and seals. The Division would also be continually trying out new labour-saving devices and recommending their adoption where necessary. It might also take over certain aspects of the lighting and air conditioning of offices, although the executive work would still presumably have to be performed by the Central Public Works Department.

33. *The Office Procedure and Training Division.*—This Division would become the custodian of the Rules of Business and Secretariat Instructions, including the distribution of business between Departments. It would also take over from the Home Department the Rules relating to secret and confidential papers. It would be its duty to see that all these rules were kept up-to-date and obeyed. Frequent amendments are to be avoided and therefore much depends on the original drafting. On the Training side it would be the business of the Division to ensure that every recruit—officer or clerk—was fully acquainted with the system of procedure before actually joining duty. The Maxwell Committee recommended the

"Attache" system, under which officers would join their Departments for some weeks before actually taking up their appointments and receive training in their future duties. I do not think that this system ever has worked or would work satisfactorily. Departmental officers are too busy with their own work. On the other hand, the attachment of new officers to the Central Administrative Office, even for a fortnight, should enable them to find their way about and obtain an adequate grasp of the methods of work. For the ministerial establishments training classes would presumably have to be held at frequent intervals. I consider below the question of the staff that would be required for this purpose. A great deal has been said and written recently about the training of Civil Servants in the United Kingdom. I have read the Report of the Committee, which reported on this subject in May, 1944 (Command 6525). Much of it is concerned with the means by which the higher grades should be put in touch with realities and obtain the sort of practical experience that forms the background of all the officers whom we employ under our present system. I doubt whether much useful guidance for the purposes immediately under discussion in this paragraph is to be obtained from that Report.

The main object of this Division should be to dispel the prevalent ideas that "office procedure" is either a sort of mystery which need not be understood or something that can be picked up well enough as one goes along.

34. *The Personnel and General Division.*— This Division would be concerned with the duties referred to in paragraph 29 above, whatever the final decisions may be on the points raised therein. In addition it would take over the Cypher Bureau and those parts of our organization which require the employment of subordinate or menial staff to carry out certain common objects, such as the peons and messengers and those employed on what used to be the Security Scheme, but which is now being converted into a proper organization for the reception and guidance of visitors. As regards the peon and messenger staff, I understand that various schemes are already under consideration for improving efficiency and, perhaps, reducing numbers. My own view is that a clear distinction should be drawn between the "officer's orderly" class and the "messenger" class. In paragraph 18 of Appendix II to this report, which deals with office procedure, I suggest that a more efficient messenger service could be devised and that the abolition of the practice of sending files to other Departments will materially reduce requirements in this respect. The officer's orderly will lead a more leisured existence than the office messenger; but should possess certain special qualification—smartness, intelligence and so on. The former should, I think, receive rather higher rates of pay. Promotion should take place from one class to another as a man gets older. I think it is quite possible that the scale on which officers are supplied with orderlies can be considerably reduced.

In addition to running these services, the Personnel Division would also be concerned with the welfare and morale of the Secretariat staff. Here almost entirely new ground has to be broken and I refrain from making any specific recommendations, because I am not qualified to do so. I would draw attention, however, to the recommendations, of the Committee on the Training of Civil Servants, referred to above, in paragraphs 34 to 38 of their Report. I am not sure that I agree with the idea of "House Journals"; but there is ample scope for giving greater publicity to the way in which the Government machine works. The continual disparagement to which our officials are subjected in the press and on the platform cannot be good for morale; and, if we have a good trumpet, there is no reason why we should not blow it. As a first step I would recommend the preparation and publication of a Government Directory which would not merely give the names of officers and a bare account of the subjects allotted to each Department, but would aim at giving a more interesting description of the objects of each Department, the way in which they were linked together and the processes which have to be gone through in order to arrive at Government decisions on complicated problems. Sir Eric Coates and myself have already collected a considerable amount of information that could go into such a Directory; and his officers are preparing a draft based on the present distribution of work. Revised editions will no doubt be required at frequent intervals if the production is to be kept up-to-date.

Under the "General" side of this Division would come miscellaneous items such as "ceremonial" and "the Secretariat Library", if it is decided to take these over, "hours of work," "holidays" and so on.

35. *Staff to be as small as possible, and to be carefully selected.*— I do not think I can be expected at this stage to make precise recommendations as to the size of the staff to be employed by the Central Administrative Office. Of three things, however, I am certain. In the first place we must begin in a modest way and aim at keeping the organization as small and compact as possible. Secondly, the only way to make the scheme a success is to select for appointment only those officers who have special aptitude for the work to be performed and pay them adequately. Nothing could ruin the plan more effectively than to employ large numbers of officers who are misfits elsewhere. It is definitely not the case that "anyone will do for a job of this kind." A third essential is an adequate and efficient inspecting staff. The most perfect system and the best of rules are useless if they are not enforced.

For all these reasons I think that the organization should consist, to begin with, of no more than a Director General (equivalent to a Secretary), three Deputy Directors (equivalent to Deputy Secretaries) and not more than 3 or 4 Assistant Directors (equivalent to Under Secretaries), with an inspecting staff of about one inspecting officer for every three Departments. In addition, the Central Administrative Office would no doubt take over as going concerns the various existing organizations referred to above. The actual strength of each of these organizations would come under review when the present abnormal conditions cease to exist.

36. *Recruitment and training of staff*.—As regards the *officers*, I would look for the best men to be found, from whatever source they may be drawn, including the Army. I would be inclined to avoid selecting members of the Secretariat Service itself as likely to be too wedded to existing methods, especially in the matter of office procedure. I have been in touch with the Organisation and Methods Division of the Treasury in England and understand that they would be prepared to provide facilities for the training of a few officers for us, as they have already done for the Governments of Bengal and Madras. This offer should certainly be accepted. The Inspecting Staff, in particular, will need careful selection and training. They will form the basis of the whole organization and should be eligible in due course for promotion to the ranks of Assistant or Deputy Director. I would give them nearly the same pay as our present Under Secretaries and I would prefer to recruit young men without pre-conceived ideas. Their object should be to establish themselves not as hostile critics, but as the colleagues of all Departments working in their interests. They would serve all three Divisions of the Office, but would be mainly employed on Office Procedure. They should be given authority to inspect any office without notice and to interview any Secretariat Officer below the grade of Secretary. They would report to their Assistant or Deputy Directors, but should ordinarily talk the matter over, before doing so, with an officer of the Department concerned. At one time I thought it might perhaps be desirable to attach these officers to different Departments, but on the whole I believe it would be better to keep them independent of departmental organization. In the intervals between inspections the members of this staff between them should, I think, be capable of organizing and running the training classes referred to above.

The *Clerks* required will be mostly of the routine grade. I would avoid a large number of assistants and insist that most of the drafting of rules and regulations should be done by officers themselves, if undue elaboration and red tape are to be avoided. Every existing Department ought to be able to surrender at least one or two clerk. (Some of the larger Departments might also be able to surrender an officer, but for the reasons already indicated I would be against this). All Departments will no doubt say that they cannot spare anyone. Such objections should be overruled.

37. *Location of office—Charter of Director General*.—It goes without saying that the new Office should be situated as centrally as possible in the main Secretariat Buildings. The officer selected to be the first Director General should be left to work out further details. I am quite sure that the watchwords of the whole organization should be, in the largest capital letters, "QUALITY, EFFICIENCY and SIMPLICITY": and whoever may be appointed should be strictly enjoined to pick his men carefully and to set his face sternly against increase in numbers, elaboration of system and constant changes of method.

I would not object to the continuance of a separate Administrative Office for Naval, Army and Air Headquarter; but I am told that the present organization in the War Department employs about 50 officers, many of whom do not appear to have any special qualification for the work. That is exactly what I think we ought to avoid.

[Here follows Annexure (See para. 26)—not printed.]

(D) PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

38. *Extension of functions. Inter-departmental Committee set up*.—In my earlier report (No. II) I suggested an extension of the functions of the Federal Public Service Commission with the object of relieving Members of Government and Secretariat officers of as much work as possible connected with "personal cases"; and I received instructions to pursue this suggestion. In addition to the comparatively narrow angle from which I am interested in the matter, there are of course the more important aspects of protecting the Members of Government or future Ministers on the one hand, and the members of the Services on the other, from the evils that may flow from nepotism and political interference in the administration of the Public Services. The subject was dealt with by the Bengal Administration Enquiry Committee presided over by Sir A. Rowlands and that Committee went so far in paragraph 255 of its Report as to recommend that Ministers (apart of course from the choice of their Private Secretaries) should have no hand whatever in the appointment, promotion, transfer or posting of any officer of lower status than Secretary or Deputy Secretary to Government or head or deputy head of a Department (*i.e.* executive Service). Whether such a recommendation should be carried into effect and, if so how, are questions, that go beyond my terms of reference. They are already under examination from the broader points of view mentioned above by the Home Department and the Secretary to the Governor-General (Public) in consultation with the Chairman of the Commission, and I have had a discussion with them. A preliminary point that I raised was whether it would be possible or desirable to extend the Commission's sphere of action from the advisory into the administrative field, following the practice in Australia, where the corresponding body is charged with "the efficient and economic organization and management of the various Government Departments and with the duty of co-ordinating their work". In discharge of these functions, for instance, there is an organization under the control of the Commission which has the power to reduce staff. Obviously if developments on these lines were to take place, the Commission would have to be fitted into the organization of the proposed "Central Administrative Office". Indeed, the Chairman of the Commission might well become the head of that organization. Whatever advantages there might be in that course, it was felt, and I agree, that to charge our Commission with functions of this kind would bring it too much into the arena of public business and so tend to undermine the position of independence it has succeeded in establishing for itself. In the capacity of Government's general "housekeeper" it would have to be ultimately responsible to some Member; and that position could hardly be combined with the present arrangement whereby the Commission is the keeper of the collective conscience of Government in the field of appointments, discipline, etc. It was agreed, therefore.

that any extension of the Commission's functions must lie within the same broad advisory field as at present, even though its area may be extended, and that the whole matter should be further examined by the Secretary to the Governor General (Public) and representatives of the Home and Legislative Departments in consultation with the Chairman of the Commission. This is being done and I refrain from making further recommendations. I stress particularly the desirability of giving wide power to the Heads of executive Services, expediting the procedure for the disposal of disciplinary cases, and relieving Secretariat officers of as much as possible of the work entailed in dealing not only with original cases, but also appeals and memorials from individuals.

(E) FINANCIAL CONTROL

39. *Views of Rowlands Committee and Sir James Grigg.*—The suggestion which was made in my earlier report (No. II), and which I have been instructed to pursue, was that greater efficiency and speed, with no less economy and a considerable saving of work, could be secured by doing everything possible to develop the financial consciences of the spending Departments and so to cut down the number of day to day references of the Finance Department. Since then I have had some discussion with the Principal Secretary, Finance Department, and have studied the recommendations made in paragraphs 268–276 of the Rowlands Committee's Report. I have also come across an article by Sir James Grigg, the following extracts from which refer to the subject :—

“Secondly, [there is Treasury financial control, which rests in the last analysis on the Parliamentary procedure of Supply and Appropriation and the subsequent audit of expenditure by the Comptroller and Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee. All of this is extremely complex and meticulous. From Gladstonian times we have inherited the habit of requiring specific Treasury authority for many of the details of expenditure even after the general policy has been approved by it and by Parliament. The doctrine ‘take care of the pence and the pounds will take care of themselves’ still prevails.

But whatever may have been its efficacy in Mr. Gladstone's time, it pretty certainly ceased to have any potency when Mr. Lloyd George arrived at the Treasury, and in fact it seems that it has transmogrified itself in practice into straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel. Anyhow, there can be no doubt that the requirement of detailed Treasury sanction involves a good deal of labour at both ends and it takes a lot of time. It also makes for a timid attitude on the part of the administrative departments.

Treasury control is particularly close in the realm of establishments. With the high development of Whitley Councils in the Civil Service there is a temptation to fit all Civil Servants into a few standard grades with uniform conditions, one of which, of course, is security of tenure. Numbers cannot be increased or varied between grades without Treasury sanction, and altogether departments have so little latitude in staff matters that they must find it hard to organize their work as they would wish. I am sure that the Treasury will have to exercise their financial powers more in bulk and less in detail. This may involve changes in the form of Parliamentary Estimates and in the rules of audit, but it should be possible to ensure that only the irritations and none of the essence of control disappear. My own experience, indeed, both in this country and in India, leads me to believe that bulk control is more economical than itemized scrutiny.”]

40. *Recommendations and suggestions.*—Where the present Finance Member and one of his most distinguished predecessors agree on the main essentials, it would be presumptuous on my part to go into further detail. I am aware that the matter has frequently been examined before, without very much practical result. It may be that more fundamental changes of the kind referred to by Sir James Grigg will be required if more is to be achieved. Obviously, however, concrete proposals would have to be worked out by the Finance Department themselves in consultation with the other Departments. Meanwhile I venture to offer a few suggestions based on my own experience of what Sir James Grigg calls “the irritations” of the present system.

(1) The average Secretary dislikes any suggestion that the views of the Finance Department on any particular point must necessarily be accepted, as if it were constitutionally in a position to give orders to other Departments. He is much readier to accept advice than dictation.

(2) He resents having his proposals whittled down, for no apparent reason except to save a certain amount of money. It is not unknown for Departments to take this propensity into account in making their proposals and to pitch their demands on the high side in consequence. Any such tendency is, of course, exactly what ought to be stopped.

(3) A fruitful cause of irritation is the practice, of which I have received specific complaint, by which a proposal sponsored by high authority (sometimes even the Member) in one department is turned down by a much lower authority in the Finance Department. It should not be necessary to mark a file by name, or write to a particular officer, to ensure that a proposal is considered in the Finance Department at approximately the same level as in the originating Department.

41. *Further suggestions.*—Other suggestions are :—

(1) Whenever the amount of work justifies it, a spending Department should have a financial adviser of its own. He should be a trained finance officer, but should be regarded more as an officer of the Department in question than as a watchdog of the Finance Department.

(2) It is no doubt desirable to prescribe and enforce standard scales of pay and allowances for the ministerial establishments and for the officers of recognised Services; but Departments should have greater discretion to fix the appropriate point in a recognised scale at which an individual should draw pay on joining and also the emoluments of special officers whose services are particularly required for temporary purposes.

I am told that in Bengal, as a result of the creation of a Chief Minister's Department in which "Organisation and Methods", "Establishments", and "Common Services" are grouped together as branches controlled by a common Secretary, who is also the Director of Organisation and Methods, it is this Secretary who is responsible for taking the orders of Government on the numbers of posts and the salaries of the staff. Financial sanction in each case is not required and the function of the Finance Department is limited to seeing whether funds can or cannot be found for the set up as a whole. This merely substitutes a different agency for the security of departmental establishment proposals and, although I am inclined to agree that the Finance Department's interest in reducing expenditure may not render it the ideal instrument for this purpose, I doubt whether such a complete by-passing of our Finance Department is necessary.

PART III.—DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF BUSINESS BETWEEN THEM

42. *Number of existing Departments.*—In my earlier report (No. II) I gave the existing number of Departments with which I am concerned as 19. This included the Defence Department, which has since disappeared, and the Supply and Industries and Civil Supplies Departments, which have since been amalgamated into the Industries and Supply Department. It omitted, however, the Railway Department—rather a shadowy entity because the Railway Board really functions as the Railway Department, but one which nevertheless ought, perhaps, to be included because the Chief Commissioner, Railways, is *ex-officio* Secretary to Government in the Railway Department. Following the principles enunciated in Part II, paragraph 18, I would prefer to see a small Secretariat interposed between the Railway Board and the Railway Member; but I make no definite recommendation to that effect, since the existing arrangements appear to work satisfactorily. That leaves the present number of Departments as 18.

1. Finance.
2. War.
3. External Affairs.
4. Commonwealth Relations.
5. Home.
6. Information and Broadcasting.
7. Legislative.
8. Agriculture.
9. Food.
10. Health.
11. Education.
12. Commerce.
13. Industries and Supply.
14. Labour.
15. Railways.
16. War Transport.
17. Posts and Air.
18. Planning and Development.

43. *My proposal to Departments regarding manageable charges.*—No part of my task as proved more difficult than securing some measure of agreement as to the number of Departments there should be in future and the distribution of work between them. At the end of December I consulted all Departments and gave it as my own view that the proper way to organize, if we were to ensure that the higher officers had time to think and were not overburdened with case work, would be to give each Secretary a manageable charge and recognise that this might result in having more Secretaries than Members. As a rough yard-stick of "manageability" I suggested that the "type design department" (though I recognised that there must be exceptions) should consist of a Secretary with about two Deputy Secretaries and four Under Secretaries, leaving it open for the moment whether our present Superintendents and Assistants should be replaced by a smaller number of "officers" of the Principal and Assistant Principal type in England. I added that I was against employing Additional or Joint Secretaries except in Departments which obviously could not conform to the type design and could not be divided into separate Secretary's charges; but that I should be in favour of magnifying the importance of Deputy Secretaries. (I do not myself accept the view that a Joint or Additional Secretary may be required in those Departments in which the Secretary has to tour or attend international conferences. I doubt whether such activities are normally the proper function of any Secretary; but in any case, with Deputy Secretaries of the right type, I can see no reason why, in all ordinary circumstances, the senior-most should not deputize for the Secretary during his absences from headquarters). To put it another way, my idea was that a Secretary should not ordinarily take work from more than three or less than two Deputy Secretaries and that a Deputy Secretary should not ordinarily take work from more than three or less than two Under Secretaries. The main difficulties in proceeding with this plan are discussed below.

44. *Criticism of my proposals and alternative suggestions.*—In the first place there is the view, which has been put to me by at least two Secretaries, that my idea of a comparatively large number of manageable Secretary's charges will merely increase the "departmentalism" which I have already referred to as one of the regrettable features of our present structure, and eventually

stimulate the political demand for a large number of Ministers to correspond with the number of Departments. I recognise the force of these objections, but do not regard them as decisive. The placing of more than one Department in the charge of a single Member or Minister should go some way towards solving, or at least easing, the difficult problem of coordination in the very wide field of Government as a whole, Deputy Ministers, if not Deputy Members, are also a possibility. In any case, unless one splits up the "units", the volume of work in each will prove excessive. Departments are after all no more than parts of a single machine, and it is a pity that more emphasis is not laid on the second syllable of the word. On the other hand, there is nothing sacred about the terminology I have employed. One could, so to speak, shift the whole organization a step upwards by having a Principal Secretary (as in the Finance Department) in charge of a group of Secretary's Departments, in which case the Principal Secretary would, I take it, be more a Deputy Member of Minister than a Secretary. Or one might move the whole organization a step further down by putting Departments in charge of Deputy Secretaries with a single Secretary in charge of a group of such Departments. The important thing to my mind is to recognise that no "top officer" (whatever you may call him) can be expected to deal satisfactorily with more than a certain volume of work or a certain number of subordinates. It makes little difference whether these subordinates are called Joint or Deputy Secretaries, *so long as they submit work to him*; and that is why I am against the Secretary—Joint Secretary—Deputy Secretary set up, where it can be avoided. It may simplify matters to refer (as I shall in future) to "Units" instead of "Departments" as representing the charge of a top officer of about the level of our present Secretary; but I adhere to the view that, if any such officer finds the need of more than three, or at the very most four, deputies (of whatever grade) to deal with the work allotted to his Unit, it will be an indication that the charge is becoming too large for him.

45. *Incompatibility of departmental views.*—In the second place, I have found a marked disinclination on the part of the present Departments to surrender items of work and a rather surprising readiness to take over more. The two tendencies, applied over the whole field, are of course incompatible; and I have therefore had to proceed largely on my own (imperfect) knowledge and the advice of those 'spectators who see most of the game', such as the officers of the Finance Department, the Secretary, Planning and Development, and the present Council Secretary.

46. *Distribution of Business—Methods of preparing lists.*—As the distribution lists in the Rules of Business have not been kept up to date for some years, the only guide to the present distribution of subjects is the Legislative Assembly Department Circular, which indicates, for the purposes of the Legislature, the subjects for which each Government Member is responsible. This I found by no means a satisfactory document; and I therefore started by reverting to a proposal that had been made by the Maxwell Committee and circulating to Departments a revised list of business drawn in terms of the 7th Schedule to the Constitution Act. The language in which this Schedule is drafted, coupled with the difficulty of exhibiting clearly the responsibilities of Central Departments in relation to items in the Provincial and Concurrent Lists, militated against the production of a really satisfactory distribution list drawn up in this way, although the method had the advantage of ensuring that the whole field of the Constitution Act was covered. I followed this up with certain suggestions for the transfer of items from one Department to another; and since then I have had personal discussions with the Secretaries concerned. A few of them—especially, as was to be expected, those in the "horizontal" Departments whose work cuts across the field of other Departments—took objection to my method of approach. The Home Secretary also brought to my notice the method recently adopted in Bengal, under which the business falling to each Department is set forth in three parts. Part I defines in general terms the functions of the Department. Part II indicates, primarily by reference to List II and List III in the 7th Schedule, the area within the sphere of the Province's executive authority and power to make laws within which the Department exercises its functions. Part III indicates, by reference to List I, the area within the sphere of the Federal executive authority and power to make laws within which the Department transacts such business as falls to the Provincial Government. Part II and III in the above arrangement would, of course, have to be reversed, if it were applied to the Centre; but the matter is further complicated by the awkward fact that a Central Department's functions in relation to items in List II or List III may refer either to the conduct of business under these items in Chief Commissioners' Provinces, or to its purely legislative powers in respect of List III items, or to its temporary powers to invade portions of the provincial field, or again to the general advisory or co-ordinating functions which the Centre may have to undertake even in normal times in relation to purely provincial subjects in Governors' Provinces. The best plan, in the circumstances, seems to be to adopt a suggestion made to me by the Secretary in the War Transport Department and to draw up the lists of each Department's business in general terms, adding in brackets, where possible, the entries in the three Lists in the 7th Schedule to which each subject is related and prefacing the whole by a list of items common to all Departments and a general explanation of the alternative, or, in some cases, dual, nature of their functions with regard to items in Lists II and III.

47. *My proposed distribution by Units.*—I attach as Appendix I a distribution list prepared in this way and draw attention to a number of notes I have made thereon relating to controversial points. I have proceeded on the principle that it is desirable to make as little change as possible in the existing agreed distribution of departmental business, except—

- (a) where the existing distribution is clearly anomalous and gives rise to disputes which interfere with efficiency; or
- (b) where some re-arrangement appears to be necessary in order to balance the volume of work and give each "Unit" as far as possible a manageable charge.

Apart from anything else, changes from one Department to another involve considerable work in sorting out and transferring old records relating to the subject of the change. In theory, no doubt, it is desirable that each Department should deal with all aspects of the subjects allotted to it; but often it is difficult to determine what amounts to "a subject" (is "Irrigation", for instance, a subject by itself or is it an integral part of "Agriculture"?) and similar difficulties may arise regarding the scope of a particular item (does "Industries", for instance, include all industrial processes or only some?). In practice, therefore, it seems inevitable that different Departments must sometimes deal with different aspects of the same subject and, if this has to be done in certain cases, it may be positively welcomed as helping to bring it home to Departments that they are all members of one team working for common objects.

I do not expect that my list will satisfy all Departments. It indicates, however, my views of the various "Units" (not necessarily existing Departments) into which the Government of India should be divided and the general subjects to be allotted to each. It may thus at least serve as a basis on which to arrive at a final decision for the purpose of the Rules of Business. It would be left to each "Unit", if it so wished, to give an even more general description of its functions on the lines of Part I of the Bengal plan. It would also be necessary for each "Unit" to prepare a more detailed list to show the internal allocation of its work to its different officers. This task, as I am suggesting in paragraph 7 of Appendix II dealing with office procedure (see paragraph 49 below), might be facilitated by the introduction of a proper system of indexing; and the Directory referred to in paragraph 34 above will also help.

48. *Subsidiary notes thereon.*—(1) It will be seen that my list contemplates 19 "Units", including the Railway Department, but not counting the Finance and War Departments. Each of the last two obviously contains more than one of my kind of "Unit", but cannot be split up into separate charges.

(2) The only new "Units" proposed, although I am doubtful whether Industries and Supply will prove a manageable single charge, are—

- (a) Works, Mines and Power—to be split off from Labour;
- (b) Marine—to be split off from Commerce; and
- (c) Services—to be split off from Home.

The first of these proposals has already been approved in principle (see my Report No. III). The second proposal is, I think, justified by the size of the present staff of the Commerce Department, which has five middle grade officers (Joint and Deputy Secretaries) and eight lower grade officers (Under and Assistant Secretaries) against my "type design" of two and four respectively, coupled with the fact that the work lying before it, especially in the field of international conferences, is bound to be very heavy during the next few years. I understand that its Secretary has already asked for an Additional Secretary. This, to my mind, would be the wrong way of dealing with the case.

The third proposal is justified by the fact that the "Services" work in the Joint Secretary's Wing of the Home Department is particularly heavy at present, owing to all the post-war problems of recruitment to the Indian Civil Service, etc., and is likely to remain so for some time. The Home Secretary agrees that he could not himself deal with both sides, or Wings, of the Department unless he could be given a Joint or Additional Secretary on each side. I would much prefer to break the existing Department up into two "Units" in the same Members Portfolio. I do not however contemplate that the need for both these "Units" will be permanent. Under a new constitution and a ministerial set up the position would be different. The volume of work would drop and, as already indicated in paragraph 29 above, the subject would then go naturally into the Chief Minister's Department. The Home Secretary would himself prefer to bring that development into effect now, by taking all "Establishment" work away from the Home and Finance Departments (compare paragraph 28 above) and assigning it for the time being to the Secretariat of the Executive Council. That, however, I regard as an impracticable proposition.

(3) On the other hand, I have included among my "Units"—

- (a) Information and Broadcasting;
- (b) Planning and Development; and
- (c) Food.

I should make it clear that I do not recommend any of these as part of the permanent set up and I abide by the recommendations made in my Report No. II with regard to them.

The Information and Broadcasting Department, I still think, should eventually be converted into a Bureau of Information and Publicity, which could be located in the Central Administrative office to serve the needs of all Departments. In that case All India Radio, even if converted into a Corporation, could conveniently be allocated to Communications; the policy aspects of Government's relations with the press (not only the administration of the press laws) would be included in the Law and Order "Unit" of the Home Department along with the passing of cinematograph films for exhibition; and the development of the Indian film industry would probably have to go to Industries and Supply.

The co-ordinating functions of the Planning and Development Department, after the all-India policy of development had been settled, should be worked into the co-ordinating, rather than the departmental, structure of Government.

The Food Department should ultimately, when circumstances permit, be amalgamated with Agriculture in a single "Unit"

(4) I do not wish it to be understood that, in my opinion, all my "Units" can conform strictly to my type design. I do, however, consider that a general pattern of that character could and should run through the whole structure.

PART IV.—SYSTEM OF WORK AND ESTABLISHMENTS REQUIRED

49. *My "office procedure" proposals.*—In this Chapter I shall consider the system on which our machine should work both as regards office procedure and also as regard the kind and approximate numbers of the officer and clerical establishments required to work it.

I do not propose any radical change in our present office system except as regards the method of inter-departmental consultation. I have, however, a number of improvements to suggest and, as the whole subject is one of detail, I have thought it better to put my suggestions in a separate note (Appendix II). I do not claim to be an expert on office procedure. My suggestions are those of an interested amateur. The most important recommendations in this Appendix are that the practice of sending files from one Department to another should cease and that a big effort should be made to improve our "indexing" on certain lines. There are other recommendations, which I need not mention here, but I hope the whole subject will receive the consideration that its importance deserves.

50. *Rough calculation of number of officers required.*—As regards the kind and approximate numbers of the establishments required, I reached the conclusion, in paragraph 48 above, that 19 Departments or "Units", excluding the Central Administrative Office and the War and Finance Departments, would probably be required for the time being, if each "Unit" were to be given a manageable task. Four "Units"—Information and Broadcasting, Planning and Development, Food, and Services—may ultimately disappear, leaving only 15. Moreover the Railway Department, as explained above, is only a paper "Unit". On the other hand, the need for additional "Units" may arise as work expands and I shall therefore base my estimates on the figure of 17. The War and Finance Departments are, or have been, the subject of separate re-organizations which I must regard as placing them outside my terms of reference. For my present purposes, however, I think it would be justifiable to regard these two Departments as accounting between them for about 8 "Units", thus giving a total number of 25, not counting the Central Administrative Office. The officer staff of that Office has been dealt with in the paragraph 35 above. If it is taken that each Secretariat "Unit" should contain about 7 officers, not including the present rank of Superintendent—that is to say, about 2 Deputy Secretaries and 4 Under Secretaries—we arrive at the rough conclusion that about $25 \times 7 = 175$ officers would be required, of whom 25 would be top officers, 50 middle officers and 100 lower officers. I wish it to be clearly understood that I am proceeding on the broadest possible lines and that my figures are primarily illustrative in character.

51. *Private Secretaries—Personal Assistants—Public Relations Officers.*—To the figure of 175 certain additions should be made to meet the following proposals.

(a) Every Honourable Member (or Minister) should have a Private Secretary of his own choice. He should be drawn either from the Indian Civil Service or some other established Service and his tenure of office should be strictly limited. These posts should be regarded as useful training grounds for junior officers and for that reason, I should say, the officers should not have more than 6 years service on selection and should not be kept away from the regular line for more than 3 or 4 years. The primary object of the the posts, however, is to "screen" the Member effectively against interruptions in his work, to arrange his tours and interviews and to answer as many as possible of the letters he receives personally. The present Private Secretary to the Finance Member could no doubt prepare a fuller description of the duties required. This would account, on the assumptions made in my Report No. II, for another 12 or 13 lower grade officers.

I may add here that, in my opinion, every Secretary (head of a "Unit") should also have a real Personal Assistant - not, as is often the case at present, a sort of glorified stenographer, but a man or woman of intelligence who could perform the kind of duties referred to above. I do not think that these Personal Assistants need be drawn from the Indian Civil Service or other executive Services. They might be of the type of our existing Superintendents and there would not be the same objection to taking older people and keeping them longer in their posts than the Private Secretaries of Members. For these reasons I do not include them at present in my estimate of the number of officers required. If any of them were not fully employed on the day to day business of their Secretaries (who should, of course, have at least one stenographer in addition, they could always be put on to special items of work from time to time in relief of the junior Secretariat officers.

(b) Certain Departments have, and possibly more in future may have, their own Public Relations Officers. Some of them may be journalists employed on contracts; but I include them in my estimate because I doubt the suitability of this source of recruitment and would prefer to employ officials after proper training for the purpose. This requirement might account for about another 17 officers, whom I place in the middle grade.

52. Certain Departments again may have their own Financial Advisers; but I make no provision for these since any officers so appointed would presumably be drawn from the staff that would otherwise be employed in the Finance Department itself. I also make no provision for "housekeeping" officers, since under my scheme all these would be employed in the Central Administrative Office. The work to be done inside Departments, including correspondence with the Central Administrative Office, control of the Cash and Routine and Issue Sections, etc., could be placed in charge of a Superintendent or an officer of that type, whatever title he may carry in future.

53. *Conclusions and comparisons.*—The rough total thus arrived at for the Secretariat comes to—

Top officers	25
Middle officers—50 ÷ 17	67
Lower officers—100 ÷ 18	118
							Total	205

To this may be added about 15 officers for the Central Administrative Office, of whom one would be a top officer, three middle officers and the remainder lower grade officers, giving the grand total of 205 + 15 = 220.

This compares with—

(1) 1939—

Top officers (9 Secretaries, 8 Joint Secretaries)	1
Middle officers (Deputy Secretaries)	12
Lower officers (Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries) about	20
							Total	49

(2) 1945 (approximate figures)—

Top officers (19 Secretaries, 6 Additional Secretaries, 26 Joint Secretaries)	51
Middle officers (Deputy Secretaries)	51
Lower officers (Under Secretaries 42, Assistant Secretaries 61)	108
							Total	205

NOTE—I think myself that most of the 26 Joint Secretaries are really more middle than top officers. I have not included quite a considerable number of officers who seem to have been performing secretariat duties but not under secretariat titles.

(3) *Mr. Rowland's Report on future Indian Civil Service requirements for the Centre.*

Superior posts	191
Inferior posts	25
							Total	216

NOTE—This figure is based on the table at page 14 of Mr. Rowland's Report, omitting, so far as I have been able to understand the position, the officers required for Departments not under my consideration, such as Political, etc. I understand that the 50 Pool posts shown therein represent only the Indian Civil Service component of the Pool for Secretariat and Executive purposes, but that about 50 Pool Officers (though not necessarily Indian Civil Service Pool Officers) represent the estimated requirements for the Finance, Military Finance and Commerce Department Secretariats. I have however included the 20 per cent. of posts which Mr. Rowland assumed (obviously wrongly. I think, in the case of the Pool and the Indian Political Service) would come from the Provincial Services.

54. *Sufficiency of totals arrived at.*—I make, and can make, no attempt to lay down the establishments of individual Departments or "Units", but the question I now ask myself is whether my broad estimate of something over 200 officers for 25 Secretariat "Units", giving an average of about 8 per "Unit", would be enough. I believe myself that it would, provided

(a) that my general views are accepted regarding the elimination of work from Secretariat Departments and the proper division of labour between them and their Boards, Directorates, etc.; and

(b) that the "office" is confined to the efficient discharge of its proper functions under a revised set of Secretariat Instructions.

At the top of the machine, if the recommendation in paragraph 9 above is accepted, you would get senior officers of great Secretariat experience who in their earlier years would have served in administrative posts. At the bottom—in the "office"—you would have your permanent element under a far more strictly enforced system of office procedure. In between—in your middle or lower officer grades—you would get a changing body of men drawn from a variety of sources, but all with some practical experience of administration.

55. *Further steps if the "office" is to be reorganised.*—If this view were accepted, little change would be required in the present organization of our "office". It would merely be necessary to reduce its strength to more reasonable dimensions and weed out the unfit. If, however, we are to go a step further in raising the efficiency and status of the "office", I would take it by applying the same principle of the "manageability of charges" that I have already applied to the officer ranks.

56. *Growth of the "office".*—In August 1939, according to the figures supplied to me by the Controllers of Accounts concerned, the Secretariat proper (including probably a few Departments with which I am not concerned, such as Political, etc.) contained 68 Superintendents, 8 Assistants-in-charge (whom I shall count as Superintendents) and 493 Assistants—a total of about 570. The corresponding figures in November 1945 were 215, 126 and 1,645 respectively—a total of nearly 2,000. The percentage of increase in the number of Superintendents and Assistants-in-charge has been rather greater than in the case of officers, while the percentage of increase in the number of Assistants has been rather less. The ratio of Assistants to Superintendents has changed from about 7 to 1 to about 5 to 1; and the actual number of Sections has increased from 74 to 331. Most Under or Assistant Secretaries nowadays (and often Deputy Secretaries as well) seem to take work from one or perhaps two Sections. In the old days the number was larger, but the staff was better. Anyway, on my figure of about 100 Under Secretaries, one might expect the Secretariat to be divided into about 150 Sections; and, allowing one Superintendent and about 7 Assistants to each Section, we would arrive at 150 Superintendents and about 1,050 Assistants as our future office strength in these grades. I have little doubt myself that this number of Assistants would be excessive.

57. *Suggestion for a new type of Section.*—If we are to improve quality and reduce quantity I would lay down some such principle as that each Under Secretary's Branch should contain two Sections and each Section should consist of one Superintendent and three Assistants. This would give a total of about 200 Superintendents (plus 25 as Personal Assistants to Secretaries) and about 600 Assistants. Each Superintendent would have a smaller charge, but would be expected to do much more original work. He would not just supervise the work of a large number of Assistants.

58. *The case for an Imperial Secretariat Service, Class I.*—Under a scheme of the kind sketched above, there would be a case

(a) for breaking up the Imperial Secretariat Service into a Class I Service (Superintendents) and a Class II Service (Assistants);

(b) for giving those in Class I a new name—perhaps Principals—and empowering them to dispose of certain classes of routine work in the name of “Government”;

(c) for recruiting Class I from at least three different sources, *e. g.*—to make a purely tentative suggestion—

(i) 50% by direct recruitment through Federal Public Service Commission examination,

(ii) 20% by promotion from Class II, and

(iii) 30% by transfer from other Services;

(d) for giving Class I fairly liberal chance^s of promotion to the higher Secretariat posts in the grade of Under Secretary and Deputy Secretary—possibly 20% of these posts in each Department in course of time; and

(e) for providing for the deputation on a fairly liberal scale of officers from Class I to Boards, Directorates and so on outside the Secretariat proper.

It is extremely difficult to arrive at any accurate estimate of what the total strength of the Class I Service should be in order to meet all these requirements plus an adequate leave and training reserve. At a guess one might place it some where in the neighbourhood of 400. For my immediate purpose, however, the important figure is the number of Secretariat posts, which I have put at 225, combined with the other figure of about 205 Secretariat officers given at the beginning of paragraph 53.

59. *The resulting picture.*—These figures would produce a “Secretariat proper” consisting of about 25 “Units”, employing about 430 “officers” and 600 “assistants”, with the proper complement in addition of routine clerks, as against (a) a prewar Secretariat of about 50 officers and 570 Superintendents and Assistants, and (b) a present Secretariat (still carrying a considerable load of war work) of about 200 officers and 2,000 Superintendents and Assistants. The more conservative may raise their eyebrows at figures of these dimensions compared with what they were accustomed to before the war. The more progressive, on the other hand, may say that they are not enough. One can only hope that there is something to be said for a “golden mean”. One and all will no doubt exclaim that my figures are impossibly tidy and symmetrical and that I have grossly over-simplified the whole problem. I must repeat what I said at the beginning of my earlier Report No. II. The scientific process might have been to begin at the bottom and build up figures on the basis of an accurate assessment of the work to be done. That being quite impossible, I have had to proceed from the top downwards and to use a series of the very broadest calculations to illustrate the sort of set up I would aim at rather than its actual details. Something on these lines would, I claim, go as far as is practicable to solve the dilemma between Secretariat and Administrative experience propounded in paragraph 10 above, by dovetailing the two classes in to each other, and also to provide the higher-powered machine to which I referred in paragraph 7. The building up of the Class I Service would, of course, take time. The methods to be pursued in order to prevent its becoming a service of pure “office wallahs” would also need further consideration. The first of these questions I pursue in the last Chapter of this Report. The second I would be inclined to leave to be solved by the method of recruitment suggested in paragraph 58 (c) (iii) and the deputation proposal in paragraph 58 (d). Direct recruits could also be given some initial administrative training for what it is worth. I would not go in for a system of temporary *exchanges* between officers of the Class I Service and those in Central and Provincial Executive Services. I may also record my general opinion here against any thing in the nature of an Administrative Staff College. I do not think administration can be taught in that way. On the other hand I would draw attention to the recommendation made by the Committee on the Training of Civil Servants in the United Kingdom (to which I have referred earlier) that selected officers should be granted a year's “sabbatical leave” about the middle of their service, to broaden their minds and give them opportunities of travelling abroad, and, if they so wished, of studying the public administration in other countries. This is a recommendation to be highly commended and, of course, applied over a much wider field than merely the new Service here under consideration.

PART V.—HOW TO OBTAIN THE OFFICERS WITH DUE REGARD TO PROVINCIAL NEEDS

60. *The rationing of man-power. Indian Civil Service, the crucial commodity.*—My second term of reference asks “whether, owing to the difficulties reported by Provincial Governments in lending officers to the Centre and their desire for return of some of the officers already lent, any early reduction is possible in the number of officers now on deputation from the Provinces”. The conclusions I have reached show that, so far from its being possible to make any considerable reduction in the total number of officers now employed in the Central Secretariat and its “Attached” and “Subordinate” Offices, it will probably be necessary to increase it. There

is, therefore, no simple solution of the Provincial difficulty. This does not mean, however, that we must abandon all attempts to solve it. It means that we must try to meet part of our own requirements from alternative sources and allow Provinces a fair share of the best man power available. Their work during the next few years is likely to be just as important as our own—in some respects even more so. No Department here will be willing to part with any of its officers; but unless these premises are accepted and constantly borne in mind, the rest of this part of my report might as well not have been written.

The officers we are now employing fall into two classes—Indian Civil Service and non-Indian Civil Service officers. I have found it difficult to secure accurate statistics about the latter, but it is fairly obvious that the main provincial problem relates to the former. My examination in detail will therefore be confined to the Indian Civil Service figures; but some of my suggestions will, no doubt, cover both classes.

61. *The facts and figures of the present Indian Civil Service position.*—(a) According to the information given me by the Establishment Officer, supplemented by Mr. Rowland's Report on "Central requirements of Indian Civil Service officers", the position is as follows. The Provincial Indian Civil Service cadres provide for 68 reserved, and 57 unreserved, posts under the Central Government and the Crown Representative—a total of 125. Their distribution, according to paragraph 9 of Mr. Rowland's Report, is :—

General Secretariat	44
Pool	32
Miscellaneous and local	18
Indian Political Service	31
										125

At the moment, against this figure of 125, the actual number is just about 240—that is to say, we are employing nearly twice as many Indian Civil Service officers as we are strictly entitled to.

(b) The contributions of different Provinces vary; but, whereas the correct contribution of each should be in the neighbourhood of 11% of its cadre, the actual percentages range from 15% in Bengal to 39 per cent in the Central Provinces. Three other Provinces—Punjab (29·5%), Madras (25·9%) and the United Provinces (23·3%)—have over twice as many officers away as they ought to have.

(c) Of the 240 Indian Civil Service officers, apparently *35 are in the Finance and Commerce Pool as against Mr. Rowland's figure of 32, and 52, as against Mr. Rowland's 31, are in the Indian Political Service. These 87 officers, I take it, are lost to the Provinces for good and there can be no question of returning any of them, at any rate permanently.

(d) There are at present 106 Indian Civil Service officers in the Secretariat excluding the External Affairs Department, which is manned mainly from the Indian Political Service. Of these 106, 28 are in the Pool or list (*i. e.* officers earmarked for continuous service in the Finance or Commerce Departments). This leaves 78 Indian Civil Service officers in the "General Secretariat" against Mr. Rowland's figure of 44.

(e) There are 82 Indian Civil Service officers in posts outside the Government of India Secretariat (excluding External Affairs Department), of whom 7 are in the Pool. This leaves 75 Indian Civil Service officers so employed against Mr. Rowland's figure of 18. Of these 75, 17 are either Members of Council or in the Governor General's Secretariat or in other posts with which I am not concerned, leaving 58 employed under Departments with which I am concerned. (Perhaps some of the 17 ought strictly to be counted against Mr. Rowland's figure of 44). I would only note in passing that of the 17, three are shown as on military duty. I should have thought that these three ought to be returned at once.

(f) Of the 136 officers with whom I am primarily concerned—*viz.* 78 in the Secretariat and 58 outside, no less than 34 in the Secretariat and 19 outside—*i. e.* a total of 53—are senior officers of about Joint Secretary's rank or above; 37 in the Secretariat and 32 outside—*i. e.* a total of 69—are middle grade officers of about Deputy Secretary's rank; and only 7 in the Secretariat and 7 outside—*i. e.* a total of 14—are lower grade officers of about Under Secretary's rank.

(g) The Central Departments employing most Indian Civil Service officers are :—

Name of Department	Secretariat	Non-Secretariat	Total
Industries & Supply	21 (2 in Pool)	4	25
Finance	19 (all in Pool or List)	8 (6 in Pool or List).	27
Home	7	12	19
Commerce	6 (4 in Pool or List)	12 (2 in pool)	18
Labour	6	10	16
Food	9 (1 in pool)	4	13

All the others have under double figures.

(h) Finally, 31 Indian Civil Service officers now in the Secretariat (8 top, 20 middle and 3 lower) and 17 Indian Civil Service officers now in non-Secretariat appointments (5 top, 11 middle and 1 lower), that is to say a total of 48 (13 top, 31 middle and 4 lower) out of 136, are due to revert to their Provinces on completion of their tenures during 1946—most of them, I gather, before the end of October.

62. *Excess of senior and shortage of junior Indian Civil Service officers in Secretariat.*—The most striking features of the above analysis, if we set them against the general picture of our 1945 Secretariat staff and its future requirements as presented in paragraphs 53 and 59 above, are as follows.

* See Note at the end of this Report.

(a) *The apparent excess of top officers and the extent to which these top posts are monopolised by the Indian Civil Service.*—At the beginning of paragraph 53 I gave our requirements of real top Secretariat officers as 25 for about 25 average "Units" against which, according to paragraph 53 (2), there were in 1945 19 Secretaries, 6 Additional Secretaries and 26 Joint Secretaries—making a total of 51. Of these apparently 47 belong to the Indian Civil Service, of whom 13 are in the Pool or List. I should say, however, that many of the 26 Joint Secretaries are not real top officers and could be replaced by Deputy Secretaries.

(b) *The apparent reasonableness of our present number of middle officers and the extent again to which these posts are monopolised by the Indian Civil Service.*—In 1945, according to paragraph 53 (2) above, there were 51 Deputy Secretaries, of whom apparently, 48 belong to the Indian Civil Service, including 11 in the Pool. At the beginning of paragraph 53 I gave our requirements as roughly 67, but 17 of these were included to fill possible posts of Public Relations Officers. Even if it is fact, however, that many of our 26 Joint Secretaries are really no more than glorified Deputy Secretaries, it is equally true that a considerable proportion of our 51 Deputy Secretaries are really no more than glorified Under Secretaries. The reasonableness of the numbers in this grade is, therefore, much more apparent than real.

(c) *The very great shortage of Indian Civil Service Under Secretaries.*—Against estimated requirements (paragraph 53) of about 113 lower grade officers, we had in 1945 [paragraph 53 (2)] about 42 Under Secretaries and 61 Assistant Secretaries; but of the former only 11 belong to the Indian Civil Service, of whom 4 are in the Pool. There are, of course, no Indian Civil Service Assistant Secretaries. Assuming that some of our present Indian Civil Service Deputy Secretaries are really doing work that could be done by Under Secretaries, the shortage in this grade is very considerable. It is due largely to the stoppage of Indian Civil Service recruitment during the war.

(d) *The great extent to which a comparatively small number of Departments—and those largely Departments concerned with war, rather than post-war, work—are contributing to the excess of so-called top officers noted above.*—Leaving the Finance and Commerce Departments out of account, since nearly all their top officers are in the Pool or List, and also the External Affairs Department, since their top officers come from the Indian Political Service, it is noticeable that Industries and Supply (7), War (5), Food (5), Labour (3) and War Transport (3) all have, or had until recently, more than two Indian Civil Service officers of the rank of Joint Secretary or above. Legislative, Home, Information and Broadcasting, Commonwealth Relations and Agriculture each have two. Labour and Home are Departments which I have recommended should be divided into separate "Units", but which, in my opinion, should not need more than four real top officers between them, instead of the present five officers of and above the rank of Joint Secretary. Here is a possible saving of one officer. Legislative, no doubt, must have two—one Secretary and one Draftsman; but Information & Broadcasting, Commonwealth Relations and Agriculture should not, in my opinion require more than one real top officer each—giving a further saving of three. Ultimately I should hope that Food would require none, War Transport and Industries and Supply not more than one each, and War not more than two—giving an eventual saving of $5+2+6+3=16$. The excess in these last four Departments is certainly due largely to wasting items of work due to the war. Commerce Department has one Joint Secretary who is not in the Pool or List. It should not require more than two against four top officers, if it is split into two units. This might give a further saving of one. All these "savings" added together come to 21, though many of them are not immediately attainable.

(e) *The similar, but less noticeable, unevenness in the distribution of Indian Civil Service Deputy Secretaries.*—Industries and Supply have 12 as against an ultimate requirement, one would hope, of not more than 3; Food have 4, all of whom may ultimately disappear; Legislative have 3, of whom at least one should, I imagine, be an Under Secretary if Indian Civil Service Under Secretaries were available. On the other hand, some Departments need more Indian Civil Service Deputy Secretaries. Commerce, Information and Broadcasting and Agriculture have only one each. Education, it may be noted, have no Indian Civil Service officers of any grade.

63. *Possible return of 25 senior Indian Civil Service officers from Secretariat.*—The net result of all these factors, if my ideas are generally accepted, would appear to be as follows.

(a) We might hope within the next year or so to return to their Provinces, without replacement by new officers from the Provinces, about 17 Indian Civil Service officers of the rank of Joint or Additional Secretary. This would leave 47 [paragraph 62 (a) ante] minus $17=30$ top officers. Of these, however, 13 would be in the Pool and only 17 would be available for the other Departments. In paragraph 42 ante I gave the total number of Departments as 18; but these include Finance and Commerce, which must be served from the Pool, External Affairs Department, which must be served from the Indian Political Service, and Railways and Education, which at present have no Indian Civil Service officers. On the other hand, War will presumably require at least two top Indian Civil Service officers and, according to my recommendations, both Labour and Home will be divided and require two top officers each. The bare number of top officers required would therefore be $18-5+3=16$. The 17 officers left should be just sufficient, bearing in mind that we have a few non-Indian Civil Service officers in top appointments already and that it will always be easier to obtain Secretaries from Provincial Governments, especially if we have returned a number of rather less senior Indian Civil Service officers to them.

(b) We might similarly hope within the next year or so to return about 8 Indian Civil Service Deputy Secretaries without replacement by new officers from the Provinces. This would leave 48 [paragraph 62 (b) ante] minus $8=40$. Of these, however, 11 would be in the Pool, leaving only 29 for the other Departments. Assuming the same number of Units to be served,

the 29 officers should again be just sufficient, bearing in mind that same non-Indian Civil Service officers in the Deputy Secretary's grade will be available.

64. *Requirements of Indian Civil Service Under Secretaries.*—Against these possible returns of senior officers we shall have to find a large number of suitable Under Secretaries. Not only is it generally desirable to improve the standard of officers in that grade, but it will also, *ex hypothesi*, be necessary to carry on the work now being done by the officers returned under paragraph 63 by a redistribution of our existing resources. That means that much of the work now being performed by our Deputy Secretaries will in future have to be done by Under Secretaries. The precise number of better quality Under Secretaries we shall require is a more difficult matter to decide. In paragraph 53 I gave our total requirement for 25 Secretariat "Units" as about 113, against which in 1945 we had about 42 Under Secretaries and 61 Assistant Secretaries. The shortage on paper is therefore only 10; but at present there are only 11 Indian Civil Service Under Secretaries, of whom 4 are in the Pool, and it is more officers of the Indian Civil Service standard, or the nearest possible approach to it, that we require. I should say myself that for the Secretariat Departments not served by the Pool or the Indian Political Service the number of junior officers of I. C. S. calibre to be aimed at should be about 54, making with the 17 top officers left under paragraph 63 (a) and the 29 middle officers left under paragraph 63 (b), a round figure of 100. It is clear, however,

(1) that we might as well ask for the moon as for 54—7=47 Indian Civil Service Under Secretaries at present; and

(2) that it would be equally idle to expect either the Finance and Commerce Departments to secure their full requirements of Indian Civil Service junior officers in some mysterious way from the Pool, or indeed the External Affairs Department from the Indian Political Service.

I would therefore put our minimum total requirements for all Secretariat Departments at about 75 Indian Civil Service type Under Secretaries. How we are to get officers of that type will be discussed in the succeeding paragraphs. It need only be added here that, if the scheme for the Imperial Secretariat Service Class I materialises, at least 200 more officers will be required as "Principals" in the Secretariat Departments, plus a somewhat similar number for leave, training and outside posts. These, however, need not be of quite the same high calibre.

65. *Indian Civil Service position outside the Secretariat.*—The most noticeable features about the number of Indian Civil Service officers at present employed in Central posts outside the Secretariat are:

(a) the large extent to which the difference between the 18 posts mentioned in Mr. Rowland's Report and the present figure of 58 [excluding 7 officers in the Pool and the 17 officers mentioned in paragraph 61 (e)] is accounted for by *ad hoc* appointments to meet special war, rather than post-war, problems in a limited number of Departments: and

(b) the very small proportion of junior Indian Civil Service officers actually employed or required, for these posts—at present only 7 out of 58.

A more detailed analysis gives the following results.

(1) The Commerce Department now employ 12 Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat (4 top and 8 middle). Two of the middle officers are in the Pool. Four of these 12 or employed on war time import and export controls and one as shipping Controller. Most of these posts should eventually disappear. Two are employed in the Indian Supply Commission, London, which is also not, presumably, a permanent organisation. Four or employed as Trade Commissioners or in the High Commissioner's Office in London, and one presides over the Tariff Board. These five appointments may be regarded as permanent, but possibly one or two of them might be filled by non-Indian Civil Service officers.

(2) The Labour Department have been employing 10 Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat, of whom I understand that two or three are reverting, or have already reverted, to their Provinces after finishing war jobs. The remainder are all employed in different Provinces as Directors or Deputy Directors of Resettlement and Employment Exchanges. In that capacity they are, of course, serving provincial purposes and the Provinces may not press for their return. I think, however, that all of them could be replaced by non-Indian Civil Service officers.

(3) The Home Department employ 12 Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat. Most of them are filling normal posts in Chief Commissioners' Provinces. There are three lower grade Indian Civil Service officers at present employed, for a brief period, as Group Testing Officers in connection with the filling of war reserved vacancies in the Indian Civil Service, etc. Apart from the return of these three officers no further reduction is possible in the near future.

(4) Industries and Supply are employing two top and two middle Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat. One of them is holding what may be called a permanent post—Director General, Industries and Supply. The other three are in charge either of war time controls (iron and steel and textiles) or of disposals. These will disappear in due course.

(5) Commonwealth Relations have five middle and two lower Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat. One of them is under suspension. The other six are either Agents to the Government of India or Secretaries to High Commissioners. These are all more or less permanent posts, but perhaps some of them might be held by non-Indian Civil Service Officer.

(6) Food Department have two top and two middle Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat. All of them are employed on food control work, the necessity for which will cease along with that for the Department itself. One post of Regional Food Commissioner might perhaps be held by a non-Indian Civil Service man.

(7) The War Transport Department have two top Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat. One is Chairman of the Bombay Port Trust, a post that might conceivably be filled by a non-Indian Civil Service officer. The other is holding a temporary post and will retire when the work has been completed.

(8) Legislative Department have three middle Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat. One presides over the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, which is a permanent appointment but has not hitherto been held by an Indian Civil Service officer. The other two preside over temporary tribunals dealing with bribery and corruption. It might be possible to replace them by non-Indian Civil Service officers.

(9) Agriculture have middle grade Indian Civil Service officer outside the Secretariat. He is Secretary to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and this post must presumably continue to be held by an Indian Civil Service officer.

(10) Posts and Air have two senior Indian Civil Service officers in the posts and Telegraphs Department. These are normal appointments.

(11) Finance are employing two senior Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat who are not in the Pool or List. One of these is a Commissioner of Income Tax who will retire fairly soon. The other is the Salt Commissioner and may be regarded as a normal appointment.

66. *Possible return of 25 Indian Civil Service non-Secretariat officers.*—From the above facts it would appear that about 28 out of the 40 "extra" Central posts now filled by non-Pool Indian Civil Service officers outside the Secretariat will either not require replacement by Indian Civil Service officers or might at a pinch be filled by non-Indian Civil Service officers. Against these possible reductions one may allow for a certain number of new posts to which it will be desirable to appoint Indian Civil Service officers. I suggest that we should aim at returning about 25 of these 40 Indian Civil Service officers to their Provinces within the next year or so.

67. *Combined return of 50 senior officers, plus demand for 75 juniors, plus demand for new Service.*—The net result, taking Secretariat and non-Secretariat together, is that we should try to return about 50 top and middle grade Indian Civil Service officers to their Provinces within the next year or so without replacement by other Indian Civil Service officers from the Provinces and that we should look round for at least 75 suitable lower grade officers mainly for employment as Under Secretaries in the Secretariat, plus a very much larger number if we are going to start a new Imperial Secretariat Service, Class I. My figure of 50 happens to tally more or less with the number of Indian Civil Service officers due to revert to their Provinces during 1946. The two figures, it is true, bear no real relation to each other either as regards their division between Secretariat and non-Secretariat posts or as regards their distribution between top, middle and lower grade officers; but they do suggest that an effort of these dimensions should be made. That would leave the Secretariat Departments of the Governor General in Council, minus External Affairs, Finance and Commerce, with $78-25=53$ Indian Civil Service officers mainly for the upper grades of the Secretariat, but with a demand for at least 75 more Indian Civil Service or equivalent Under Secretaries for the Secretariat, as a whole; and with $58-25=33$ Indian Civil Service officers for posts outside the Secretariat. The figure of 53 may be regarded as inadequate; but my whole point is that a readjustment of this character would give both the Centre and the Provinces a fair share of the best material available. The actual selection of officers for return can only be done, I think, by allotting to each Department a quota in proportion to its existing staff and asking for particular consideration to be shown to the Central Provinces, the Punjab, Madras and the United Provinces, whose contributions to the Centre are markedly in excess of those of other Provinces. A Committee invested with high authority would almost certainly be necessary to carry the process through.

[*Note.*—Since this part of my report was drafted, the exigencies of the food situation, combined with the leave requirements of officers during the coming hot weather, have necessitated immediate action under a Committee appointed by His Excellency. Action already taken may, therefore, have altered some of my figures; and my recommendations (to which, however, I adhere generally) must be read in the light of such changes.]

68. *Division of problem into (1) return and replacement scheme; and (2) new Service scheme.*—If it is agreed that an objective of this character lies before us, it is no use blinking the fact that it is going to be extremely difficult to achieve it. I would divide the whole process into two schemes, although they may overlap to some extent:—

(1) a scheme for the return of Indian Civil Service officers to their Provinces accompanied by the recruitment of other officers to take their places and fill the deficit in our lower Secretariat grades; and

(2) a scheme for the building up of the proposed new Imperial Secretariat Service, Class I.

It is obvious that the "two way traffic" involved in the first of these schemes must flow more or less concurrently. In the second the traffic will mostly be in one direction—recruitment to the new Service—but it is equally obvious

(a) that it would take a very long time to build up from the bottom in the ordinary way a Service containing anything up to 400 officers,

(b) that no such Service can be expected to spring fully armed from my head or anyone else's, and therefore

(c) that, as usual, some middle course must be adopted by which we shall be able to provide ourselves with at least a properly balanced nucleus of the Service at the earliest possible date.

It is clear also that there must be both a long term and a short term aspect of both schemes, and that I am mainly concerned with the latter.

69. *The return and replacement scheme*.—The main point about this scheme is that it must be essentially a deal in Indian Civil Service officers or ersatz Indian Civil Service officers. The standard wanted is as near the Indian Civil Service standard as possible. We can hardly begin returning officers to their Provinces until we have in sight enough replacements of about that standard to keep our own machine going. I have given our figure of requirements as about 75, but there would be no harm in giving ourselves a little more margin. There would, indeed, be no great risk in putting the figure at 100, because any excess we may succeed in obtaining could always be employed elsewhere or spill over into scheme No. 2.

70. *Long-term considerations*.—From the long-term point of view it is true

(a) that the Indian Civil Service is being brought up to its pre-war strength by the filling of "war reserved vacancies"—a process which, it is hoped, will be completed by the end of 1946 and will result in an accession of strength amounting to some 200 officers ;

(b) that Mr. Rowland in his Report on future Central requirements of Indian Civil Service officers has proposed a considerable increase over the pre-war strength of the Indian Civil Service so as to provide for a much larger numbers of posts at the Centre ; and

(c) that the Home Department have been consulting the Provinces on a proposal to secure some part of the desired increase in the strength of the Indian Civil Service by promoting to it, or "listing", a number of the best men in the Provincial Services at a fairly early stage in their careers.

The first of these developments will no doubt relieve the strain on the Provinces, but I assume that none of the new officers will be available for service at the Centre until they have worked for several years in their Provinces. They do not therefore provide any immediate solution of our side of the problem.

The second possibility—it is no more at present—lies even further ahead. The future of the Indian Civil Service is itself in doubt : and, even if Mr. Rowland's proposal were to be accepted, I suppose it would be at least 7 or 8 years before the Centre would derive any great benefit from them. [Incidentally, I do not agree with Mr. Rowland's figures—in the first place, because he wrongly assumes that 20 per cent. of the posts required for the Indian Political Service and the Finance and Commerce Pool can be drawn from the Provincial Services ; in the second place because the requirements of the Indian Political Service itself obviously require revision; and lastly because, in my opinion (see paragraph 9 above), we should cease in any case to regard the Indian Civil Service as the only Service from which to meet Central Secretariat requirements.]

Even the third proposal, if it materialises, will secure no immediate relief for the Centre, since few, if any, of the officers selected from the Provincial Services would be suitable for employment at the Centre without further training.

On the other hand, all these factors do effect our problem in so far as they emphasise its temporary character. From the practical point of view they point to the importance of securing a fairly high proportion of older men to fill our immediate needs so as to leave the way as clear as possible for the younger men from the Indian Civil Service when they do become available.

71. *Possible sources of immediate supply*.—Where then are we to look for the men we want now ? The only answers seem to be

(a) in the armed forces ;

(b) in the various large temporary Directorates and other Offices outside the Secretariat—especially under the supply Department—which have grown up during the war to meet purely war time needs ;

(c) possibly, in some of the war-time Secretariats themselves, although it must be remembered that in my previous calculations of existing strength I have included all those who are now actually serving as Secretariat officers ; and

(d) again possibly, in the All-India, Central or even Provincial Services other than the Indian Civil Service, some of which might be able to suggest the names of an officer or two who would be suitable for immediate employment as Under Secretaries.

I do not think that (c) and (d) should be entirely disregarded, but it is obvious that the main fields of recruitment must be (a) and (b).

72. *The proposed "Pool" of officers*.—On the above basis steps have already been taken, after discussion between the Council Secretary, representatives of the Home and Finance Departments, the Establishment Officer and myself, to initiate a scheme for the selection, through the Federal Public Service Commission, of a pool of about 100 suitable officers on certain terms. The details of this scheme are explained in the Annexure to this part of my report ; and on its success depends, so far as I can see, the whole of my return and replacement proposals. If a larger number of suitable officers is forthcoming than is required as Under Secretaries, I have

no doubt that it will be easy to place them elsewhere, either in Directorates and posts outside the Secretariat or, as I have mentioned above, as part of the nucleus of the new Service scheme, to which I shall now turn.

73. *The new Service scheme.*—The point of prime importance about this scheme is that it will be fatal to fill the proposed Service simply by promoting our existing Superintendents and Assistants. That *could* be done by a stroke of the pen, but it would merely mean paying more for our existing material. We want a higher standard. That is why I have tentatively recommended [paragraph 58 (c) above] that not more than 20 per cent. of the new Service (80 out of 400) should be filled in this way. It may conceivably be necessary, to start with, to admit a somewhat larger proportion; but in that case I would press most strongly for taking in a majority of older men who would not have long to serve and would thus leave the way clear for new recruits. From the discussions of the Committee of Secretaries mentioned in my third term of reference, it appears that the Secretaries of 12 Departments gave it as their opinion that 129 of their present Superintendents and Assistants were fit for promotion as Principals or Assistant Principals. My scheme omits the grade of Assistant Principal; and I very much doubt whether anything like that number are really fit for promotion as Principals. At a rough guess I would put the figure for the whole Secretariat at something more like 75 to 100. Many of these may already be serving temporarily as Assistant Secretaries and thus come within the category of those who might become available to form part of the nucleus of the Service if the return and replacement scheme succeeds. In any case I would make 100 the outside figure to be recruited to begin with from these sources.

My next suggested source of recruitment [paragraph 58 (c) above] was from existing Directorates and Services outside the Secretariat (in the former of which of course eventually a considerable number of the new Service would be employed.) Here again, however, we should be in danger of robbing Peter to pay Paul and the selection would have to be most strict. To begin with I doubt whether more than 50 suitable men are likely to be forthcoming, although I contemplate that eventually about 30 per cent. of the Service (120 out of 404) should be filled in this way. It is possible that a certain further number of suitable officers might also be found from the Armed Forces, either as an overflow from the pool described in paragraph 72, or by having a second comb-out at a rather lower level of qualifications if the first selection proves a success. We cannot, however, regard the Armed Forces as an inexhaustible reservoir of good material; and I would not put the number that might be secured in this way above 25 or 30.

The last and main source of recruitment—accounting for 50 per cent. of the total—should, I suggested [paragraph 58 (c)], be by open examination held by the Federal Public Service Commission. The Chairman of the Commission informed the Committee of Secretaries that probably not more than 20 really good men a year could be recruited in this way; and at that rate it would take 10 years to fill half the Service.

74. *Possibility that the new Service may have to be recruited in two stages.*—On the above premises it would appear that the nucleus of our new Service, even if we start by admitting a few older men who might fall short of the standard required, cannot be expected to exceed at the most half its ultimate strength. Sooner than lower the standard, or disperse such good material as we can secure over too large an area, I would prefer to aim at only about 200 in the first instance and limit the field of their employment. This could be done either by confining them to the Secretariat proper and not providing any men for work outside, or—perhaps preferably—by selecting a suitable number of Secretariat Departments along with their Directorates, etc., in which to introduce the new system and by allowing the remainder to function as at present until the new Service can be developed and expanded. In that case, I would choose the Departments from the group that is mainly concerned with post-war development. I would put these Departments in the following order of priority based on what appear to be the most immediate necessities of the case

- (1) Agriculture and Food.
- (2) Health.
- (3) Education.
- (4) Works, Mines and Power.
- (5) Labour.
- (6) Commerce and Marine.
- (7) Industries and Supply.
- (8) Transport.
- (9) Communications (Posts and Air).
- (10) Planning and Development.

The Finance and War Departments could be left to carry on their own re-organizations, while Home, Legislative, Information and Broadcasting, External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations might continue to function as at present.

I do not altogether like splitting the scheme in this way, but apart from the fact that it may be necessary to do so, the procedure proposed would enable the new system to be tested before committing the whole Secretariat to it; and it would also ease the practical problems of retrenchment and readjustment of staff that must accompany it.

75. *Further action required.*—The proposals in the last two chapters of this Report have been made on the broadest lines and I fully realize that much more detailed work will be needed if they are to be applied in practice. It would, however, be waste of effort to attempt such a task before the principles had been accepted; and in any case I think that detailed proposals would have to be worked out by the Departments themselves—probably by the appointment of officers on special duty.

76. *Financial considerations.*--A few words are required to explain why I have made no attempt to assess the cost of my proposals or suggest scales of pay for the various grades of staff concerned. Here again, detailed calculations at this stage would be both difficult and quite unreliable. I understand that all pay scales are likely to come under revision in the near future. Above all, the extra expenditure, if any, that my proposals may involve will be infinitesimal compared with the sums that the Government propose to spend on their schemes of post-war development and will represent a very small addition to the overhead charges of those schemes. I may, however, point out that, if the most important general feature of my proposals is accepted--namely, more officers and less clerks--the savings in one direction will be large. Our present (admittedly swollen) pay bill for the higher grades of the Secretariat Offices alone, taking the average pay of a Superintendent to be Rs. 740 p. m., that of an Assistant in charge to be Rs. 400 p. m. and that of an Assistant to be Rs. 270 p. m., must be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 6½ lakhs a month on the figures given in paragraph 56. Even if the average pay of the new grade of Principal is taken as Rs. 1,000 and that of the smaller number of Assistants proposed as Rs. 300 p. m., the corresponding monthly bill, on the figures given at the end of paragraph 58, ought not greatly to exceed Rs. 4 lakhs. This would leave about Rs. 2½ lakhs a month to meet a higher bill for more or better Under Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries, while my contemplated reduction in the number of Joint Secretaries and possibly some decrease in the average pay of Secretaries (if there are to be more of them) would also help to reduce cost.

Further, while I have recommended (paragraph 24) a levelling up of pay scales in head-quarter offices outside the Secretariat, I contemplate that similar reductions in the number of clerks should take place there also; and, if that can be achieved, financial results of the same order should follow.

I have no doubt that opposition to "Office" reductions will be enormous and will raise many difficult problems; but equally I have no doubt whatever that such reductions will be in the public interest and I believe they can fairly be set against the increased opportunities for better careers for officers of the right type. I have assumed throughout that the vast majority of the new officers, if not all of them, will be Indians.

March 1946.

R. TOTTENHAM,

[NOTE.--In para 61 (c) I gave the number of I. C. S. officers in the Pool as 35, against Mr. Rowland's figure of 32. This figure, with that of the Indian Political Service, gave a total of 87 I. C. S. officers who could not be returned to their provinces. Information received from the Establishment Office since the Report was submitted shows that there are apparently 40 I. C. S. officers either on the List or in the Pool or on probation for the Pool and that the number of posts in the Pool reserved for I. C. S. officers in 1939 was 35. This suggests that both Mr. Rowland's figure and those originally supplied to me by the Establishment Officer were not correct, and that 5 more I. C. S. Officers may have to be added to the 87 not returnable to their provinces. I have, of course, been unable to make the consequential amendments in the figures in the succeeding paragraphs.]

ANNEXURE (See para. 72)

Requisition for the recruitment of candidates for appointment to the posts of Officer in the General Administrative Pool

1. (a) Designation of the post Officer in the General Administrative Pool.
(b) Number of posts to be filled ... 100.
2. Class and service to which the post belongs, ... Class I.
3. Whether permanent or temporary (if temporary, period for which it will last). Temporary. Duration of appointment—5 years in the 1st instance.
There is a possibility that selected persons from among the recruits may be made permanent later.
4. Whether pensionable or non-pensionable ... Non-pensionable, except for persons who are in permanent pensionable service.
5. Period of probation, if any One year.
6. Can the appointment be terminated by notice If so, on what conditions? Terminable on three months' notice by Government on ground of unsuitability, misconduct, or medical unfitness.
7. (a) Duties (a) Officers will be entrusted with general administrative and/or executive duties in the Central Secretariat and other offices of the Central Government.
(b) Place or places in which the officers will be required to serve. (b) Anywhere in India.
8. When will the selected candidates be required to join? As soon as possible
9. Scale of pay.—
(a) for direct recruits (a) Rs. 600—40—1,000. Starting pay will be fixed according to qualifications and experience, as recommended by the Federal Public Service Commission. Officers posted as Under Secretaries will get a Special Pay of Rs. 100 per month, subject to a minimum of Rs. 750 per month to time.
(b) for persons who have been in continuous Government employ since 15th July, 1951. (b) According to the rules and orders applicable to such persons from time.
10. Prospects promotion of to higher posts or to higher time-scales of pay, if it is desired to state them.
11. Provident Fund. Pension Fund. Officers will be required to subscribe to a Contributory Provident Fund, except in case of persons who are in permanent pensionable service.
12. Any special concessions, such as free quarters, light, water. Nil.
13. Will any special concessions be given to a candidate of non-Asiatic domicile? Nil.
14. Qualification required—
(a) Academic (a) Must possess a Degree of a recognised University.
(b) Training (b)
(c) Experience (c) Two years, administrative experience under the civil Government or in the Forces.
(d) Any other qualifications. (d) Must be (i) a Commissioned officer or an ex-officer, or (ii) a gazetted Government Officer or ex-Government officer who, while in service, was drawing a salary of at least Rs 600 p. m.
15. Age limits (if any) 30—50.
16. Nationality }
17. Domicile }
18. Are Government servants eligible? } Government servants are eligible : See item 14.
If so, will any of the conditions be relaxed in their favour? The conditions to be so relaxed should be indicated. No.
19. (a) Are women eligible? Yes.
(b) If not, has an order to this effect under Section 275 of the Government of India Act, 1935, been obtained?
20. Are members of any particular community or communities to be preferred? If so, the degree of preferences to be given should be stated. The appointments are subject to the rules regarding communal representation 25 posts will be filled by Muslims, 8 by members of other minority communities, and 8 by members of Scheduled Castes provided candidates with suitable qualifications are available.

APPENDIX I

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF BUSINESS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS

1. In the Lists that follow the references in brackets are to items in List I, II or III in the 7th Schedule to the Constitution Act. Items in List II of that Schedule have been included and allocated to the Departments indicated in so far as they (a) relate to C.C.s' Provinces, or (b) are covered by temporary legislation conferring on the Centre powers inside the provincial field, or (c) involve, by agreement with Governors' Provinces, central advice, co-ordination or financial assistance.

Items in List III have been included and allocated for the same reasons and also because they fall within the legislative authority of the Centre.

2. No attempt has been made to list the numerous executive, advisory, research, or educational agencies, through which the functions allotted to each Department are discharged. Nor have the various functions been included which are common to all or most Departments, such as—

(a) the administration of the agencies referred to above, subject to the general conditions of service laid down by the Government of India (List I. 8) ;

(b) the control and maintenance of the land and buildings in charge of each Department, so far as these functions have not been allotted to the Central P.W.D. (List I. 10) ;

(c) the handling of offences against laws with respect to any of the matters in the respective Lists (List I. 42, List II. 37 and List III. 1) ;

(d) the making of enquiries and the collection of statistics for the purposes of any of the matters in the respective Lists (List I. 43, List II. 38 and List III. 24 and 35) ; or

(e) the levying or collection of fees (other than court fees) in respect to any of the matters in the respective Lists (List I. 59, List II. 54 and List III. 25 and 36).

3. On the departmental lists themselves I have noted the changes proposed and also departmental objections to these changes where they still exist. There are several matters of major importance on which complete agreement has not been secured and the orders of the Government of India will therefore be required. I list these below together with my recommendations on each.

(a) *Works*.—There is considerable difference of opinion regarding departmental responsibility for items which may lead up to engineering works of one kind or another. I have included "irrigation and flood control", but not "irrigation and flood control works" under Agriculture for the same reason that "water supply and drainage", but not "water supply and drainage works" are included in the Health list. In my view the initiative in these matters should come from the Departments mentioned in each case and they should have such expert advisers as may be considered necessary for that purpose. On the same principle "hydroelectric power for agricultural purposes" might perhaps be included in the Agriculture list and "hydro-electric power for industrial purposes" in the Industries and Supply list. On the other hand, all branches of civil engineering are allotted to Works, Mines and power and, as things are, that must mean more than the mere execution of projects. It must include the technical planning of such projects in conformity with the wishes of the initiating Department and a certain amount of policy work and co-ordination. The distinction I have drawn is, I hope, clear enough ; but I am afraid it is not fully accepted. Works, for instance, claim that "major irrigation" and "major irrigation works" are inseparable, especially if the latter form part of multi-purpose projects, and should therefore both be placed in their Department. Agriculture claim that irrigation and agriculture are inseparable and that the irrigation engineers should be located in their Department in order to enable them to discharge their responsibilities. Health make similar claims with regard to water supply, drainage and town planning, pointing out that some Provinces do maintain a public health engineering cadre separate from the P. W. D. [It has been agreed that these matters must remain in the Health list and that, in Delhi, the Chief Commissioner should address the Health Department and not the Works Department on all matters relating to the filtered water supply and sewage disposal. The closest possible liaison should be maintained between the Health and works Department and the latter should remain responsible for the execution of schemes approved by the former and for the preparation and execution of new technical schemes to the extent required by Health as well as for the maintenance and repair of the existing system to the extent required by that Department.] In my opinion, however, it would be almost as wrong, as things are at present, to provide each Department with engineers who specialise in the kind of works they may require as it would be to give every Department engineers and architects for their buildings. The position would, however, be modified and, I think, improved if effect could be given to the scheme which the present Labour Secretary has in mind, for the creation of a Bureau of first class consulting engineers and architects of every type, whose services would be at the disposal of all Departments, including the new Department, of Works, Mines and Power. Such a Bureau would be of the kind mentioned in para. 21 of my Report No. II and its proper location would be a matter for further consideration. Its existence would lead to the ultimate recognition of the Department of Works as a Service solely concerned with the execution of works projects and therefore, perhaps, rightly placed along with other "Common agencies". Meanwhile I recommend that my allocation should be approved.

(b) *Land*.—This item, which is a provincial subject (List II. 21), used to be in the old Education, Health and Lands list. It is now in the Agriculture list. The fact that this new Department took the name of Agriculture, and not Land, means presumably that it is mainly

concerned with agriculture and agricultural land—undoubtedly a sufficient task for any single Department. I see no reason, therefore, why its energies should be diverted by having to deal also with building or urban land. This should be primarily the concern of the Health Department, although the Department of Works may also come in so far as such land is required for official purposes involving building or engineering works, and also so far as the rents of private buildings required for official purposes stand in need of control. Rent control in Delhi and Simla, for instance, may remain as at present with the latter Department so long as control is necessary.

Similar considerations apply to the subject of land acquisition—also a provincial subject (List II. 9). The law relating to land acquisition may remain with Agriculture, though it does not fall within the legislative authority of the Centre; but each Department should be responsible for the acquisition of the land it requires and Agriculture need not be concerned except in so far as compulsory acquisitions may affect agricultural interests in particular areas.

It is only in Centrally Administered areas, and particularly in Delhi, that these questions assume practical importance. In Delhi there is a very great demand, which is likely to increase, for land for central buildings of one kind or another, and the amount of Government land and also of agricultural land in the Province is limited. Obviously major questions of policy may arise both as to the disposal of the Government land available and as to the acquisition of privately owned agricultural land for building purposes. Competition between Departments, disputes, overlapping, ill-regulated expansion and many other evils are bound to arise unless special machinery is devised to deal with the whole subject at a high level. All actual grants of Government land, either for official or non-official purposes, and all acquisitions of private land will continue to be dealt with executively by the Chief Commissioner; but it seems necessary that the area within which such grants or acquisitions should not take place without the orders of the Central Government should first of all be authoritatively settled and defined in the light of present and prospective official requirements, and then that all land transactions within that reserved area should be allotted to a single Department. Land, including certain nazul estates, already placed at the disposal of the Delhi Improvement Trust on certain conditions would not come within this area. The Department selected should be made responsible for consulting all the interests concerned, and particularly those of the Agriculture and Health Departments. It would consider all proposals for the use of land in the reserved area in relation to Government's requirements (including in that phrase such matters as accommodation for diplomatic and consular representatives and for institutions sponsored by Government such as the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research), but it would not be concerned with the detailed use of any land in the area which it might be decided to place at the disposal of municipal authorities or private persons.

I suggest, as a special exception to the principles stated at the beginning of this note, that the most appropriate Department to select for this purpose, since it will be responsible for all official construction, would be the Department of Works, Mines and Power. The Secretary of that Department should preside over a standing committee consisting of the Secretaries in the Health and Agriculture Departments, the Chief Commissioner and a representative of any Department concerned with a particular grant or acquisition; and to this committee should be referred all important cases and any disputes that may arise. If agreement cannot be reached, the matter should go to the Co-ordinating Committee of Council for decision. The New Delhi Advisory Committee established under Labour Department Resolution No. B. 3, dated 12th December 1940 would continue to function under its existing terms of reference.

I have included entries in the lists of Works, Mines and Power, Health, and Agriculture to give effect to these recommendations. They are, I believe, acceptable to all except the last.

(c) *Agricultural industries*.—The development of industries is a provincial subject (List II. 29) except where development under central control is declared by central law to be expedient in the public interest. So far as I am aware, there is no such central law at present. At any rate, although I have drawn attention to the point, no Department has brought any such law to my notice. Meanwhile disputes seem to have been going on for sometime as to the allocation of departmental responsibility for the planning and development of various food industries; and it was decided at the 19th meeting of the Committee of Council on Food held on January 5th, 1946, that responsibility should be distributed as follows, so as to allow Departments already dealing with an industry and possessing experienced staff for that purpose to continue to do so—

Agriculture.—Gur and khandsari production: ghee; milk powder on a small scale; fruit preservation; fish; and refrigeration.

Industries and Supply.—Coffee, tobacco and cigarettes.

Commerce.—Tea.

Food.—Sugar; milk powder on an industrial scale; edible oils including linseed; salt; mustard and pepper; wheat products, including breakfast foods and malts; spirits, beer and wines; and all unspecified food industries.

I have retained this distribution in the departmental lists, except for the transfer of salt to Finance (C.B.R.), but it is difficult to regard it as a satisfactory arrangement. The Agriculture Secretary has brought to my notice that the list is not complete; and there are certain established industries dealing with agricultural products apart from tea, coffee, tobacco, etc.,—e.g. jute and cotton—in relation to which apparently Agriculture deals with the relevant Central Committees, but Commerce handles questions connected with the acreage to be put under cultivation and the price to be given. It seems to me that the development of food industries, or, indeed, industries based on any agricultural product, is not really a matter for either Agriculture or Food, and that Commerce should not be concerned with production. Food, no doubt, so long as the need for it exists as a separate Department, must have a leading voice as regards the industries to be selected for intensive development in view of the present food

situation ; and Agriculture may equally be concerned with the pushing of a particular industry in the interests of the producer. The development of industries generally is, however, clearly for Industries and Supply and it seems to me extremely difficult to differentiate between one industry and another on the basis of the source from which the raw material is produced. In some established industries, no doubt, such as tea, or coffee, the export aspect may predominate, or they may be the subject of international commodity agreements which might justify their allocation to Commerce rather than Industries and Supply. Salt, for special reasons, may be appropriately allocated to Finance (Central Board of Revenue). My general recommendation, however, is that efforts should be made as soon as circumstances permit to leave Agriculture and Food (on the assumption that they will eventually combine) responsible for production ; Industries and Supply for the development of the industrial processing of agricultural produce ; and Commerce for trade in, and export of, the finished product.

(d) *Weights and Measures*.—“Establishment of standards of weights” is a central subject (List I. 51) while “weights and measures” is a provincial subject (List II. 3). The whole subject is now apparently included in the Commerce list and that Department presses for its retention on the ground that weights and measures form the basis of all trading. Agriculture originally contended that it should take over this item, but is now prepared to agree that it should remain where it is. Industries and Supply has been busy for some time on the formation of a Central Standards Institution for India and thinks that the subject should be allocated to it. The standards referred to by Industries and Supply may no doubt cover a wider field than is included in the expression “weights and measures”; but it seems to me that the whole subject in its broadest sense is one in which nearly all Departments are interested from some particular point of view, although none may be concerned with the whole field. Commerce, for instance, is interested in tons and yards more than in drachms or miles ; Agriculture in acres and bushels more than in inches and pennyweights ; Industries in kilowatts and gallons more than in furlongs or minims. Science is, however, interested in practically the whole field and I am inclined to think that the whole subject of the establishment of standards, both inside and outside the field of weights and measures, should go to the Department responsible for the co-ordination of Scientific Research. I have accordingly allotted it provisionally to the Department of Planning and Development, although I know that this allocation is not universally accepted. My own view is that this Department should not form part of the permanent set-up of the Government of India and that its activities, including this particular item, should in due course be absorbed in the co-ordinating machinery of Government, and eventually find a place in the Chief Minister’s Department. No doubt the practical application and administration of the standards prescribed will remain the responsibility largely of Provincial Governments or certain Central executive Services ; but for the purposes of our departmental lists I do not think it is possible or necessary to distinguish between these two aspects of the matter.

(e) *Census and Vital Statistics*.—The first of these is a central subject (List I. 16) now allocated to Home, while the registration of births and deaths is a provincial subject (List II. 14) which has hitherto found a place both in the Health and Home Lists. My conception of the future functions of the Home Department as the Department responsible (a) for Law and Order and (b) the Public Services, makes it an unsuitable repository for either of these subjects, and I have had no hesitation, even though there may be special legislation to cover the cases of European British subjects, in allotting the registration of births and deaths to Health. A proposal has been under consideration to set up an office under a Registrar-General to take over the census and the whole range of statistics the basis for which is provided by the census. This proposal, I am told, has been kept in suspense pending the receipt of the Bhoré Committee’s Report. For these reasons I have provisionally allocated “census” also to Health ; but I am by no means sure that this is the correct allocation. As stated in para. 21 of my Report No. 11, a Bureau of Economic and Statistical Advice should, I think, ultimately find a place among other “common agencies” in the Chief Minister’s Department and I believe that “Census” should go there too. I agree with the view of the last Census Commissioner that in a country with a population problem of the magnitude at present before India, the census and all the enquiries and statistics based thereon should be brought as soon as possible under one roof and under really competent direction and the Department selected should be responsible for the flow of basic information on all these matters.

(f) *Fisheries*.—“Fishing and fisheries beyond territorial waters” is a central subject (List I. 23) and “fisheries” (i.e., in inland and territorial waters) is a provincial subject (List II. 24). Commerce has been dealing with first (and also, wrongly, with fisheries in Chief Commissioners, Provinces) and Agriculture with the second. In my opinion the whole subject should undoubtedly go to Agriculture. Commerce do not agree and point out that international fishing agreements may be involved and that there is a close connection between the fishing fleet and the mercantile marine. I do not consider that these objections are conclusive and I see no reason why Agriculture should not handle such international agreements as may be involved. The fishing industry generally stands in great need of development and the division of production between two Departments cannot make for efficiency. If the processing of fish is eventually allocated to industries and Supply, in accordance with the principle advocated in (c) above, there will, of course, have to be close liaison between that Department and the Department responsible for production.

(g) *Major ports*.—These are a central subject (List I. 22) at present allocated to War Transport. During the war Vizagapatam was allocated to War, but this port is now, I understand, going over to Railways. Commerce suggests that the whole subject should go to it and, at first sight, it would appear that there is something to be said for the suggestion, especially if Commerce is divided into two Units, one of which will deal with marine matters or shipping. Transport, however, strongly maintains that these ports are more intimately connected with land transport than with shipping and the proposal to allocate Vizagapatam to Railways bears out that contention. I recommend that the existing allocation should stand. If that view is accept-

ed, it is a question whether the Bengal Pilot Service, which is at present under Commerce should go over to Transport. This Service operates in the Hooghly both outside and inside the limits of the Port of Calcutta, but it is mainly concerned with the safety of shipping using that port. Personally I think it should go to Transport. I have allocated it, accordingly.

(h) *Government Advertisements.*—I have included this item provisionally in the list of Information and Broadcasting. I have done so mainly on the assurance I have received from that Department that considerable economies can be obtained, but that a lowering of the rates at present charged by newspapers can only be secured by putting all Government advertising in the hands of a single central agency, to which Departments will communicate their requirements and a draft of their advertisements. It is worth recalling that an experiment on these lines was made in 1937, but was abandoned in 1939 (Home Department O. M. No. 39/1/39-Poll, dated the 15th February 1939) on the ground that it had merely “resulted in duplication of clerical work in the Bureau of Public Information” (which was then under the Home Department). The Bureau was instructed to supply all Departments half-yearly with list 5 of the best advertising media and Departments were left to send their advertisements direct to newspapers selected from that list. This is still the practice so far as “classified” advertisements are concerned (*i.e.*, those relating to posts, business, works, etc.); but in the interval the Information and Broadcasting Department developed its Advertising Branch and has in fact handled nearly all the “display” advertisements of different Departments, such as those relating to Government loans, the Grow More Food Campaign, etc. There is no desire on the part of Departments to change this practice. As regards classified advertisements, I have consulted the Departments and Offices mostly concerned. There seems to be no great enthusiasm for centralization and the Chairman of the Federal Public Service Commission, who spends Rs. 28,400 a year on advertising, is opposed to it; but the general view seems to be that there is no objection provided :—

- (a) that the change will save money, and
- (b) that speed and efficiency can be guaranteed.

Several Departments point out that the scheme cannot apply to offices not at the headquarters of the Government of India and that there must be provision for exceptions in very urgent cases. The Industries and Supply Department asks why a “rate contract” cannot be negotiated with the press of which all Departments and Offices, including those not at headquarters, could take advantage. Mr. Thapar says that negotiations can only take place on the basis of a collective estimate of the consumption of space over a period of one year and that the newspapers will only accept the agreed “contract” rate in respect of advertisements received from a single agency. All others would be treated as “casual” and would be charged higher. The annual cost of Government’s classified advertisements, so far as I have been able to ascertain, runs into several lakhs of rupees and, if substantial savings can be secured by centralization and in no other way (though I confess I am not fully convinced on that point), I regard that consideration as decisive. I do not think that any reduction of work or material increase of efficiency is likely to be obtained by the change. Indeed, if Departments wish to send urgent advertisements direct without losing the benefits of the lower rates, or if an office outside Delhi desires to obtain these benefits, copies of their communications to the newspapers would have to be endorsed to the Advertising Consultant, who would then confirm the orders and receive the bill from the newspaper selected for scrutiny and payment; and this would obviously mean some increase of work and, possibly, some delay.

FINANCE

(Including the Central Board of Revenue and Departmental Finance Branches)

1. International finance and financial agreements (List I. 3); the regulation of foreign exchange.
2. General finance, that is to say :—
 - (a) Public accounts and estimates.
 - (b) Public expenditure.
 - (c) Public ways and means, including loans to and from the public treasury (List I. 6 and List II. 5).
 - (d) Management of the public funds.
 - (e) Policy relating to taxation, including customs and excise duties for revenue purposes, either
 - (i) for the benefit of Central Revenues (List I. 44, 45, 46, 54, 54A and 55); or
 - (ii) for the benefit of Provincial Revenues by central taxes (List I. 56 and 58); or
 - (iii) for the benefit of Provincial Revenues by provincial taxes, excise duties and cesses (List II. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 48A*—but see also Transport—48B, 49 and 50).
 - (f) Provincial and local finance.
 - (g) Borrowing of public bodies.
 - (h) Grants to Provincial Governments.
3. Currency and banking, that is to say :—
 - (a) The mints and security printing (List I. 5).
 - (b) Coinage (List I. 5).
 - (c) Paper currency (List I. 5).
 - (d) The Reserve Bank of India, the Imperial Bank of India and other Banks (List I. 33 and 38).
 - †(e) Money lending and money lenders (List II. 27).
 - (f) Post Office and Defence Savings Bank (financial policy), but see also Communications (List I. 7).
 - (g) Post Office Life Assurance Fund (financial policy), but see also Communications (List I. 7 and 37).
4. Salaries and allowances, that is to say :—
 - (a) General financial questions relating to the pay, allowances and leave of public officers (List I. 8 and List II. 6).
 - (b) Pensions and gratuities (List I. 9 and List II. 7).
 - (c) Provident fund.
5. Opium and opium products (List I. 31, and List II. 31).
6. Customs, including duties on goods imported and exported by sea, land or air, except protective tariffs—see Commerce; interpretation of the customs tariff (List I. 44).
7. Central excises (List I. 45).
8. Salt, including production‡ from all sources, subject to the provisions of item 4 of the Works, Mines and Power list; salt excise duty (List I. 47 and 45).
9. Income-tax, corporation tax and excess profits tax, excluding the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal—see Legislative (List I. 54 and 46).
10. Stamps and stamp duties (List III. 13), including—
 - (a) the supply and distribution of all kinds of stamp;
 - (b) rates of stamp duties on bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, bills of lading, letters of credit, policies of insurance, proxies and receipts (List I. 57); and
 - (c) Stamp duties on other instruments (List II. 51).
11. Provincial excise administration (List II. 31) and provincial excise duties on alcoholic liquors, narcotic and nonnarcotic drugs, and medical and toilet preparations containing alcohol, etc. (List II. 40); the revenue and customs aspects of poisons and dangerous drugs (List III. 19)—but see drugs standard control—Health, and Poisons Act—Home.

Temporary war items

1. Control of capital issues.
 2. Policy in regard to lease-lend, Canadian mutual aid, and reciprocal aid.
-

FOOTNOTES

* (1) The taxation of motor vehicles is transferred by agreement to Transport.

† (2) Transferred by agreement from Home.

‡ (3) This involves taking over from Food "supplies of salt from private sources." Both Departments agree. The methods of working salt mines will be subject to control by Works, Mines and Power, while the actual mining and control of the product will remain with Finance.

WAR

1. His Majesty's Naval, Military and Air Forces borne on the Indian establishment, including their Administrative, Ancillary and Auxiliary Services and their employment in aid of the civil power; any armed forces which are not forces of His Majesty, but which are attached to or operating with them (List I. 1 and List II. 1).
2. Naval, Military and Air Force works; the acquisition, custody and relinquishment of land for purposes of defence (List I. 2 and 10).
3. Educational institutions for the training of prospective members of the armed forces (List I. 12).
4. Preventive detention for reasons of state connected with defence (List I. 1 and List III. 34).
5. Cantonments and house accommodation therein (List I. 2).
6. Ecclesiastical affairs, including European cemeteries (List I. 4).
7. Marine surveys and danger to navigation outside ports and tidal waters—see also Commerce and Transport (List I. 25).

Temporary War items

1. Co-ordination of the provision, storage, location, transport, etc., of petroleum products (List I. 32 and List II. 29).
2. Special police enquiry agency.

FOOTNOTE

I have not taken account of the proposals for the reorganization of this Department which are being made by Mr. Shreeve and which, I understand, are based on the assumption of constitutional changes.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—FOREIGN

(Present External Affairs)

1. Relations (other than commercial) with foreign countries, including Palestine and foreign settlements in India; diplomatic and consular representation in India and in foreign countries (List I. 3).
2. Treaties and agreements with foreign countries, including the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization, but excluding the International Court of Justice and treaties and agreements the subject matters of which are the special concern of some other Department (List I. 3).
- *3. Extradition from British India to foreign countries (List I. 3) and the reverse process.
4. The administration of Baluchistan and Gilgit and the control of tribal areas, including the civil armed forces employed for that purpose (List I. 1).
- †5. Preventive detention for reasons of state connected with external affairs (List I. 1 and List III. 34).
- *6. Emigration from India to foreign countries and the return of emigrants; deportation and repatriation of the subjects of foreign States from India and of Indian Nationals from foreign countries to India; passports and visas, excluding grant of visas or endorsements for entry into India—see Home (List I. 17).
7. British Indian relations with the Indian States of Kalat, Las Bela, Kharan, Dir, Swat, Amb, Chitral, Hunza, Nagar and Sikkim.
- †8. Pilgrimage to holy shrines in Iraq and Iran and Hedjaz, *via* Iraq (List I. 17).

Temporary War items

1. Evacuation of Indians from foreign countries previously occupied by the enemy and assistance to destitute Indians in such countries.
2. Return of Indians to foreign countries previously occupied by the enemy.

FOOTNOTES

†(1) The wording follows agreement reached with Commonwealth Relations and Home and involves some readjustment of business between them.

†(2) It is a matter for decision between Foreign and Commonwealth whether the latter should take over—

(a) preventive detention for reasons connected with commonwealth affairs and (b) all pilgrimages outside India.

(3) It is proposed to transfer the Cypher Bureau to the Central Administrative Office.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—COMMONWEALTH

(Present Commonwealth Relations)

1. Relations (other than commercial) with Commonwealth countries including the rights of Indians in such countries (List I. 3).
 2. Agreements with Commonwealth countries except those the subject matters of which are the special concern of some other Department (List I. 3).
 - *3. Extradition to Commonwealth countries (List I. 3) and the reverse process.
 - *4. Emigration from India to Commonwealth countries and the return of emigrants; immigration to India from those Commonwealth countries to which the Reciprocity Act applies; deportation and repatriation of the subjects of Commonwealth countries from India and of Indian nationals from such countries to India (List I. 17).
 - †5. Pilgrimage to places beyond India, except those mentioned in the Foreign List (List I. 17).
-

Temporary War items

1. Evacuation of Indians from Commonwealth countries previously occupied by the enemy and assistance to destitute Indians in such countries.
 2. Return of Indians to Commonwealth countries previously occupied by the enemy.
-

FOOTNOTES

* (1) The wording follows agreement reached with External Affairs and Home and involves some readjustment of business between them.

† (2) Commonwealth might take over all pilgrimages to places outside India.

(3) The expression "Commonwealth countries" includes the United Kingdom.

***HOME—LAW AND ORDER**

(Present Home)

- *1. Conventions with other countries in judicial matters (List I. 3), including questions relating to the International Court of Justice and references from the United Nations Organization relating to traffic in women and children and obscene publications.
- *2. Extradition from British India to Indian States (List I. 3).
3. The Central Intelligence Bureau (List I. 1).
4. Public Order (List II. 1), including—
 - (a) preventive detention for reasons other than reasons connected with defence or external affairs (List I. 1 and List II. 1 and List III. 34);
 - (b) administration of the press laws (List III. 17);
 - (c) the control of seditious, obscene or otherwise objectionable literature (List I. 19 and List III. 17) and of dramatic performances (List II. 35);
 - (d) the administration of the Arms Act (List I. 29), the Explosives Act (List I. 30) and the Poisons Act (List III. 19);
 - (e) criminal tribes (List III. 23); and
 - (f) the activities of Indian agitators abroad.
5. Police (List II. 3), including the extension of police powers and jurisdiction to areas in other provinces and to railway areas (List I. 39).
- *6. Administration of justice, that is to say—
 - (1) constitution and organization, jurisdiction and powers of courts, except the Federal Court—see Legislative (List I. 53, List II. 1 and 2, List III. 15);
 - (2) criminal law and criminal procedure (List III. 1 and 2); and
 - (3) mercy petitions from Chief Commissioners' Provinces.
7. Prisons and prisoners (List II. 4), including the removal of prisoners and accused persons from one unit to another (List III. 3).
8. State lotteries (List I. 48), betting and gambling (List II. 36).
- +9. Foreigners, including—
 - (a) immigration from foreign and Commonwealth countries, except those to which the Reciprocity Act applies—see E.A.—Commonwealth (List I. 17);
 - (b) the entry of persons, other than returning emigrants, from Commonwealth countries except those to which the Reciprocity Act applies—see E.A.—Commonwealth (List I. 17);
 - (c) the grant of visas and endorsements for entry into India; and the regulation of the movements of foreigners in India (List I. 17);
 - (d) naturalization (List I. 49);
 - (e) European vagrants inside India—see also E. A.—Commonwealth (List III. 23).

FOOTNOTES

* (1) This list is based on the proposals—

- (a) to divide the present Home Department into (i) Law and Order, and (ii) Services; and
- (b) to allot to other more appropriate Departments as many as possible of the miscellaneous items now assigned to Home.

Proposal (a) involves taking back from Legislative those parts of "Judicial" transferred during the war which relate to criminal law and procedure, including extradition to Indian States, certain international commitments, and suits against Government servants, and, on the other hand, handing over to Legislative certain civil law matters, including religious and charitable endowments, the registration of deeds and documents and certain appointments of marriage registrars, administrators general and official trustees.

Proposal (b) involves the re-allocation of the following items to the Departments indicated :—

Money lending to Finance and Agriculture.

Victoria Memorial and moral and social hygiene, including children's courts, to Education.

Census [see para. 3 (e) of general covering note], registration of births and deaths, lunacy and the Ranchi European Mental Hospital to Health.

Pounds and cattle trespass, protection of wild birds and animals, prevention of cruelty to animals and procedure in rent and revenue courts to Agriculture.

† (2) The heading "foreigners" may not be absolutely correct; but the items included under this head represent the results of the agreement reached with External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations. They involve some re-adjustment of business between all three Departments.

(3) It is proposed to allot to the Central Administrative Office various items now dealt with in the Public Section of Home, including Rules of Business and Secretariat Instructions, holidays, move to Simla, liveries, security arrangements and visitors, and ceremonial.

***HOME—SERVICES**

(Present Home)

1. The Public Services—Secretary of State's, Central and Provincial (List I. 8 and List II. 6), including—
 - (1) general questions relating to recruitment, conditions of service, conduct, discipline, and communal representation, but excluding general financial questions relating to pay, allowances, leave, pension, gratuities and provident fund—see Finance;
 - (2) all matters concerning the ICS and I.P.S. ; and
 - (3) procedure in the case of suits against, and prosecutions of, Government servants—see also S. G. G. (Public).
2. The Federal Public Service Commission, excluding appointments thereto—see S. G. G. (Public)—but including the regulation of the relationship between the Central Government and the Commission (List I. 8).

Temporary War items

1. Man power.
2. Civil passages.

FOOTNOTES

- *(1) See footnote (1) under Home—Law and Order.
- (2) It is proposed to transfer from Home to the Central Administrative Office certain aspects of the internal administration of the Imperial Secretariat Service.

***INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING**

1. Publicity work and advice for all departments, including †Government advertisements.
2. All India Radio (List I. 7).
3. Cinemas (List II. 35), including—
 - (a) the development of the Indian film industry, excluding the production of raw stock and cinematograph equipment (List II. 29) ; and
 - (b) the sanctioning of cinematograph films for exhibition (List III. 33).
- ‡4. Government's relations with the press excluding the administration of the Press laws—see Home (List III. 17).
5. Government assistance to arts.

FOOTNOTES

*(1) If it is eventually decided to allot the work in item 1 to a Bureau, instead of a separate Department, item 2 would go to Communications, items 3 (a) to Industries, item 3 (b) and 4 to Home—Law and Order and item 5 to Education

†(2) See para. 3 (h) of general covering note.

‡(3) Home is not prepared to accept the suggestion that the administration of the Press Laws should be transferred to this Department. I recommend that matters in this respect should remain as they are at present.

LEGISLATIVE

1. Legal drafting and legal advice to all Departments ; the Advocate General and other law officers.
2. Publications—the issue and keeping up to date of volumes containing Acts, Ordinances, Rules, Orders, etc.
3. Business in the Central Legislature ; the Indian Legislative Rules ; and the Standing Orders of the two Chambers.
4. Secretariat of the Council of State.
5. Elections and nominations to the Central Legislature (List I. 40).
6. The Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (List I. 54).
- *7. Conventions with other countries in matters of civil law (List I. 3), including—
 - (a) references from the United Nations Organization relating to the civil status of women, assistance to indigent foreigners and legal assistance to the poor ; and
 - (b) reciprocal arrangements for—
 - (i) the disposal of estates of foreigners dying in India,
 - (ii) the execution in Commonwealth countries of commissions, letters of request and summonses from British Indian Courts ; and
 - (iii) the enforcement in Commonwealth countries and Indian States of maintenance orders.
- *8. The Federal Court (to the extent authorised by the Constitution Act) and the rules relating to the conditions of service of its Judges, officers and establishments.
- *9. Civil law and civil procedure (List III. 4), including the law relating to—
 - (a) evidence and oaths (List III. 5) ;
 - (b) marriage and divorce, including the appointment of registrars of marriages in Indian States under the Indian Christian Marriage Act ; infants and minors ; and adoption (List III. 6) ;
 - (c) wills, intestacy and succession, save as regards agricultural land—see Agriculture (List III. 7) ,
 - (d) transfer of property other than agricultural land—see Agriculture ; registration of deeds and documents (List III. 8) ;
 - (e) trusts and trustees (List III. 9) ;
 - (f) contracts, except contracts relating to agricultural land—see Agriculture, but including the authorisation of officers to execute contracts and assurances of property on behalf of the Governor General (List III. 10) ;
 - (g) arbitration (List III. 11) ;
 - (h) bankruptcy and insolvency; administrators general and official trustees, including their appointment for Chief Commissioners' Provinces and for British subjects in Indian States and the adjustment of fees levied by them (List III. 12) ;
 - (i) actionable wrongs (List III. 14) ; and
 - (j) the law relating to charitable and religious endowment (List II. 34).
- *10 Admiralty jurisdiction (List I. 21).
11. The legal profession (List III. 16).

Temporary war, etc., items

1. Tribunals under the Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 1943 (Bribery and Corruption).
2. Claims under the Bombay Explosion (Compensation) Ordinance, 1944.
3. Pension tribunals (Naval, Military and Air Force Disability Pensions).

FOOT-NOTE

* This allocation is based on the return to Home of "Judicial" items relating to Criminal Law and Procedure and the transfer from Home to Legislative of some additional items relating to Civil Law and Procedure—see note [i] under Home - Law and Order. The adjustments have been accepted except that Legislative is opposed to the transfer from Home of the law relating to charitable and religious endowments item [j].

AGRICULTURE

1. The Survey of India, the Botanical Survey of India and the Zoological Survey of India except Anthropology—see Education (List I. 14).
2. Agriculture and horticulture (List II. 20), including—
 - (a) agricultural education statistics and research (List I. 12 and List II. 17) ;
 - (b) protection against pests and prevention of plant diseases (List I. 19, List II. 20 and List III. 30) ;
 - *(c) the processing of certain agricultural products [gur, khandsari, ghee, milk powder (on a small scale), fruit and refrigeration]; the development of agricultural industries including machinery, fertilisers, seeds, cattle food and the production of power alcohol (List II. 29) ;
 - †(d) irrigation and flood control for agricultural purposes, but see also Works. (List II. 19); and
 - (e) minor and emergency irrigation works (List II. 19).
3. Co-operative societies (List II. 33 ; rural finance and agricultural indebtedness List II. 27) ; agricultural markets and marketing and merchandise marks under the Agricultural Produce Act (List I. 27 and List II. 27).
4. Land, except the ‡ “reserved area” in Delhi Province—see Works—but including—
 - (a) all matters relating to agricultural land ; and also treasure trove (List II. 21) ;
 - (b) land revenue (List II. 39) ;
 - ¶(c) procedure in rent and revenue courts (List II. 2) ;
 - (d) recovery of claims in respect of arrears of land revenue arising outside the Province (List III. 4) ; and
 - ‡(e) general questions relating to the compulsory acquisition of land (List II. 9), but excluding—
 - (i) acquisitions of non-agricultural land for building, town-planning and improvement—see Health, and
 - (ii) particular acquisitions of land by other Departments.
5. Animal husbandry, including—
 - (a) veterinary training and practice (List II. 20 and List III. 30) ;
 - (b) research connected therewith (List I. 12) ;
 - ¶(c) pounds and cattle trespass (List II. 20);
 - ¶(d) protection of wild birds and animals (List II. 25) ; and
 - ¶(e) prevention of cruelty to animals (List III. 22).
6. Forests (List II. 22) ; the shellac* industry (List II. 29).
7. **Fishing and fisheries, inland marine (List I. 23 and List II. 24) ; the processing* of fish for industrial purposes (List II. 29).

FOOTNOTES

- *(1) See para. 3 (c) of general covering note.
 †(2) See para. 3 (a) of general covering note.
 ‡(3) See para. 3 (b) of general covering note.
 ¶(4) Transferred by agreement from Home.
 **(5) See para. 3 (f) of general covering note.
 (6) See also para. (d) regarding weights and measures.

FOOD

1. The following matters connected with foodstuffs, excluding tea*—see Commerce, coffee*—see Industries—and cattle* foods—see Agriculture—namely—
 - (i) the procurement of foodstuffs for civil and military requirements ;
 - (ii) the organization of, and assistance to, industry to meet supply requirements (List I. 29), including the processing* of agricultural products other than those assigned to Agriculture, Commerce, or Industries and Supply;
 - (iii) control over the price, supply and distribution of foodstuffs; and
 - (iv) regulation of import and export of foodstuffs (List I. 19).

FOOTNOTES

- (1) I have regarded the whole of this Department as being on a temporary basis.
 *(2) See para. 3 (c) of general covering note.

HEALTH

1. International conventions and agreements relating to quarantine and other health matters (List I. 3).
2. Port and air quarantine, including hospitals connected therewith (List I. 18); seamen's and marine hospitals.
3. Public health and sanitation (List II. 14), including—
 - (a) the prevention and control of diseases and the control of carriers of disease (List III. 30)
 - (b) supply and distribution of cinchona products and quinine substitutes (List II. 29);
 - (c) occupational health, but see also Labour item 2 (a);
 - (d) nutrition ;
 - (e) adulteration of foodstuffs and drugs; and drugs standard control—but see also Finance and Home (List II. 30); and
 - (f) disposal of community wastes.
4. Medical relief; hospitals and dispensaries (List II. 14) including—
 - * (a) lunacy and mental deficiency (List III. 18);
 - † (b) Ranchi European Mental Hospital (List I. 52); and
 - (c) the administration of medical benefits under the health insurance scheme—but see also Labour (List III. 27).
5. Central agencies for research and training connected with items 3 and 4 (List I. 12).
6. Medical education (List II. 17).
7. The medical, dental, pharmaceutical and nursing professions (List III. 16).
8. Local Government, that is to say the constitution and powers of municipal corporations, improvement trusts, district boards, mining settlement authorities and other local authorities for the purpose of local self-government or village administration (List II. 13).
- †9. Drinking water supplies and drainage, including river and beach pollution (List II. 19)
10. Urban land and transactions relating thereto, except the † “reserved area” in Delhi Province—See Works; relations of landlord and tenant in urban areas, except house rent control in Delhi and Simla—see Works (List II. 21).
11. ¶ Census (List I. 16); vital statistics and registration of births and deaths (List II. 14).
12. Pilgrimages in India (List II. 15).
13. Burials and burial grounds, other than European cemeteries—see War (List II. 16).
14. Inns and inn-keepers (List II. 28).

FOOT-NOTES.

- * (1) Transferred by agreement from Home.
 † (2) See para 3 (a) of general covering note.
 ‡ (3) See para. 3 (b) of general covering note.
 ¶ (4) See para. 3 (e) of general covering note.
 (5) “Ferries and tolls” and “vehicles other than mechanically propelled vehicles” have been transferred to Transport.

EDUCATION

1. Education, general, technical and professional, including the Banares Hindu University and the Aligarh Muslim University (List I. 13) and provincial education (List II. 17), but excluding medical and agricultural education—see Departments concerned.
2. The Imperial Library, the Indian Museum, the Imperial War Museum and the *Victoria Memorial (List I. 11).
3. The registration of unofficial books; libraries†; museums; and records, including the Imperial Records Department and the Indian Historical Records Commission. (List II. 10 and List III. 5 and 17).
4. Copyright (List I. 27).
5. Cultural and scientific societies and associations (List II. 33).
6. Reformatories (List II. 4), including ‡social and moral hygiene and children's courts.
7. Archaeology (List I. 15).
8. Anthropology (List I. 14).
9. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (List I. 3).

FOOT-NOTES.

- * (1) Transferred by agreement from Home.
 † (2) It may be decided to transfer the Imperial Secretariat Library to the Central Administrative Office.
 ‡ (3) Transferred by agreement from Home.

COMMERCE

(Present Commerce)

1. Trade and commerce, internal [within the Province (List II. 27) and inter-provincial] and external (List I. 19), including—
 - (a) commercial intelligence and statistics;
 - (b) exhibitions outside India;
 - * (c) trade representation abroad including India Supply Commission, London—see also Industries and Supply; High Commissioner for India in London; and
 - (d) registration of capital goods.
2. Trade agreements and commercial treaties with Commonwealth and foreign countries [List I. 3], including
 - (a) tariff preferences;
 - (b) international commodity agreements: and
 - (c) international conventions bearing on trade or similar matters.
3. Tariff policy and protective tariffs (List I. 44 and List II. 29); Tariff Board and tariff valuations.
4. Control of imports and exports, but see also Food (List I. 19).
5. Trade marks and merchandise marks (List I. 27)—except merchandise marks under the Agricultural Produce Act—see Agriculture.
6. Company law, excluding banking law—see Finance (List I. 33).
7. Insurance and law of insurance, including provident societies and actuarial work (List I. 33 and 37), but excluding health and unemployment insurance for industrial labour—see Labour and Health—and Post office Insurance—see Communications and Finance.
8. Registration of accountants and the Indian Accountancy Board.

Temporary war items

1. Trading with the enemy and enemy firms; custody of enemy property.
2. Reparations.
3. War risks insurance.
- † 4. Emergency scheme for the purchase and export of tea.
5. U. N. R. R. A.

FOOT-NOTE

- * (1) The ultimate allocation of this item depends on the proposal, which is now under consideration, to set up a Foreign Diplomatic and Commercial Service.
- † (2) See para. 3 (c) of the general covering note.
- (3) I have taken "weights and measures" out of the Commerce List—see para. 3 (d) of the general covering note.

MARINE

(Present Commerce)

1. Maritime shipping and navigation, including wireless telegraphy on ships (List I. 7), but temporarily excluding coastal shipping by country craft—see Transport; the carriage of passengers and goods by sea; the mercantile marine, including training therefor; and merchant shipping (List I. 12, 21 and 26.)
- * 2. Welfare of Indian seamen (List III. 27).
3. Marine engineering (List I. 10) and training therefor [List I. 12].
4. Lighthouses and other provisions for the safety of shipping [List I. 25], excluding † major ports—see Transport and Railways—and marine surveys and dangers to navigation outside tidal waters—see War.

Temporary war items

1. Control of Indian shipping including requisitioning, but see also Transport regarding coastal shipping.
2. Compensation schemes for ships officers and seamen.

FOOT-NOTES

- * (1) I leave this where it is, in spite of the recent proposal of the C. C. C. to transfer it to Labour, since I understand that the matter is still under discussion. I think Marine must continue to deal with the welfare of Indian seamen, especially outside India. I would not, however, recommend that the Department should be responsible for separate schemes for health and unemployment insurance for seamen.
- † (2) I have left these with Transport, though Marine wish to take over—see para. 3 (g) of general covering note.
- (3) I have removed "fisheries beyond territorial waters" from this list and placed the whole subject in Agriculture—see para. 3 (f) of general covering note.
- (4) Secretary, Planning and Development, would transfer practically all the above work to Transport. I think this would result in far too heavy a charge.

INDUSTRIES AND SUPPLY

1. Development and organization of industries, including industrial exhibitions in India (List II. 29), but excluding, tariff protection—see Commerce—foodstuffs*—see Food—and certain agricultural* industries—see agriculture.
2. Industrial research, inventions and designs, including patents (List I. 12 and 27).
3. Supply and distribution of goods for Government purposes or in aid of industry (List II. 29), excluding food stuffs, except coffee*,—see Food and Agriculture, but including—
 - (a) Government factories other than those under the control of the War Department (List I. 10 and List III. 26) ; and the Government Test House, Alipore ;
 - (b) the procurement of stores within or outside India ; and
 - (c) supply missions abroad.
4. Disposal of surplus or obsolete stores and salvage.

Temporary war items

- †1. Control of hoarding and profiteering.
2. Production (as well as supply and distribution) of coal.

FOOT-NOTES

* (1) See para. 3 (c) of general covering note.

† (2) If controls are to continue, it is for consideration whether this should not be put among the permanent items.

LABOUR

(Present Labour)

1. The International Labour Organization (List I. 3)
2. Regulation and welfare of industrial, commercial and agricultural labour, except welfare* of Indian seamen—see Marine (List III. 27), including—
 - (a) conditions of labour, statistics and research connected therewith, policy of industrial housing, wages, hours of work, canteens, recreation and education, and employment of women and children ;
 - (b) Labour Welfare Officers, in Central Government undertakings ;
 - (c) provident fund, employers' liability and workmen's compensation ;
 - (d) health insurance and invalidity pensions—see also health ;
 - (e) old age pensions ;
 - (f) labour and factory legislation and its enforcement in Central Government undertakings (List III. 26) ;
 - (g) regulation of labour in mines and oil fields (List I. 35) ; and
 - (h) safety measures in factories and connected with the carriage of hazardous goods in major ports—see also Transport (List I. 25 and List III. 26).
3. Unemployment, including—
 - (a) the resettlement and employment in civil life, except on land, of demobilised members of the defence services and discharged war workers, except medical personnel (List II. 32) ; and
 - (b) unemployment insurance (List III, 28).
4. Migration within India (List I. 50).
5. Labour relations, including trade unions ; industrial and labour disputes (List III. 29) ; conciliation machinery in Central Government undertakings.
6. Technical and vocational training schemes in India and abroad (List I. 12)

Temporary war items

1. Administration of National Service (Technical Personnel) Ordinance, 1940.
2. Unskilled labour supply.
3. Civil Pioneer Force.

FOOT-NOTE

* (1) See note (1) under Marine.

WORKS, MINES AND POWER

(Present Labour)

- *1. All branches of civil engineering and control of civil engineering standards relating to buildings, roads, waters, waterways, water supplies, water works, irrigation (other than minor irrigation works), flood control, drainage, water storage and water power, including—
- (a) research and training in relation thereto ;
 - (b) the execution of central works projects ;
 - (c) the maintenance, equipment, lighting and air conditioning of Central Government buildings ; and
 - (d) assistance and/or advice to Provinces and States. (List I. 10 and 12, List II. 8 and 19).
- †2. Transactions in land in the "reserved area" of Delhi Province ; house-rent control in Delhi and Simla (List II. 9 and 21).
3. The Geological Survey of India (List I. 14).
4. Mines and mining (List I. 36 and List II. 23), including—
- (a) research and training connection therewith (List I. 12) ;
 - (b) methods of working and safety provisions (List I. 35) ;
 - (c) excise duties on coal and coke (List I. 45) ;
 - (d) the stabilization of the mica industry and any other minerals brought under Central control, except temporarily coal—see Industries and Supplies (List I. 36) ; and
 - (e) control of Government mining products, except §salt—see Finance—and §railway collieries—see Railways.
- ‡5. Oil, petrol and petroleum products (List I. 32 and 36) subject temporarily to the co-ordination at present exercised by War and the continuance of petrol rationing by Transport and excluding excise on motor spirit and kerosene—see Finance, but including—
- (a) all aspects of production, supply and distribution (List II. 29) ; and
 - (b) distribution, but not production—see Agriculture—of power alcohol.
6. Explosives, excluding the administration of the Explosives Substances Act—see Home (List I. 30).
7. Electricity and electrification schemes (List III. 31).
8. Boilers (List III. 21).
9. Gas and gas works, including †producer gas (List II. 26).

FOOT-NOTES

- * (1) See para. 3(a) of general covering note.
- † (2) See para. 3(b) of general covering note. The general subject of relations between "landlord and tenant in urban areas" has been transferred to Health.
- § (3) See also notes under Finance and Railways. These entries represent the conclusions of the C.C.C. on my Report No. III. The question of railway collieries is, I understand, still under consideration.
- ‡ (4) This entry follows the conclusions of the C.C.C. on my Report No. III. but involves some departure from the principles of para 3(c) of the general covering note. I am not sure how far the reference to List I. 36 in this item and item 4 is correct. The reference should, perhaps, be to List II. 23.
- ¶ (5) This item is now temporarily in the Transport list, but will presumably be transferred.
- (6) It is proposed to transfer (a) the Estate Office and (b) Printing and Stationery from this Department to the Central Administrative Office.

RAILWAYS

1. Federal Railways (List I. 20), excluding the Railway Inspectorate—see Transport—but including—
- (a) all railway works, lands and buildings (List I. 10) ;
 - (b) research and training in connection therewith (List I. 12) ; and
 - (c) the actual working of *railway collieries subject to the provisions of item 4 of the Works, Mines and Power list.
2. Minor railways ; tramways outside municipal limits and ropeways for the public carriage of goods and passengers (List II. 18).
- †3. The port of Vizagapatam (List I. 22).

FOOT-NOTES

- * (1) I understand that the allocation of this item is under separate discussion.
- † (2) I understand that this item is being transferred shortly to Railways.

TRANSPORT

(Present War Transport)

- *1. Roads, including bridges, †ferries and †tolls (List II. 18 and 53).
2. Road-transport, including—
 - (a) mechanically propelled vehicles and †other vehicles (List II. 18 and List III. 20)
 - (b) the compulsory insurance of motor vehicles (List I. 37); and
 - ‡(c) the taxation of motor vehicles (List II. 48A).
3. Municipal tramways (List II. 18).
4. Inland waterways and transport thereon, including dues on passengers and goods so carried (List II. 18 and 52 and List III. 32).
- *5. Major ports, except Vizagapatam—see Railways; provision for the safety of shipping therein including the administration of the Bengal Pilot Service, but excluding matters connected with the carriage of hazardous goods—see Labour item 2(g) (List I. 21, 22 and 25).
- **6. The Railway Inspectorate (List I. 20).

§Temporary war items

1. Railway priority control (List I. 20).
2. Coastal shipping priority control (List I. 26).
3. Coastal country craft (List I. 21).
4. Petrol rationing (List II. 29) and producer gas.
5. Control of import, distribution and price of motor vehicles and spare parts (List II. 29).

FOOT-NOTES

- * (1) See para. 3(a) of general covering note.
 † (2) Transferred by agreement from Health.
 ‡ (4) Transferred by agreement from Finance.
 ¶ (5) See para. 3(g) of general covering note.
 ** (6) Transferred from posts and Air, but might be included under Railways—see para. 12 of Report No. II. The Inspectorate is now independent of the Railway Board.
 § (7) Of these items it is presumed that "producer gas" will go in due course to Works, Mines and Power and "coastal country craft" to Marine, while the need for the remainder will disappear.

COMMUNICATIONS

(Present Posts & Air)

1. International agreements relating to posts and tele-communications and civil aviation (List I. 3).
2. Posts and telegraphs, including—
 - (a) telephones, wireless and other like forms of communication, except wireless telegraphy on ships—see Marine (List I. 7).
 - (b) Post office savings bank—see also Finance (List I. 7).
 - (c) Post office life assurance fund—see also Finance (List I. 37).
3. Meteorology (List I. 14).
- *4. Civil Aviation (List I. 24), including—
 - (a) provisions for the safety of aircraft (List I. 25) and
 - (b) the carriage of passengers and goods by air (List I. 26); but excluding the sanitary control of air navigation and quarantine—see Health.

FOOT-NOTES

- * (1) There might be something to be said in theory for transferring this item to Transport, but I have no doubt that for practical reasons it must remain where it is.
 (2) The Railway Inspectorate has been transferred to Transport—see note (6) in Transport list.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

1. All-India policy of post-war development and co-ordination of central and provincial planning for that purpose (List I. 34 and 36 and List II. 23 and 29).
- *2. Co-ordination of scientific research, including the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and its connected bodies (List I. 12).
- †3. The establishment of standards of weights and measures etc.

FOOT-NOTES

- * (1) In my Report No. II I advised against the formation of a separate Department of Scientific Research. The matter has since been the subject of inter-departmental discussion and this item represents the agreed results.
 † (2) See para. 3(a) of general covering note.

APPENDIX II

OFFICE PROCEDURE

In these notes I draw on my first hand experience of the Home Department and assume that a common system of Office Procedure has produced the same or similar faults in other Departments. If in any particular case this assumption is unwarranted, I beg that Department's pardon. Equally I should owe the Home Department an apology if my criticisms were to give the impression that I regarded it as the worst offender. On the contrary—though comparisons are odious—I think that the Home Department in most respects still sets an example of how Secretariat work should be done.

I. *The initial stage—registering, numbering and indexing*

1. I am a firm believer, in the circumstances of this country and especially if one's "Units" can be kept fairly small, in getting as much as possible of the work connected with the registering and keeping of files done in the Section which deals with them, and not by a separate agency such as a Central Registry. Incoming papers, however, must first reach the Section concerned. The distribution of receipts and also the typing and issue of letters can be done by a central agency. In every Department there is, or should be, a centrally situated Routine and Issue Section, in which there is, or should be, one or more Receipt Clerks especially selected for their intelligence and knowledge of the distribution of departmental work. All communications received, either by post, telegraph or hand, except those addressed to an officer by name, are opened by the Receipt Clerk and are, or should be, entered at once in a simple Diary.

This Diary contains six columns—

- (1) Serial No.
- (2) Number of Receipt (*i.e.*, sender's No.).
- (3) Date of Receipt (*i.e.*, sender's date).
- (4) From whom received.
- (5) File No. (*i.e.*, receiving Department's file No., if any, as quoted in the Receipt).
- (6) This has no heading, but is, or should be, used for the name of the Section to which the paper is sent by the Receipt Clerk.

The date is written across the centre of the page at the beginning of each day. Nothing could be simpler, provided that the entries comply strictly with the headings. In column 4 there is the usual tendency to do more than is required and to enter the subject-matter of the receipt. This is quite unnecessary; it must waste hours of time; and should be strictly prohibited. After entry in the Diary, receipts are sent to the Branch Officer concerned, who is supposed to note instructions on them, where possible, or, if they are of great importance, to submit them to higher authorities for information or instructions. This latter practice should be encouraged, since senior officers *can* often be expected to give brief instructions at once on important cases, whereas junior officers cannot. Papers addressed to an officer by name and opened by him should of course be sent to the Receipt Clerk after they have been opened and he should enter them in the Diary as soon as he gets them.

The Receipt Clerk then sends all the receipts to the Sections concerned in batches. The Section next proceeds to enter them in a Section Diary of exactly the same form. The Section does not acknowledge the receipt of the papers, but the Section Diary shows that they have been received and the order in which they have been received. If any paper or file is wrongly sent to a particular Section, it *returns* it to the Receipt Clerk, who corrects his Diary and sends it to the right Section. The importance of appointing knowledgeable men as Receipt Clerks is obvious.

2. The Section then proceeds to enter the receipts in the Movement (or File) Register. Sometimes, of course, the receipt relates to a current file. In other cases a new file has to be opened. The Movement Register is supposed to contain a sort of history sheet of each file and, in theory, there should be a separate page for each file, at the top right hand corner of which the file number is entered. It is, however, the practice to enter several files on the same page under the same standard file numbers (see para. 5 below), and often this *can* be done conveniently with some saving of paper. On the other hand, the history of a long file, if properly entered, may take even more than one page. If the Register is not to be of the loose leaf type (which has its inconveniences) the proper course is to insist on a separate page, not for each standard file number, but for each file, reducing the size of the page if necessary, and to put continuation sheets on a later page of the register after noting its number in red ink at the foot of the original entry, instead of pinning them on to the same page as is done at present. The present form of Movement Register contains 7 columns. No. (1) is the usual serial number. Nos. (2) to (5) are exactly the same as columns (1) to (4) of the Diary, except that, as a file may start with an issue and not a receipt, column (5) is headed "from *or to* whom". In practice only the Diary number is entered in column (2) and columns (3), (4) and (5) are not filled in at all. Column (6) is a very broad column headed "subject of letter" and column 7 is headed "record number and date", *i.e.*, gives the final disposal. Actually there are no separate "record numbers". The file is recorded under its own number when finished. In due course, the Superintendent marks on the file itself its classification for record purposes—either A (which means keep and print), or B (which means keep, but do not print), or D with a number (which means destroy after the stated number of years). It would be simpler to state the actual year of destruction after the letter D. The Superintendent's marking is then entered in Column (7) of the Register, which

would therefore be more appropriately headed "date of final disposal and classification for record". Actually, in the examples of this register that I have seen little or no attention is paid to the column headings. The general practice seems to be to enter a long description of the subject-matter in column 6 and to use all the rest of the space available for pencilled entries (often in no kind of order) showing the movement of the file from office to officers or to other Departments, and the dates of issues. There is nothing to show to whom the 'issues' are addressed or whether they are of an *ad interim* or final character. I attach (Annexure A) photographs of one particularly horrible example I have come across. This sort of broken up jig-saw puzzle may conceivably convey something to the office itself. It is certainly of no use to anyone else and it is not my idea of a register. All the receipts and issues connected with a particular file should be exhibited in an orderly manner in separate columns and, if it is necessary to record the internal movements of the file, as I think it may be, this should be done by means of neat pencilled entries made in order, on the line and in the space provided for the purpose.

3. If a comprehensive Diary is maintained by the Receipt Clerk or Clerks for the whole Department, I see no reason for separate Section Diaries. The Diary number and the sender's number and date should be entered direct in the Section Movement Register itself. The Diary for the whole Department might then be kept on the loose leaf system (it is not an important permanent record) and I suggest that it should be written up in duplicate according to Sections by copying pencil and carbon paper. One copy of the sheet or sheets relating to each Section should be sent to the Section concerned. The Section should then make the necessary entries in its Movement Register; fill in Column 5 of the Diary where it has been left blank (so that every paper will then be traceable by its File No.); initial each sheet in token of receipt; and return it to the Receipt Clerk. The precise form of the Movement or File Register itself might be determined by experts. I attach a new form for consideration (Annexure B). I note here, in advance, that as soon as the practice of sending files bodily from one Department to another is abandoned, the register will no longer be required to record the issue or receipt of files to or from other Departments. All issues and receipts will be in the form of letters, and all receipts will either go into some existing file in the Department itself or form the beginning of a new file.

4. My remarks under this heading apply, of course, primarily to receipts which must be placed on a regular file and be submitted for orders of some kind. There are many papers (for example, Intelligence Reports) which are sent for information and on which no action is required. For some of these (for example, reports received at regular periodical intervals) it will be desirable to keep a standing file, although few, if any, movements will have to be recorded in the register. Others may suitably be placed on the Notes on a current file. In addition there may be receipts wrongly addressed to the Department and simply sent on to the right one, or receipts of so little importance as not to be worth registering—for example elementary requests for information from members of the public or complimentary copies of publications sent by their authors. Newspaper cuttings might also fall under this category, unless the Public Relations Officer of the Department desires to keep regular files of them. It would be necessary for each Department to lay down the classes of papers that need not be registered. There might also be advantages in adopting a special word for this purpose. The word now used is "filed", which may mean several things. In Madras, such papers used to be "lodged" as distinct from being "recorded". They can be destroyed after a comparatively short interval.

5. Whatever may be the form of the Movement or File Register—that is to say the main instrument for the registration of papers—the most important adjunct to it is the manner in which the file is numbered and indexed. *Intelligent indexing is the foundation of every efficient office system.* The instructions on the subject in our present "Secretariat Instructions" are good enough, so far as they go; but they do not go very far and anyhow they seem to be disregarded or carried out with little intelligence. The present system is as follows.

(a) There is in each Section a list of Standard file numbers for the main subjects dealt with. These numbers remain the same year after year—e.g., number 21 is always Internal Security, number 30 Press Legislation, number 44 State Prisoners, and so on. Each file opened under a standard number during a particular year is given a serial number followed by the number of the year—30/1/46, 30/2/46 and so on. It is a simple system, but much depends on the careful selection of the subjects which are given standard file numbers.

(b) As soon as a file is given a number, it is decided whether to index it, and the usual practice, I gather, is to index all files. There is no harm in this, even if some of the entries in the index may prove to be unnecessary. *What is important is that every file should be given from the outset a suitable title, which will serve both as the index title and for other purposes.* The additional work in typing an index slip should be small.

(c) It is in the preparation of the index slips that the chief faults are committed. The procedure appears to be first of all to write out the purport of the file (often at considerable length), then to select various key words in the purport, and finally to index the file under each of these key words. Here are some samples.

I

- (1) Ruling
- (2) Provincial Government
- (3) Abeyance
- (4) Superior Reserved Posts
- (5) Inferior Reserved Posts

} All except one of these headings is crossed out on each index slip.

Ruling that action of a Provl. Government in holding in abeyance of a superior or inferior reserved post and substitution for it of an unreserved inferior or superior reserved post (sic) is not permissible as it amounts to altering the cadre of a Service sanctioned by the Secy. of State and renders nugatory the provisions of Section 246 (2) of the Government of India Act, 1935, regarding reserved posts. F. No.—

II

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Amendment (2) Federal Public Service Commission (3) Regulation (4) Governor General (5) Post | } | All except one of these headings is crossed out on each index slip. |
|--|---|---|

Proposed amendment of the F. P. S. C. (Consultation by the Governor General) Regulations that if (sic) the tenure fixed for a post should not continue therein beyond the period of time originally fixed without F. P. S. C. being consulted. F. No.—

III

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Decision (2) Departmental examination (3) Stoppage of increment (4) Penalty (5) Probationers | } | All except one of these headings is crossed out on each slip. |
|--|---|---|

Decision that were success in a departmental examination has been prescribed as a condition for the drawal of increments, their stoppage till the examination is passed does not amount to a penalty under any Rules whether the officer concerned is a probationer or an offg. Government servant. F. No.—

IV

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Plans and Estimates (2) Camp for training (3) Training of I.C.S. Probationers (4) Administrative approval (5) Expenditure sanction (6) Home Department (7) Dehra Dun | } | All except one of these headings is crossed out on each slip. |
|--|---|---|

Plans and estimates of the erection of a Camp for the training of the I.C.S. probationers at Dehra Dun. Administrative approval and expenditure sanction of the Home Dept. to the above F. No.—

6. It is obvious that most of the heads given in the above examples are completely useless. No one would ever think of his own accord of looking for any of the files mentioned under such absurd heads as, for instance, Ruling, Provincial Government, Abeyance, Amendment, Regulations, Governor General, Post, Decision (particularly absurd), Penalty, Probationers, Plans and Estimates, Administrative Approval or (most futile of all) Home Department. *It should be constantly born in mind that an index title is not, and should never attempt to be, a summary of the contents of the file. It is simply an aid to the identification of a file under the minimum number of distinctive catchwords. I would re-write the four examples somewhat as follows, indexing each of them under one title only and adding no purport whatever.*

I

Service rights (or some general head of this kind)—Reserved posts—Holding in abeyance and replacement by unreserved posts—Not permissible.

II

Federal Public Service Commission—Regulations—Extension of tenure of posts—Consultation by Governor General necessary—Amendment approved.

(Note.—The original index slip in this case is almost completely unintelligible).

III

Service regulations or some such general head)—Punishment—Stoppage of increments on failure to pass prescribed examinations—declared not to be a--

IV

Indian Civil Service—Probationers Camp, Dehra Dun—Construction approved.

7. The appalling waste of time and labour and the complete uselessness of the results that the above examples illustrate must be put an end to. What is required is :

- (a) proper instructions about indexing ;
- (b) a standard list of index heads, sub-heads and cross references ; and

(c) a system under which *the way in which the work is being done will come continually and automatically under review by higher authorities.*

I make no apology for reproducing as Annexure C an extract, verbally modified here and there, from the Madras Collector's Office Manual, written by my cousin, Sir Alexander Tottenham, which describes clearly how all these objects can be attained in the simplest possible manner. I am aware that some features of the Madras system are already incorporated in our own. Our practice of having two indices—one for subjects and the other for names—is also a good one. The main features of the Madras system are, however, the proper selection of heads and sub-heads on which to build up a correct title and the compilation of a standard list of index heads and sub-heads, etc., from which no deviation is allowed without approval by higher authority. *The preparation of this list is obviously the foundation of the whole system and must be entrusted to an officer of intelligence.* I would recommend the careful preparation of such lists for each Section of each Department and their approval by the Secretary himself. The initial trouble would be considerable, but the subsequent saving of labour and gain in efficiency would be enormous. Incidentally the result would be an alphabetical list of the work in each Department which could well be used, in elaboration of the Rules of Business, to indicate the internal distribution of the work in the Department. Standard file numbers could also be noted against each main head.

There are, of course, cases which deal with two different subjects—*e.g.*, the creation of a post and the appointment of a particular officer to it. Such cases would require two index slips, but of quite different character. For example—

(1) (in the subject index) Intelligence Bureau—Deputy Director—Additional post of—Sanctioned for two years.

(2) (in the name index) Smith A.B.—Deputy Director, Intelligence Bureau—Appointed.

Ordinarily, however, all the cross referencing should be done in the standard list of index heads. It would tell you, for instance, under which head to look for cases regarding the conduct of Government servants. Thus—
under G.

[Government Servants Conduct Rules. See Rules—Government Servants Conduct.]
under C.

[Conduct of Government servants. See Rules—Government Servants Conduct.]
under R.

Rules—Government Servants Conduct—

The title (whether a file is indexed or not) will *appear both on the file cover and in the movement Register and also at the head of every draft.* Where two index slips are required for the foregoing reasons, the more general for the two titles should be selected for this purpose. It will generally be sufficient to use the head and sub-head or sub-heads alone, without the "content", or at any rate without the whole of it. In the above example, for instance, the title on the file cover, in the Movement Register and at the head of letters would be—

Intelligence Bureau—

Deputy Director—Additional post of—

As the file progresses, additions or amendments to the 'content' may become necessary. This does not greatly matter since the index slip can always be corrected up to the moment when the file is finally closed and, if the index head, itself has been correctly selected in the first instance, it will remain unchanged throughout. Incidentally I can see no reason why the Section indices should not be printed up separately. Their consolidation into a single Department index must involve quite a considerable amount of work with incommensurate advantages. *I regard this matter of indexing as most important.* It will become even more so if officers of the future are expected to rely on their offices less than they do at present. Probably each Section should have copies of the other Sections' indices. Every officer should also have copies of the relevant indices on his table and should make practical use of them. He cannot do so so long as the indices themselves are inefficiently prepared.

II. *The operative stage—noting, drafting and consulting other Departments*

8. The existing Secretariat Instructions explain pretty clearly the respective functions of the "office" and "officers" and how they should be exercised. As I have already mentioned, however, they are not strictly obeyed. If they were, we should hear much less of the abuses now so frequently complained of. Thus, when a case is submitted for orders, there is to be only one office note (Secretariat Instructions Part I, para. 7) and not more than two notes by officers before it reaches the Member (para. 8); notes must not repeat or paraphrase the paper under consideration (para. 9); full use is to be made of personal discussion between officers, both inside the Department (para. 12) and inter-departmentally (paras. 14 and 22); drafts are to be submitted along with the note wherever possible (para. 13); no file is to be referred to another Dept. without the orders of an Under Secy. [para. 23 (1)]; the points of reference are to be clearly stated [para. 23 (2)]; further noting by junior officers after the return of a file from another Dept. or on a second reference to another Dept. is prohibited [para. 23 (3) and (4)], simultaneous references to a number of Departments are to be made where possible (para. 24); unnecessary papers are to be removed before a file is submitted to a Member or sent out of a Department (para. 57); not more than one flag is to be attached to any put up file (para. 58); pages are to be properly numbered (para. 59); the subject of the file is to be clearly entered on the first page of the notes (para. 60); routine notes are not to be put on the file (para. 63); the express letter form is recommended for general adoption (appendix B para. 33); the use of immediate labels is strictly

limited (appendix B para. 52) ; and so on. See also annexure C to the Maxwell Report, which lays down instructions regarding the arrangement of files and various other matters. I can only suggest that any of these instructions that it may be decided to retain—and most of them are sound—should be enforced by more peremptory orders than is the case at present.

9. I have two general recommendations to make regarding

- (1) meetings and personal discussions : and
- (2) inter-departmental consultation.

As regards (1), I am the last person to deny the value of personal discussion, but I do not think that it provides the solution to all difficulties. The injunction, for instance, that when a difference of opinion between Departments is disclosed, personal discussion should usually be substituted for further noting sounds all right in theory ; but, if every Sectt. officer when confronted with such a situation had to ring up his opposite number or numbers in other Departments, and arrange a meeting, progress would actually be retarded. Sometimes the point *can* be quickly settled over the telephone, but I am strongly of the opinion that this instrument should not be used for protracted discussion and argument. The fact that it is so used accounts partly, I am sure, for the inefficiency of our telephone system. I must have wasted hours in my time in ringing up numbers which are constantly engaged. The fact is that the geographical lay out of our Secretariat, with its long distances between different offices, is a practical hinderance to the mode of procedure by personal discussion. It should be confined, therefore, to important cases, in which the trouble of fixing a meeting and making the journey to attend it are worth while, and, of course, to cases inside the Department or where the other Department is close at hand. From this point of view the proper allocation of office accommodation so as to bring together the Departments that have most to do with each other is important. One may draw a distinction between "discussion" with one or two other officers and "meetings" at which a large number of Departments is represented. The latter, I am sure, are over-done. Frequently they are the result of laziness or pressure of work. A difficult file comes along at a time when one may be particularly busy. It is easy to get rid of it for the moment by suggesting a meeting ; everyone always agrees ; and the consequence, in my experience, is often a gathering of officers who have not really studied the subject and who waste much time in doing at the meeting what they should have done before, namely, formulating their own ideas about it. Every officer must have noticed the marked distinction between the well-conducted conference presided over by a good chairman and attended by officers who know their own minds and have met to see how their different points of view can be adjusted and, on the other hand, the sort of conversazione which results when officers attend a meeting largely to find out what it is all about and are often unable to speak with authority on behalf of their Departments. It should, I think, be laid down that no meeting or conference should ever take place without the previous circulation of a carefully prepared agenda stating the points for discussion, and then only on the understanding that those who attend would be expected to state their views authoritatively at the discussion. A record of the meeting should always be made and circulated, giving the conclusions reached and indicating the authority or Department responsible for taking further action on each conclusion. I am tempted to suggest further that definite days and times—say three afternoons a week—should be set apart for conferences. It would at any rate be a convenience to know that there were certain "close seasons", during which one could be moderately certain of finding officers at work in their rooms and not engaged in conferences.

10. As regards [2], inter-departmental consultation generally, I have already indicated, and have no doubt, that our present system of sending whole files bodily to other Departments must cease. We must in future consult each other by means of self-contained communications setting forth the points on which the views of other Departments are required; and each Department must maintain its own files, which will never leave the Department, except (see para. 12 below) when referred to a Board, Directorate, or Bureau attached to the Department. No one will deny that the present practice has its advantages—both in simple cases and also, I think, in specially complicated cases. In the former—*e. g.*, where a file is sent simply 'for information' or where a short draft has to be accepted by one other Department—nothing could be simpler than marking the file itself to that Department; and no great delay results. In a complicated case—*e. g.* where a long reply has to be sent to all Provincial Governments after considering their views and where several Central Departments are concerned—it may become necessary under the new system to copy a lengthy correspondence and, possibly, invite the opinion of different Departments on different points before attempting a draft. In some cases it might be sufficient to send only copies of a summary of Provincial replies (which would increase the importance of good summarizing) and, wherever possible, a draft should be sent for acceptance or comment. When drafts are so sent, it could be done by a simple printed form. Such a form is suggested in Annexure D. If the Department referred to wished to keep a copy of any amendments proposed, it would, of course, be at liberty to do so, but ordinarily this should not be necessary. Each Department consulted would eventually receive a copy of the draft as issued and this should be sufficient for its record. Another type of complicated case can best be illustrated by a concrete example. Let us take the provision of telegraph facilities in India for foreign news agencies. Here both technical and policy questions are involved. The file belongs to I. & B., while Home, E. A. and Posts and Air are all concerned—the last with the technical aspect and the other three with the policy aspect, on which their views may be widely divergent. It is convenient, under the present system, to mark the file first to P. & A., who will say what can be done, and then to the others, who will say what they think should be done. Each successive Department, when the file reaches it, sees what views have been expressed and much time and labour may be saved, at any rate in the last Department, by simply noting agreement with views already recorded on the file. If each Department is

consulted independently, not only will it have to record its own views at length, but also to send a copy of those views to the others, each of which will wish to maintain a complete file on the subject. Something, no doubt, may be done in such cases by inviting the views of the technical Department first of all and then sending a copy of its reply to the Departments concerned with policy. But there is no doubt that the total volume of work involved will be greater. Obviously when all replies had been received, it would be the duty of the Department in charge to prepare a note summarizing the points of agreement and the points of difference and making suggestions, if it so wished, for the composition of the latter. It would then arrange a meeting, the agenda for which would be the note in question.

11. In spite of the disadvantages indicated above, the change of system must be accepted—

(a) because it is necessary owing to the multiplication of the number of Departments; and

(b) because it will produce certain positive advantages. The size of each file ought to be slightly reduced, although the total number of files will increase. The bulk and weight of messenger loads will be considerably reduced and may justify some reduction in the number of messengers. Above all, officers will think twice before making a reference when they know it means drafting a fresh communication stating exactly what they want to know. (Personally I think we could run much greater risks than we do at present by issuing orders without reference to other Departments, even when they may be concerned, and sending them copies after issue. Most of us know fairly well what is controversial and what is not; and, if we do make a mistake occasionally, the Department concerned can always object when it receives the copy and in most cases the mistake can be put right without any great difficulty). The change will also dispense with the need for the complicated provision in para. 26 of the Secretariat Instructions under which, on the basis that all notes are confidential, "each Department shall be deemed to have given its general consent to the reference of its notes to the officers mentioned below by the Departments indicated in each case".

12. The only points for further consideration are—

(1) the extent to which Secretariat Departments should be permitted to make references direct to the offices "attached" or "subordinate" to other Departments and *vice versa*; and

(2) whether Departments should continue to be allowed to send their files to their own "attached" or "subordinate" offices and *vice versa*, and also to other Departments, if any, in charge of the same Member.

As regards (1), I am in favour of recognising the various headquarter offices—Boards, Directorates, Bureaux and so on—more and more as an integral part of the Government machine. I therefore think that direct references between Secretariat Departments and any of them—certainly those which perform "common agency" functions such as a Bureau of Public Information—should be freely permitted, subject perhaps to the understanding that any executive Head or Director so consulted should be responsible for bringing the matter under reference to the notice of his own Secretariat Department whenever he thinks it should know about it.

As regards (2), I think it would be impossible to insist that Secretariat officers should address their own Directors and executive Heads (and *vice versa*) only by letter. These Secretariat and Directorate files should be regarded as more or less common property between them. In fact many policy proposals, according to my ideas as already set forth, would be worked out on Directorate files. The only stipulation should be the one now contained in para 26 (2) of the Secretariat Instructions, namely that no Secretariat file should be sent to a Directorate, etc., if it in any way personally concerns an officer working in the latter.

Whether two or more Departments under a single Member should be allowed to send their files to each other is a more difficult point to decide. Since the number of Departments in each such case must necessarily be very small and they will automatically be located next door to each other, there is much to be said for permitting this practice. On the other hand, I contemplate that separate Departments under a single Member will only be constituted to deal with clearly separable groups of subjects (compare the present Agriculture, Health, and Education Departments); it will still be desirable that each of these Departments should have its own files on any subject of common concern; and the whole new system (and the form of registers) would be upset if such an exception were made. I would therefore be opposed to it.

I have also considered whether there should be any other exception to the rule that departmental files in future should not leave the Department to which they belong—*e. g.* in the case of references to the Finance Department for financial concurrence. I have come to the conclusion that the change of system, if accepted, should be uniformly and completely enforced and that no such exception should be allowed. It may sometimes be necessary to send an *old* file to another Department to enable it to study its own notes recorded thereon, but this does not affect the general principle.

13. All that remains to be considered is—

(a) the form in which references to other Departments should be made, that is to say, whether by unofficial note, official memorandum, or demi-official letter; and

(b) where these communications should be placed on the file, that is to say whether on the notes file or the correspondence file.

I do not think it much matters what procedure is adopted in these respects, so long as it is consistent and uniform, especially in the matter of file arrangement. Nothing is more annoying than to find papers placed sometimes on the notes file and sometimes on the correspondence file. I would be inclined to recommend the demi-official form of reference, mainly because it is simpler and avoids the employment of the stilted construction in the third person. Instead

of "The undersigned is directed to state that the A Department proposes so and so. Department B is requested to be so good as to state whether it concurs, etc.", you can say "We propose so and so. Do you agree?" If the D. O. form is adopted, I suggest that the paper used for office notes should ordinarily be employed. D. O. letters written on different sized note-papers do not make for tidiness in the arrangement of the file. On the basis that all inter-departmental discussion is simply "noting" in the broadest sense, I would be in favour of putting all these references and the replies to them on the notes file. The only case in which, in my opinion, references to other Departments and their replies should be placed on the correspondence file is when one Department wishes to consult all, or a large number of, other Departments on a certain proposal and there is no "outside correspondence." The proposal in such cases is properly the subject matter of the correspondence and it is convenient to have all the replies filed together in that file.

14. I have a few further suggestions to make under this general heading. The first relates to the duties "duties of the office" and the injunction that officers should, so far as possible, note their instructions on the dak when received by them. I do not deny that there are certain cases in which officers, and particularly senior officers, should be able to comply with this injunction; but to expect that "office noting" can thereby be materially reduced is only a pious hope. In many cases officers (and particularly junior officers) cannot give instructions off-hand and most of them write "papers please" or "examine", which means nothing and need not be written at all. Where officers *might* be expected to display more initiative is in assigning the degree of urgency to be attached to the treatment of a particular letter—it is no use writing "quickly please" on every paper—and also indicating whether they *are prepared* to deal with the case themselves with the minimum of office noting, or whether they want a full dress examination of it. Annexure B of the Maxwell Committee's Report attempted to lay down the "functions of the office." I do not think their definition has ever been taken into general use and I do not altogether agree with it. I agree that there are certain functions that should be carried out automatically on any case sent to office without specific directions; but those included in Part (A) of the Annexure referred to include :—

- (iv) to supply other relevant facts and figures available in the Department ;
- (v) to put up precedents or papers containing previous decisions and policy : * * * and
- (viii) to bring to notice at the proper time matters requiring action or orders.

These, in my opinion, are too vague and amount in practice to "examining the case and seeing that all matters requiring decision are brought forward", which is a function to be performed only by direction of an officer according to part (B) (i) of the Annexure. The last—(viii)—does not properly relate to "any case sent to office without specific directions." It is a general function to be performed even when there is no actual "case" or file in existence. My idea is that the automatic functions of the office, in the absence of specific directions, should be limited to the following—

- (1) to see that all papers quoted in the correspondence and notes are forthcoming, are properly arranged and paged and have correct marginal references ;
- (2) to verify the facts, so far as open to check—*i.e.*, to point out any obvious mistake of fact ;
- (3) to state the points for orders (except in the simplest cases where this is unnecessary) ;
- (4) where necessary, to draw attention to the statutory or customary procedure required for the disposal of the case and to point out the law and rules and where they are to be found ;
- (5) in routine cases or cases where there are established precedents or where the action required is obvious, to put up drafts for approval ;
- (6) in the simplest cases to put up fair copies for signature along with the drafts.

(Note.—This last is an addition, but I think a useful one. A great deal of time is wasted at present in approving obvious drafts and sending them back to be fair copied for issue).

Among the functions to be performed only by a direction of an officer I would include—

- (1) to examine the case, to look for and put up precedents and to supply other relevant facts and figures available in the Department ;
- (2) to tabulate and summarize information ;
- (3) to prepare drafts on the lines directed.

Among the general functions of the Office I would include—

- (i) to see that all files are properly and neatly arranged ; and
- (ii) to bring to notice at the proper time, and not at the last possible moment, matters requiring action or orders.

If some such instructions were approved, officers could be expected to note, provisionally at any rate, on the dak whether they wanted a full examination by office or not. There would be nothing to prevent a fuller examination being carried out a later stage, if the officer found it necessary ; but he would at any rate receive a certain number of cases from the office properly referenced, but without delay.

15. My next suggestion relates to the procedure for preventing or checking delays. Standard forms are prescribed for the submission at fixed intervals of lists of unanswered communications of different descriptions. There are also reminder and suspense statements. These are sometimes, I believe, supplemented or elaborated by zealous officers in particular Departments. My

own experience is that they are of little practical use and not worth the trouble they take to prepare. Other people may hold different views and I do not wish to be dogmatic. At any rate it is a fact that arrears lists do not, and obviously *cannot*, distinguish between the respective importance of different letters or files; and entries in them *can* be evaded by a number of devices. It may eventually be discovered, but seldom from these returns, that a particular clerk or officer has been sitting on a number of important cases for an unconscionable time. I believe that the only real way to prevent and check delays that matter is by personal examination of a clerk's or officer's papers. "Each grade of officer from Superintendent upwards should, I suggest, be held responsible for examining the papers of those working under him at least once a fortnight (but not on any fixed day), for satisfying himself that nothing is seriously amiss and for reporting bad delays to the officer next above him. This method would split up the work and, according to my ideas of the proper size of units, would not place an unmanageable burden on anyone's shoulders. The Superintendent (or whatever he may be called) would have to examine the work of about 3 Assistants and possibly some routine clerks including the recorder; the Under Secretary that of two Superintendents; the Deputy Secretary that of two Under Secretaries; and the Secretary himself (if this were necessary) that of two Deputy Secretaries. I doubt whether any kind of arrears statement would be necessary."

16. My last suggestion relates to the arrangement of files. The Maxwell Report (para 99) suggested the admirable rule that no paper should be placed on the main file except by order of an officer. Records of a secondary or routine character, whether in the form of correspondence or notes, were to be included in separate subsidiary folders. There is also the practice of putting certain papers into appendices, either to the notes or the correspondence. Unfortunately none of these devices—even if a genuine attempt had been made to enforce them, which I doubt—would entirely secure the object in view, that is to say, the production of a record containing only real essentials. In every file, as one goes along, one has to give certain intermediate instructions in between the important stages and it is almost impossible to keep these off the main file. Would not better results be achieved by a different approach? Instead of trying to keep unessentials off the main file, might it not be better to face the fact that everything should go on to the file in the first instance and then make a definite effort to select the really important bits and put them in a separate folder to form the permanent record? In short and simple cases this separation of the essential from the ephemeral would be unnecessary. In any case it would not work if the separation were left to the end (as was supposed to be the practice in the old days). *The editing would have to be done as one went along and this might necessitate the typing of duplicate copies of all notes by higher officers.* There are however two expedients which might help in the working out of this idea, if it were decided to proceed with it. In the first place "all notes might be regarded as drafts until approved by the officer to whom they were submitted. Thus, if an Under Secretary did not agree with the note put up by the office, but thought the case would have to be submitted to higher authority, he would either re-write the note or amend it, just as he would amend a draft letter, and the result would go up to the Deputy Secretary as a draft over the signature of the Under Secretary alone. If the Deputy Secretary did not like the Under Secretary's note, he would repeat the process. Thus the file would reach the Secretary, if it had to go so far, with only one note. Sometimes it might be the original office note with the signatures of the Under Secretary and Deputy Secretary attached to it; sometimes the Under Secretary's note approved by the Deputy Secretary; and sometimes just the Deputy Secretary's own version. The procedure would not apply at any stage at which the officer to whom the note was submitted decided to pass order himself. Under such a system the higher officers, it is true, would not have the benefit of seeing the views of all their subordinates and, apart from the possibility that a brain wave here and there might be suppressed, they would be deprived of one means of assessing the merits of their subordinates' work. If, however, the top officer accepts the view that reaches him, that is all that really matters." The system would at least secure that he would have the minimum to read and would facilitate the shaping of the permanent record on the lines suggested above.

"Another device, which is really the same idea in a different form, is that all officers should be encouraged, whenever possible, to put their views in the form of a draft letter instead of expressing them at length in a note, which has subsequently to be converted into such a draft. Not many officers have the gift, which is no doubt to be cultivated where it exists, of writing their notes in such a form that whole passages from them can be bodily transferred to the ultimate draft. On the other hand there are many cases in which a junior officer's note might well be simply—"My views are given in the revised draft below."

III. *The final stage—Issue and record*

17. Our Register of Issues contains seven columns :—

- (1) Serial No.
- (2) Branch.
- (3) Inward Register, Diary or General number.
- (4) To whom and number of enclosures.
- (5) Subject or File No.
- (6) Remarks (Record reference, amount of stamps, etc.).
- (7) Stamp values.

As a separate register is maintained for each Section, columns 2 and 3 (whatever the latter may mean) are not required and they may be omitted. In the examples I have seen they are not actually used. In column 4 the number of enclosures is generally omitted and I doubt whether

in fact their entry is necessary. In column 5 the "subject" should never be necessary and in the examples I have seen I am glad, but rather surprised, to see that it is not in fact entered. The file number, or the Diary No. if there is no file, is all that is required and the name of the Section, which follows the number, may safely be omitted (because there is a separate register for each Section), though in fact it is generally added. Column 6 is not used for the purposes given in brackets in the heading and I see no value in them. On the other hand, it is used (properly) for the entry of the peon book number when an issue is sent by hand, and for recording that a letter has been sent by registered post acknowledgment due when this is done.

18. The Register, simplified as above, seems to meet all requirements and is generally well maintained. The only suggestions I have to make are :—

- (1) that the system of using service stamps should again be examined, and
- (2) that economy and efficiency might be increased by organizing a Central Messenger Service for local deliveries.

As regards (1), I am aware that the matter has repeatedly been considered in the past ; but the expense and labour involved in the design, printing, distribution, custody, issue, accounting for, and affixing of service stamps must be very considerable ; and I have always thought that machines could and should be introduced which would secure the objects in view much more simply. The main object is to maintain a proper record of the commercial working of the P. & T. Department and this requirement should not involve the elaborate process of taking money out of one pocket and putting it back into another. There have been several examples of the abuses to which that system is open.

As regards (2), I presume that each Department has a system of despatches for local delivery at fixed hours. If not, it should have. I am pretty sure, however, that the number of messengers could be considerably reduced, without any loss, and probably some increase, of efficiency, if a common service were organized for local collections and deliveries with regular rounds like those performed by the ordinary postman. As I have mentioned elsewhere (Report No. IV, para. 34) the abandonment of the system of sending files to other Departments should simplify the matter considerably. This would be a matter for the Central Administrative office to take up when established.

19. When files are sent to the Record Room, they are tied up in bundles between stout boards according to the year to which they relate. Each bundle contains so many file numbers. They are then arranged on specially made record racks according to the Sections to which they belong. When a requisition slip is sent to the Record Keeper for a particular file, the relevant bundle has to be untied, the file removed, and a slip put in its place. After so many years—I gather that 10 is about the ordinary period—one year's records are sent to the Imperial Record Room, where I am told the arrangements are on similar lines, but more efficiently carried out. I should add that the records of a confidential or secret Section are arranged and kept in almirahs in the Section itself. In theory, when the almirahs become full, a year's records are sent to the Imperial Record Room in the same way as from the departmental record room. In practice, however, I find that confidential records are often sent to the departmental record room as a sort of half way house between the Section and the Imperial Records. This practice obviously destroys the theoretical justification for keeping confidential records in the Section itself.

20. I can make no suggestions for improvement in the actual storage of recorded files. They cannot be arranged vertically like books in a shelf with their titles on the back ; so some form of 'bundling' is necessary. There is, however, room for improvement in regard to the various matters noted below.

(a) There is often great delay in closing and putting away a file. No finished file—that is to say one on which no action is outstanding—should be allowed to remain "current" for more than a fixed maximum period, say, one month.

(b) "When orders are given to close and record a file, its classification for record (see para. 2 above) is not always given." Apart from other disadvantages, this practice must entail a great deal of extra work for someone when the time comes to transfer records to the Imperial Records Room. The form of file register, which I have suggested (see Annexure B), provides for the classification to be recorded along with the final disposal of the file and this rule should be strictly enforced. There would, I think, be something to be said for storing files classified for retention for less than 10 years in separate bundles, instead of along with those classified for permanent retention. This would facilitate the yearly weeding out of files for destruction. On the other hand it might increase the difficulty of tracing the wanted file.

(c) Something might be done to improve the system of checking files issued from the Record Room and securing their return as soon as they are no longer required. So far as I understand, the system is for the Record Keeper and his staff to check once a year the bundles of the preceding year and send a list of "outstanding" files to the Sections concerned ; but there is no regular system for checking "outstanding" slips in the bundles of earlier years and these may have to wait until the time comes to send them to the Imperial Records.

I cannot lay claim to any expert knowledge in this matter, but I would suggest that useful lessons could be drawn from the systems employed by large circulating book libraries.

(d) Judging from the Record Rooms that I have seen, a great deal could be done to tidy them up, improve their lighting and introduce more method into their arrangement. The same applies to the Stationery Rooms in which printed forms and stationery are supposed to be arranged and from which they are issued. A large amount of unnecessary "junk" seems

to accumulate in these rooms. I have seen a Stationery Room, for instance, used for the storage of charcoal for chapprais. The Record Room contains enormous numbers of spare copies of various publications such as proceedings of the Legislature, printed reports of Committees, etc., etc. In it also is done the work of pasting correction slips into books of Regulations and Statutes. I think that one room in each Department ought to be kept strictly for recorded files; another for stationery and forms; a third for spare copies, etc.; and probably a fourth for the day to day work of the Record Keeper and his assistants. All the rooms are now in the basement of the Secretariat and have to be artificially lit. This may be good for the files. It is not equally good for the human beings who look after them. The possibility of providing better lighting for the fourth room should be examined.

21. It is fairly obvious that, if the number of Departments is to remain large and each Department is to have its own separate files, the space required for records will have to be increased. This is a matter which will have to be investigated in due course by the Central Administrative Office. I am not sure that better results would not be obtained by encouraging all Sections (and not only secret Sections) to keep at least two years' records in almirahs in their own rooms. I hesitate, however, to make any definite recommendation on this point. The suggestion is based on the view that it is the files of the last year or two that are most often required for reference and that the Section, in its own interests, is likely to devote greater care and thought to the convenient arrangement of its records.

IV. General

22. Our Office System, subject to the reforms I propose especially with regard to Indexing and the Movement Register, strikes me as a reasonable and workable system, with two very important provisos—

(a) that it is worked uniformly in every detail in the manner in which it is intended to be worked; and

(b) that it is made the responsibility of some high authority to ensure that it is so worked.

Our Registers are certainly simpler than those I have seen recommended, for instance, by the Bedaux Company; and I would strongly deprecate turning that Company loose on our offices or, indeed, making any radical alteration in our present system. It may not be perfect; but it is established and it is capable of producing adequate results. Radical changes often depend on the taste of their author. A particular officer may, for instance, think it better to arrange files with the last paper at the top instead of at the bottom as under our system; but that is not in itself a sound reason for making the change. There is a great deal to be said for continuity.

23. I note here that the Bedaux registers are complicated largely because their system is based, mistakenly so far as most Government business is concerned, on the assumption that you can measure the work of a Department and thus arrive at the staff required to deal with it by the number of its receipts and issues. Elaborate provisions have consequently to be introduced in order to determine what should and what should not be regarded as a fresh receipt or as a fresh issue. The only purpose for which a commercial organization like the Bedaux Company might perhaps be employed is to examine our mechanical processes, such as typing and issue, the number of clerks required to perform them, the physical lay out of our offices and, possibly, the designs of our office furniture, equipment and appliances. This again would be a matter for the Central Administrative Office to pursue.

24. As regards my two main provisos, the first steps obviously are—

(a) to provide an adequate Manual of Instructions and to require all officers and clerks to study it and, perhaps, pass an examination in it; and

(b) to set up a full time inspecting agency, to help in ensuring that the instructions are obeyed, and to make neglect or disregard of them a punishable offence. The inspecting agency is covered by my proposals for the Central Administrative Office. The Instructions cannot be drafted until final orders have been passed on my report. A great deal of work has already been done in the Home Department on the revision of the existing Instructions, but the results are not, in my opinion, altogether satisfactory and considerable further work will be required. I shall hardly have time to undertake this myself, but note here a few general suggestions, and hope that the task, when taken up, will be entrusted to an officer not lower in rank than a Deputy Secretary specially selected for the purpose.

(1) The Instructions should be obligatory and should not leave so much discretion to the Secretaries in different Departments as they do at present. If an instruction about procedure is sound, there should be no need to allow any exceptions to it.

(2) Because office procedure is a matter of detail, instructions on the subject must themselves be detailed and lengthy. I would divide the Instructions into two parts, the first of which would explain the essentials, mainly for the information of officers, and the second of which would go into greater detail, mainly for the information and guidance of the office. Many detailed instructions for the use of particular registers could and should be printed on the forms themselves.

(3) Part I of the Instructions should begin, as many Acts do, with a list of definitions. There are many words that ought to be defined so as to ensure that a uniform meaning is attached to them, e.g., Department, Office, Division, Branch, Section, File, Case, Correspondence, Notes, and many others.

(4) Part I of the Instructions should then go on to give a brief description of the main registers and processes (numbering, indexing, etc.) which form the foundations of the whole system. The present Instructions plunge "in medias res" and assume a knowledge of these fundamentals which often does not exist.

(5) At some suitable place in the Instructions should be included a list of Simple DOS and DON'TS on the lines of those suggested in Annexure E.

ANNEXURE A

[Photographs of entries in an existing Movement Register are attached to my original report and are not reproduced in the printed copies.]

ANNEXURE B

FILE REGISTER

FILE NO. _____

INDEX TITLE _____

RECEIPTS			MOVEMENTS		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Diary No.	From whom	Date of receipt in Section		To whom	Date

Instructions (to be printed at the beginning of the book).

- (1) If the file starts with an Issue the first entry should be in Cols 5 and 6.
- (2) In Cols. 2 and 3 should be entered both original Receipts and replies to intermediate Issues.
- (3) In Col. 4 only should be entered in pencil on the lines from left to right the movements of the file between office, officers or attached offices. Each entry should be crossed out when the next movement is recorded.
- (4) The final disposal to whom and date of last issue should be entered in red ink across the middle of the page—also the classification of the file for record, with the year in which it should be destroyed, if not to be retained permanently.
- (5) If one page is not sufficient, entries should be continued on a fresh page after noting its number at the foot of this page (continued on page).

ANNEXURE C

EXTRACT FROM MADRAS COLLECTORATE'S OFFICE MANUAL

1. *Introductory.*—Indexing is of the utmost importance. There used to be no instructions laying down the general principles to be observed, and there was no comprehensive list of standard index headings. The work was left to a lowpaid clerk, and, as the files were indexed after disposal, his work was subject to little or no supervision. As he was without knowledge, instruction or guidance, he naturally did the work very badly. Long rambling “purports” were the rule, which told you much that you did not want to know, and probably omitted just what was important. They were not framed so that their gist at once caught the eye, and as the index was written in a volume instead of on slips or cards, they could not be arranged in strict alphabetical order. Finally, there were no definite orders as to what papers should be indexed, and consequently rubbish was indexed in large quantities while important papers were as likely as not to be omitted.

2. *Advantages of the present system.*—Under the system now in force in this office, a paper which seems to be of any importance is indexed when it is received, at the same time as it is registered, and by the clerk who is to deal with it. This clerk is more likely to know what are the important points to be noted in the title than some clerk to whom the file is sent after disposal, and who has had nothing previously to do with it. The index-title is written on two slips in duplicate with the help of carbon paper. One slip is sent to the record-keeper, and the other is kept by the clerk. Thus each clerk has an index of his own files, whether current or disposed of, to which he can refer at any time, to find out the number of any file, to find out whether a given subject is pending or has been disposed of, and to find out when a communication is received whether it is a “New Case” or not, and whether there are any previous disposals relating to the same subject.

3. These titles are prepared in accordance with certain definite rules, which will be found in the succeeding paragraphs, and a voluminous and exhaustive list of standard heads has been compiled which will be found in Appendix A (extract attached). Adherence to these rules, and to the list of standard heads will ensure that the index titles are prepared on reasonable and consistent principles, that they are so framed that their gist catches the eye at once and that they are susceptible of strict alphabetical arrangement. Such an arrangement of the titles is rendered possible by the system of writing each title on a separate slip. These slips are filed on the “loose-leaf system”, which permits of a fresh leaf being inserted in its proper order at any point. These volumes are kept in wooden trays.

4. *Filing of Index slips.*—In the record room the slips are filed in one combined index for the whole office. When one of the volumes of slips becomes too bulky it will be broken up into smaller volumes. Each such volume will be labelled, e.g. :—“A section A—L” or in the record-keeper’s index, simply “A—C”. It will be noted that the slips will be filed in one continuous series till the index is printed.

5. *Title prefixed to all drafts.*—The title is written on every draft (after the word Sir, or Gentlemen) and if a paper is indexed it is marked “I”. Thus, instead of the indexing being left to the discretion of a junior clerk, and that without supervision, it is constantly brought automatically to the notice of the heads of sections and the Collector, who see on every draft the index-title, and can modify it if necessary. They can also see whether a file has been indexed on receipt or not.

6. *Importance of prefixing title to all communications.*—It will be observed that the rule that the title of every letter, etc., should be written at the head of it, is of great importance from more points of view than one. It is an assistance to the person to whom the letter is addressed, it is an assistance to this office if the correspondent quotes it, as he is requested to, in any subsequent communication, and it enables the indexing to be properly supervised. The rule must not therefore be regarded as a mere bit of meaningless red tape, but must be strictly and invariably obeyed. Owing to the absence of titles, brief intermediate communications, and sometimes even more important communications, received from other offices are often unintelligible in themselves. One has to send for the file to understand what they refer to. Similarly if we receive a letter from outside which quotes only the correspondent’s number, not ours, there may be some little difficulty in tracing what it refers to (especially if the subject is not apparent on the face of the letter), whereas if our number is quoted the file can be traced at once. It is a rule of the first importance when addressing anyone always to quote his number if we have previously received any communication from him on the subject.

7. *Title, Head, Sub-head and Content defined.*—In the following paragraphs detailed instructions are given for the preparation of titles. It is to be remembered that, even if a communication is not indexed, it is to have its title, and that title is to be prepared exactly as if it were intended for incorporation in the index.

The entry in the index relating to an individual paper is called a “Title”. The important word that is placed first in the title, by which its alphabetical position in the index is determined, and on which primarily depends the possibility of finding the file, is called the *head*. This may be followed by a *sub-head*; and then comes the *content*.

8. *Head must be (a) obvious, (b) distinctive.*—The first thing to do when writing an index

title is to select your head. *The head must be a word that will naturally occur to any one who wants the papers. It must not be too wide.* For instance, to index all the petitions received in a Collector's office under the head "petitions" would be absurd; though orders of a general nature, relating, let us say, to the way in which petitions should be dealt with, would be appropriately indexed under that head.

9. *Consistency essential. Standard heads and sub-heads unauthorised additions forbidden.*—Next, in selecting your heads you must be consistent. Even if your heads are badly chosen, so long as you are consistent in your use of them less mischief will be done than if they are in themselves better chosen, but papers relating to the same subject are indexed sometimes under one head and sometimes under another. Consistency can only be secured by prescribing a standard list of index heads and sub-heads. Such a list is given in Appendix A (extract attached). A copy of the list will be in the hands of every clerk. Clerks must constantly refer to the list. No head or sub-head may be used in any circumstances whatever unless it is included in the list. If any addition to the list or any modification in it is found necessary, it may only be made with the sanction in writing of the Collector.

10. *Use of heads and sub-heads.*—In the list some of the heads have their sub-heads printed under them. A head may be used alone or in combination with such a sub-head. Such sub-head may not be used without a head. This rule is subject, however, to the instructions printed at the head of the list. Any head may, if appropriate, be used as a sub-head under another head. For example, "Budgets" may be used as a sub-head under "Land Revenue".

11. Under important and wide heads large numbers of sub-heads will be required. Every such sub-head must either be a head or sub-head found in the list, or one included in it under proper authority as laid down above.

12. *Use of "General" as sub-head.*—It has been said that a head may be used alone. The smaller ones will be chiefly so used. Under the larger heads there will be some papers of a general nature. For such, a sub-head "General" may be opened under any head with several sub-heads. But this sub-head must be sparingly used. No paper for which a more definite and suitable sub-head can be found should be indexed under "General". One legitimate use of the head is when a case falls under several sub-heads. Another is when it falls under none; for instance there might be a Government Order dealing with the policy to be adopted in regard to Allowances generally. This would have to be indexed under Allowances—General". It is of utmost importance that a "General" or "Miscellaneous" sub-head under a head should not be used except for legitimate purposes as sketched above. Of course, "General" or "Miscellaneous" should not be used as a head.

13. *Local Classification.*—Local classification should be introduced where possible. For instance in indexing papers relating to assignments, leases, etc., of land or to encroachments, it is simplest in this district to make the head "Land". After this will come the name of a division such as "Egmore"—"Vepey", etc. After the name of the division will come the resurvey number—R.S. No... .., and after the resurvey number the general nature of the subject such as "Assignment", "Lease", "Encroachment" followed by useful particulars such as petitioner's name—"Subrahmanya Pillai, A.K."—and such topographical or other details as "Pillaiyar Kovil"—"Drainage channel." Land acquisition files will be indexed in exactly the same way under "Land acquisition". The names of the divisions will be arranged in strictly alphabetical order. The R.S. Nos. will be arranged in numerical order under each division.

14. *Personal papers.* Personal papers relating to officials will be indexed under the name of the officer concerned. A proper title would be, e.g., "Subrahmanya Ayyar, D.—Sub-Magistrate, —Reduced." "Subrahmanya Ayyar" would be indexed under "S" and "Subrahmanya Ayyar, A." would come before "Subrahmanya Ayyar, D."

15. *Suits.*—Papers relating to "Suits" will be indexed under the head "Suits", thus:—First will come the designation of the Court, then the number of the suit, preceded by appropriate abbreviations "A. S." (Appeal Suit), "O. S." (Original Suit), etc. These abbreviations will be arranged in alphabetical order, and under each the suits will be arranged according to their years and numbers.

16. *Bracketted heads.*—Heads printed in brackets in the list are not to be used as heads, but only if necessary as sub-heads under the alternative heads printed against them. They may not be used even so if they are mere synonyms of such alternative heads. Thus, for example, under the head "Allowances," "Exchange Compensation" may be, and must be, used as a sub-head. Papers are not to be indexed under "Exchange Compensation" used as a head. Similarly, papers relating to land improvement loans are to be indexed under "Advances, Land Improvement." But "Cinematograph" is not to be used under "Bioscope" (the correct head) because they are synonyms.

17. *Arrangement of several sub-heads.*—The same title may contain more than one sub-head. The order in which these should be arranged is a matter in regard to which definite rules cannot be prescribed. Generally speaking the wider and more abstract should come before the narrower and more concrete. The necessity for consistency must not be forgotten.

18. *Content.*—After the heads and sub-heads comes the "content". This must be as brief as is compatible with expressing clearly the main subject of the file and some particulars of the

individual matters to which it relates—so as to enable one easily to find the papers that one may require. Brevity is a merit in a content. If a content shows one at a glance, like a newspaper head-line, the subject of the paper, it is a good content. Unnecessary length is a positive evil in a content. It defeats the object in view. On the other hand, a content which is merely general is of little practical use, and if it does not distinguish a file from others relating to closely similar but not identical subjects, time may be wasted in taking out and examining several files, before what is wanted is found. *The head or sub-head should never be repeated in the content.*

19. *Wording and articulation.*—The whole Title—Head, Sub-head and Content—must consist mainly of substantives, adjectives (where indispensable) and participles. Minor parts of speech should be excluded as far as possible and there must be no attempt at grammatical construction. That strict alphabetical arrangement may be practicable, it is essential that the title should be articulated, or broken up into members, each consisting of a few words as possible, and each expressing an element in the subject matter. Each member will begin with a capital letter, which will help to determine the alphabetical order and should be separated from the members preceding and succeeding it by a bold dash. It is no use to try to put too much into a single title. The title must indicate clearly but briefly one main subject of the order.

20. *Two, or more, titles when necessary.—Cross-references.*—If an order deals with more than one subject, two or more complete titles under different heads may be necessary. But the same content must not be repeated under more than one head, either in its entirety or partially. Instead of this, where a subject falls under more than one head, and it seems useful to index it under each head, but there is no need for distinct contents under each head, a cross reference or cross references must be used,—that is, the complete title will be printed under one head, while against the other heads will be printed merely “See, so and so” (mentioning the former head). *The same cross reference must never be repeated.* On page 74 of the Government Local and Municipal Index (Local) for 1918 “Pasteur Institute, Coonoor, see under Accounts” is printed five times over one after the other, which is obviously ridiculous.

EXTRACT FROM LIST OF INDEX HEADS

A head may be used alone or in combination with any sub-head. Any head may, if appropriate, be used as a sub-head under any other head *e.g.* “Budgets” may be used as a sub-head under “Police”. Local classification should be introduced wherever possible. In indexing papers relating to land, that is after the head, “Land” should come the name of the division of the city, *e.g.*, “Egmore” “Vepey”, etc., followed by the resurvey number and then by further particulars such as “Assignment—Ponnuswami Pillai (P.V.)”, or “Encroachment—Perumal Koil”. The names of divisions should be arranged in alphabetical order, the resurvey numbers in numerical order under each division. Personal papers relating to officials should be indexed under the name of the officer concerned. Heads in brackets are not generally to be used as heads, but only, if necessary, as sub-heads. Additional legal, etc., heads may be selected if required, from the lists at the beginning of each volume of Woodman’s Digest. The abbreviations [C.L.], etc., in brackets should always be used.

A

Abkari—
 Advisory Committee.
 Beer.
 Country liquor—[C. L.].
 Arrack.
 Toddy.
 Drugs—Cocaine, Ganja, Morphia, Opium, etc.
 Fixed Fee system.
 Foreign liquor—[F. L.].
 General.

[NOTE.—Under these sub-heads further sub-heads, such as Duty Lease, Licence, Permit, Shop, Shop-site, Warehouse, will be opened as required.]

Accidents. [See also Railway].

Accountants—
 Chartered—
 General
 [Income-tax—See Income-tax.]

Taluk Head—
 [Village—see Village officers.]
 [See also Auditors.]

[Accounts Code. See Civil Account Code.]

Accounts—
 Adjustments.
 Classification.
 Objection.
 Taluk.
 [Treasury—See Treasury.]
 Village.

[Acquisition. See Land Acquisition.]

[Acts. See under the several short titles.]

[See also under books and publications.]

[Additional member. See Legislative Council.]

- Address—
 [Forms of. See Correspondence.]
 [Valedictory. See Government Servants' Conduct Rules.]
 [Adjustments. See Accounts.]
 Administration Report.
 Excise—
 Presidency—
 Salt—
 (and so on)
 Administrative powers.
 Administrator-General.
 Advances—
 Agricultural—
 Floating—
 Horse—
 House-building—
 Land improvement--
 Motor—
 Permanent—
 Provincial—
 [General Provident Fund—See Provident Fund.]
 [Survey—See Survey.]
 Tents.
 Advertisements. [See also Publicity.]
 Advocate-General.
 [Affiliation. See Education.]
 [Afforestation. See Forests.]
 Afghan Sardars.
 Agency
 [Agricultural Advances. See Advances.]
 [Agricultural Calendar. See Books and publications.]
 [Agricultural Journal. See Books and publications.]
 Agricultural Society.
 [Agricultural Statistics. See Statistics.]
 Agriculture—
 Castor seed.
 Cattle-breeding.
 Coconuts.
 Cotton.
 Agriculture—*contd.*
 Food-grains.
 Groundnut.
 Implements.
 Indigo.
 Insects and pests.
 Manure.
 Oil-seeds.
 Rubber.
 Seed selection.
 Sugar-cane.
 Tobacco.
 [NOTE.—Other sub-heads to be opened as required.]
 Aircraft.
 [Air-guns. See Arms Act.]
 Alienations--
 [Land. See Land.]
 Pensions. See Pensions.]
 [Revenue. See Land.]
 [Aliens. See Foreigners.]
 Aliens—Enemy.
 [See also Enemy property—Enemy trading.]
 Allotment.
 Additional
 [See also Funds.]
 Allowances.—
 Bonus.
 Capitation—
 Charge—
 Compassionate--
 Conveyance--
 [Daily--See Travelling.]
 Deputation--
 Duty--
 Exchange Compensation--
 General.
 Grain compensation--
 [Horse.--See Conveyance--.]

- House-rent--
- Local--
- Personal--
- Shorthand--
- Tentage--
- Travelling--
 - Officials.
 - Non-officials.
 - Witnesses.
- War, etc.--
 - [Ammunition. See Explosives.]
 - [Anchors. See Marine.]
 - [Ancient Monuments. See Archæology.]
 - [Andamans. See Port Blair Convicts.]
 - [Anicut. See Irrigation.]
 - [Animals, cruelty to. See Cruelty to animals.]
 - [Animals, wild. See Wild animals.]
 - [Anthrax. See Cattle disease.]
 - [Anti-malarial measures. See Malaria.]
 - [Antiquities. See Archæology.]
 - [Anti-rabic treatment. See Pasteur Institute.]
- Appeals--
 - [This head is for general orders about Appeals. Appeals against orders will be indexed under the subject of the orders, e.g. "Assignment". Departmental appeals will be indexed under the name of the Appellant. Appeals from the decisions of the Civil or Criminal Courts will be indexed under "Suits, Appeals" or "Criminal Appeals" respectively and Income-tax and Super-tax appeals under "Income-tax" and "Super-tax" respectively.]
 - Second appeals (the above note applies here).
 - Appeal against acquittal. [See also Criminal Appeals.]
- Appointments --
 - [General orders about appointments. Individual appointments will be found under the name of the officer concerned.]
- Apprentices.
- [Appropriation. See Funds.]
- Arbitration.
- Arboriculture.
- Arms Act--
 - Exemptions
 - Licences.
- [Army. See Military.]
- [Arrack. See Country liquor.]
- Arrears--
 - [See also Revenue Recovery.]
 - Irrecoverable.
 - List.
 - [of Pension, See Pensions.]
- Articles of Commerce Ordinance.
- Articles of War.
- Assault.
- [Assessed waste. See Land.]
- Assessment--
 - [Ground-rent. Quit-rent. See Land.]
 - [Income-tax. See Income-tax-Assessment.]
 - [Tree-tax. See Country liquor.]
- Assessors.
- Assignment--
 - Darkhast.
 - Land.
 - Land Revenue.
 - [Revenue. See Land.]
 - [Provincial. See Funds.]
 - [Imperial to Provincial. See Funds.]
- Assistant Collectors.
- Assistant Tahsildars.
- Assurance, Life.
- [Assurances. See Registration.]
- Asylums. [See also Lunatics.]
- Audit.
- Auditors. [See also Income-tax.]
- [Auditors' certificates. See Companies Act.]
- [Avenues. See Trees.]
- [Ayurvedic System. See Medicine--indigenous system.]

ANNEXURE D

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION SLIP

Date..... Department
File No.....

Reference your file No.....(to be entered if known).
Attached are

- (1) Copy/copies of communication/communications from.....
(2) Draft reply/replies thereto.

Please return the draft drafts, noting in the margin whether you accept it them or have any amendment to suggest, and adding the number of your file below your signature. A copy of the draft/drafts as issued will be sent to you in due course.

To Signature.
.....(officer)
.....(Department)

ANNEXURE E
DOS AND DON'TS

Attention to the following details will save trouble for others, if not also for yourself.

- (1) Do enter the correct number on the top of every fresh page.
(2) If you punch a hole in a paper, DO see that it is over half an inch from the edges, top and side.
(NOTE—All stationery, for notes, drafts and fair copies, should, as recommended by the Maxwell Report, be supplied ready punched at the proper place well away from the edges.)
(3) If you wish a paper to be brought on to the Note file with a note of your own, Do refer to it as "the paper above" and not as "the paper below". Your own note comes last on the file.
(4) If you refer to a previous file in your note, DO quote its number and enter the flag letter on the margin. DON'T refer in your note to "the papers at flag A". The flag disappears. Your own note remains. Someone one day may want to know what you were referring to.
(5) DO bring to the notice of other Departments any mistakes made by their despatchers in the security or priority marking of the covers you receive. They cannot notice these mistakes themselves. If a case is brought to your notice, DO punish any clerk of your own who writes or stamps "Immediate" on a cover that does not contain immediate papers.
(6) DON'T ever pin papers together. Pins are intended only for the temporary attachment of flags or slips.
(7) DON'T keep flags and slips (e.g. PUC slips) on files or papers after they have served their purpose.
(8) One file one flag is the ordinary rule. If the pages of the file are properly numbered, one flag is enough. DO observe this rule.
(9) When you affix a flag or slip, DON'T pin it to the very top of the page with as much as possible of it projecting above the page. It will only be bent down or torn off. And DON'T drive the pin in up to its head. It will tend to cut the paper and fall out.
(10) DON'T use tags as paper clips by passing the ends repeatedly through the punched hole and then tying them in a knot. Tags are intended to keep papers loosely together in such a way that a new paper can be added with the minimum of trouble. If you want to keep papers more firmly together, use a paper clip in addition to a tag.
(11) If you are sending instructions into your office, DO use a full note sheet. Half sheets on Note files save practically no paper. Chit paper is not intended for this purpose. But if your officer has written instructions on a receipt in the Correspondence file or on a chit, DO type them out at the proper place on the note file.
(12) If you are submitting a file to higher authority DON'T end your note. if you can possibly help it, at the very bottom of the page. If you must, see that a fresh blank sheet is added and numbered, on which he has room to record his orders.
(13) Do avoid officialese. As one illustration, the words "in this connection" are never necessary, but are used thousands of times.

SUMMARY OF REPORT No. IV**PART I.—GENERAL**

1. Assuming that the Government of the future will contain X Portfolios (Members' charges) and that a portfolio *may* contain more than one Department (Secretary's charge), it is necessary, before reaching conclusions as to the number of Departments, to consider the system on which they will work and the sort of staff required to work it. This involves an examination of the scheme for Central Civil Service. (Para 2).

2. The case for this scheme is that our present machine has broken down under the stress of (war and presumably, the inferior quality of our temporary war staff) and that it will certainly be unequal to the tasks of post-war development unless it is radically altered and strengthened. The creation of a Central Civil Service on the Whitehall model would substitute for the large "case-noting" section of the "office" a smaller number of good officers who by long acquaintance with the subjects with which they dealt would become "policy experts". They would be able to dispose of many minor cases themselves and to put up the remainder in a far more businesslike form for the orders of higher officers. Eventually the new Service would also provide men for some of the higher posts. The top officers would thus be much more efficiently screened than at present and would be left with sufficient leisure to think out policy. (Para 6).

3. The main defect of our present system is admittedly the extent to which it involves reliance on an "office" of insufficiently high calibre. This reliance flows partly from our practice of borrowing officers from the provinces, who may start with little or no special knowledge of the subjects with which they deal. The "office" takes charge, and hence the delays and inefficiency resulting from excessive noting and file shifting. On the other hand, these evils *could* be reduced by insisting on stricter compliance with existing orders designed to reduce them; opinion in favour of the new scheme is by no means unanimous; the need for it may be felt more in the Departments concerned with post-war development than in the others; and, above all, there is a very great deal to be said for our present method of obtaining officers. We secure thereby men of some administrative experience who know what being governed means, who are accustomed to taking decisions, and who are therefore more likely to want to get things done than to find reasons for not doing them. Moreover, it is not a defect of *system* that has of late made it difficult or impossible to procure officers of the number and type required to work it. The system could be adjusted in course of time to produce them. In other words while I agree that at present we have too few officers of the right kind and too many clerks of the wrong kind, and that a new and higher-powered machine is required, I do not think it necessarily follows that we must go in for an entirely new make. (Paras 3, 4, 5 and 7).

4. Perhaps the only respect in which the present system itself requires alteration is in the matter of inter-departmental consultation. Owing to the great increase in the number of departments it has ceased to be a simple and convenient process to send whole files from one Department to another. Specific proposals will be made later on this point. (Para. 8).

5. I admit that I start with a prejudice against the Whitehall system, which has hitherto produced the Civil Servant who spend his whole life in one office. I do not like the idea of a very large Secretariat; I doubt whether a mass of junior Secretariat officers would in practice relieve the higher officers of any great amount of work; and I am pretty sure that a great increase of quantity would spell deterioration in quality. I would not however have the same objection to a material increase in the officer strength of executive Directorates and Services outside the Secretariat or to a similar strengthening of the ranks of expert advisers in these executive Services and Directorates. (Para. 8).

6. On the question of principle, there is a clear dilemma between the need for Secretariat experience and the need for Administrative experience. It is impossible to combine both in the same individual from the top to the bottom of one's organization. In England there is an increasing tendency to bring Civil Servants "into touch with realities" by sending men *out* to do a turn of 'field work'. In India we have always followed the reverse process of taking men *in* to do a spell of Secretariat work; and I have no doubt that this is the better way. The man who comes in is of value to the Centre and of increased value to the province when he returns. The man who spends his earlier years in the Secretariat and then goes out to do a practical job for a province increases his value to the former, but may be of little use to the latter. I would therefore retain our present practice at any rate over a large part of the field down to and including most of our present grade of Under Secretary. On the other hand—

(a) I would in future cast the net for Secretariat officers over all Services (All India, Central and Provincial) and not over the I.C.S. alone; and

(b) while retaining the tenure system during roughly the first half of a man's career, I would abolish it thereafter. After about 15 years service or so it should be quite clear whether a man's talent lies in the Administrative or the Secretariat field. If it is in the Secretariat field, he should remain there and should not be sent back to his province except to serve in the provincial Secretariat. (Paras. 9 and 10).

7. Apart from the above objection in principle to a Central Civil Service, I do not think that the new scheme takes sufficient account of the following facts.

(a) Policy cannot be framed in *vacuo* but only in the light of actual problems; senior officers cannot therefore be relieved of all case work; in fact the trouble at present is not so much that senior officers are over-loaded with unimportant work as that they have too much important work to do; in other words their charges are too large.

(b) Quite a considerable part of the detailed work which now occupies the time of Secretaries descends upon them from above and therefore cannot be reduced simply by increasing the number of officers below.

(c) A largely increased number of junior officers, although they may prevent certain items of work from rising, will inevitably increase the net volume of the upward flow and may set up a "snow-ball" process.

(d) On whatever scale the officer strength of the Secretariat may be organised, it will never be sufficient for a major emergency such as war. (Para. 11).

8. After examining these practical points in some detail (Paras. 12—15) I come to the conclusion (Para. 16) that the lines on which to approach the problem are briefly as follows:—

(1) I would begin by clearing the ground by cutting out of the Secretariat certain items of work which do not fall within my conception of its proper function and by reducing the amount of work now done on certain others. By far the most important point here, to my mind is

(a) a proper division between Secretariat Departments on the one hand and executive Directorates and Services on the other and a liberal delegation of powers to the heads of the latter.

Subsidiary steps, as mentioned in my previous report would be—

(b) the setting up of a Central Administrative Office to relieve Departments of as much work as possible connected with the internal economy of the Government of India;

(c) the provision of various "common agencies" or Bureaux which would serve the needs of all Departments in certain specialized matters (*e.g.* publicity) instead of being themselves separate Departments with whom agreement must be reached before action can be taken;

(d) the expansion of the functions of the Public Service Commission with the object of relieving Secretariat officers of as much work as possible connected with "personal" cases; and

(e) a revision of the relations between the Finance Department and the spending Departments with the object of placing greater financial responsibility on the latter and reducing the number of references to the former.

(2) One would then be left with a mass of true Secretariate work and the next step would be to set up a sufficient number of Departments to deal with conveniently sized blocks of allied subjects. I would lay down very roughly what the size of a normal Department should be, basing it on the number of subordinates from whom a top officer can be expected comfortably to take work, and then attempt to fit the work into units of this kind.

(3) Having arrived at the number of Departments or Units so required, I would then turn my attention to the actual methods of work and the sort of staff required to do it. I would insist on complete compliance with a revised and well thought out "Manual of Office procedure". It is at this stage that I would tackle the question of our "office" and whether any, and if so what, proportion of it should be converted into a new grade of officers.

(4) Finally, one would be left with the problem of how to obtain (a) immediately and (b) permanently, officers of the type and in the numbers required with due regard to provincial demands for the return of some of the existing officers

I follow this programme in the next four Parts of this Report.

PART II.—CLEARING THE GROUND

(A) *Executive Directorates and Services*

9. I distinguished (Para. 17) four main types of Departments.

Type 1.—Departments the business of which is Central and which operate through Central Government Services.

Type 2.—Departments the business of which is Central but which operate through Directorates or individual officers.

Type 3.—Departments the business of which lies largely in those parts of the provincial field in which the executive work is done by Provincial Government Services, but in which Central financial assistance and expert advice are required.

Type 4.—Departments the business of which lies in the provincial field, but in parts of it in which the Provinces do not require financial assistance or advice and the main work is therefore to keep the Provinces to a common policy.

10. In each type except the last, of which perhaps the only example is the law and order side of the Home Deptt., there is, or should be, a headquarter organization outside the Secretariat presided over *either* (Type 1) by the Head of an Executive Service such as the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, or (Types 2 and 3) by the Head of a Directorate, such as the Director General of Civil Aviation or the Public Health Commissioner. Where there are Central or Provincial Government Services to draw from, as in Types 1 and 3, the officers required for these headquarter organizations can be drawn largely from those Services. Where there are no regular Government Services to be drawn from, as in Type 2, it is more difficult to get the officers required and therefore, where the circumstances justify it, there is a strong case for bringing regular Services into existence. There are proposals for instance to start a regular Diplomatic Service and also a Commerce and Industries Service, in which would be collected all the *ad hoc* appointments that now have to be made. There might also be a case for a Scientific Civil Service, as in England. However these headquarter organizations may be composed and whatever they may be called—in Type 3 Departments it is suggested that they should be Boards—the main point is that their respective Heads should be given the maximum powers, thus taking work out of the Secretariat, and that everything possible should be done to

exalt their importance. Their offices should be located next door to the Secretariate Departments concerned ; and inside these offices, rather than in the Secretariat should be placed all the specialists, research groups, etc., whose advice is just as necessary in carrying out policy as in framing it. They should in fact be the repositories of precedent and the storehouses of experience from which the Secretariat, should be able to draw much of the material it requires for the framing of policy. Organizations on these lines do not dispense with the necessity for a Secretariat, in which can be applied that broader scrutiny of policy proposals and of their setting in the national or inter-national field which is required from the point of view of the Government as a whole and which can seldom be obtained satisfactorily from the expert or enthusiast in a particular subject. On the other hand, they should enable the Secretariat staffs themselves to be kept fairly small. Much of the concrete planning to give effect to policy could be done in these headquarter offices after consultation between the Member, the Secretary and the Head concerned ; and when schemes had been thoroughly worked out in these offices and then submitted to the Government, they should not be required to run the gauntlet of the lower Secretariat batteries. In other words, if the headquarter offices outside the Secretariat were properly staffed and their relations with the Secretariat properly defined and conducted on the lines proposed, it should be possible—

(a) to relieve the Secretariat of a considerable volume of work, which at present often involves some duplication of effort, and thus avoid making large increases in the Secretariat staffs ; and

(b) to secure quicker and better results in the carrying out of policy. (Paras. 18 to 20 & 23).

11. As a corollary, I recommend (Para. 20) the abolition of the present distinction between "Attached" and "Subordinate" Offices, and a levelling upwards of the rates of pay therein. This process should, however, be accompanied by an increase in the number of officers and a decrease in the number of clerks on the lines later proposed for the Secretariat itself.

12. In a Department of Type 4, such as the Home Department, and in those Departments, such as Legislative and parts of the Finance Department, which have no executive functions and therefore no headquarter offices of the kind described above, the Secretariat staff itself may have to be provided on a more liberal scale. In considering the case of the Home Department, I make the incidental suggestion that the administration of C.Cs.' Provinces might be improved by creating a headquarter office, which might be attached to the Home Department and which would provide the link at present missing between these administrations and the Central Government as a whole. The business of the Head of this organization—whatever exact status he may be given—would be to keep in direct touch with C.Cs.' requirements, to visit their charges at frequent intervals and to ensure that everything possible was done both to push their interests with the Central Departments concerned and to carry out locally the policy of the Government. Delhi, as being already sufficiently on the spot, and, possibly, Baluchistan, as consisting mainly of Tribal areas and State territory, might be excluded from this arrangement. (Paras. 21 & 22).

(B) and (C) Central Administrative Office and Common Agencies

13. I take these two subjects together and leave it an open question whether a Publicity Bureau, instead of the existing Information and Broadcasting Department, should find a place within the scheme of a Central Administrative Office. My own opinion remains that it should. In my earlier report I gave a list of the "house-keeping" items of work which might be assigned to such an Office ; and I now suggest the addition, as "common agencies", of the Printing and Stationery organization, the Cypher Bureau, and the Secretariat Library. The work connected with the move to and from Simla might also be added, and also residential, as well as office, accommodation (Para. 27).

14. The main preliminary question is whether the C.A.O. should have the status of a Secretariat Department. In Bengal a somewhat similar organization has been started as part of the Chief Secretary's "Office" in the Chief Minister's "Department"; but we cannot at present provide the added authority which these titles convey. I would therefore prefer to put the whole organization to start with under a Director General, who would serve the needs and therefore carry the authority, of all Departments and who would merely be "attached" to some portfolio as a matter of administrative necessity and convenience. A direction by the Governor General or the Governor General-in-Council would help to ensure that the Director General's views would ordinarily be accepted on the matters with which he dealt. (Para. 26).

15. I would not at present give "establishment work" to the new Office. Until we get a ministerial set-up at the Centre the general administrative and financial aspects of Service organization must remain divided, as at present, between the Home and Finance Departments. The most I would do would be to make the Head of the new Office responsible for the internal administration of the Imperial Secretariat Service. This proposal, will however, require further consideration in the light of the conclusions reached on the extension of the functions of the Federal Public Service Commission—see Section (D) below. I attach considerable importance to the principle of bringing the selection of Secretariat officers—that is to say the machinery of the Establishment officer and the Committee and Board with which he now deals—as far as possible under the umbrella of the Commission; but as I hold that the Commission itself must remain, as at present, outside the departmental organization of Government, it follows that none of this machinery can find a place inside the Central Administrative Office.

I recommend, however, the introduction, on certain conditions, of the Whitely Council system in the Secretariat under the general control of the Head of the Central Administrative Office. (Paras. 28 to 30).

16. On these premises I recommend the creation of a Central Administrative Office presided over by a Director General equivalent in status to a Secretary, with three main Divisions presided over by Deputy Directors corresponding to Deputy Secretaries. These Divisions would be—

- (a) accommodation and equipment;
- (b) office procedure and training; and
- (c) personnel and general, and I make proposals in some detail for the allotment of work to each Division. A fourth Division for 'publicity' could be added later if the decision goes that way. (Paras. 31 to 34).

17. I make no precise recommendations as to the number of officers to be employed under the three Deputy Directors, though I think that three or four Assistant Directors should be sufficient; but I attach the maximum importance to three general principles.

In the first place, the organization should be kept as small and compact as possible. The main criterion in deciding whether any item of work should be allotted to the new office should be whether it can be performed centrally better than, or at least as well as, by separate Departments.

In the second place, its officers should be selected for special aptitude for the work and should be paid adequately. Nothing could ruin the plan more effectively than to employ large numbers of officers who are misfits elsewhere.

Thirdly, there must be an adequate and efficient inspecting staff, who might also be used to run recruit training classes. (Para 35).

18. All the officers should be recruited from the best available source, preferably not the Imperial Secretariat Service itself. The inspecting staff should form the basis of the whole organization and should be intended for promotion in due course to the higher ranks. Able young men without preconceived ideas should be selected and trained; and advantage should be taken of the offer of the Treasury to help us in this latter respect. The clerks should be mostly of the routine grade and the majority of those

required ought to be available by surrender from the different existing Departments. The Office should be centrally located and the watch-words of the whole organization should be "QUALITY, EFFICIENCY AND SIMPLICITY." A separate Administrative Office for Naval, Army and Air Headquarters may be continued if necessary. (Paras. 36 and 37).

(D) *Public Service Commission*

19. The possibility of extending the functions of the Federal Public Service Commission, with the object, *inter alia*, of relieving Members of Government and Secretariat officers of work on personal cases, is being pursued by an interdepartmental committee; and their conclusions may be awaited. I reject the idea of extending the Commission's sphere of action from the advisory into the administrative field, following the practice, *e.g.*, in Australia, and I agree that the Commission itself should remain for the present outside the departmental organization of the Government. (Para. 38).

(E) *Financial Control*

20. After referring to the recommendations in paras. 268 to 276 of the Rowlands Report and quoting certain views recently expressed by Sir James Grigg, both of which appear to be in favour of reducing the number of detailed references to the Finance Department. I suggest that concrete proposals will have to be worked out by the Finance Department themselves in consultation with other Departments. (Paras. 39 and 40).

21. I mention (Para. 40) some examples of what Sir James Grigg calls the 'irritations' of the present system and recommend (Para 41) that, where the amount of work justifies it, spending Departments should have financial advisers of their own and that, while standard scales of pay and allowances should be prescribed, Departments should in certain cases be given greater discretion in the matter of applying them. I am not in favour at present of the almost complete by-passing of the Finance Department, which seems to have been agreed to in Bengal. (Para. 41).

PART III — DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF BUSINESS BETWEEN THEM

22. In my earlier report I gave the existing number of Departments as 19. As the Defence Department has since disappeared and the supply and I. & C. S. Departments have been amalgamated, the number is reduced to 17. On the other hand, I did not previously include the Railway Department, which exists on paper, but which actually consists only of the Chief Commissioner for Railways in his *ex-officio* capacity as Secretary to the Government of India. In conformity with the principles enunciated in Part II, I would prefer to interpose a small Secretariat between the Railway Board and the Railway Member, but I make no definite recommendation to that effect since the existing arrangements appear to work satisfactorily. Including the Railway Department the present number of Departments is 18. (Para 42).

23. At the end of December I informed Departments that, in my opinion, the correct organization and the proper way to relieve the higher officers of detailed work would be to give each Secretary a manageable charge; and as a rough yardstick of "manageability" I suggested that the "type design department" (though I recognised that there must be exceptions) should consist of a Secretary with about two Deputy Secretaries and four Under Secretaries. While most Secretaries seem to have accepted this suggestion in principle, the view has been put forward that an increase in the number of Secretary's charges would increase "departmentalism" and stimulate a political demand for a larger number of Ministers in the future. While recognising the force of these objections, I do not regard them as decisive. I adhere to the view that no "top officer" can be expected to deal satisfactorily with more than a certain volume of work or a certain number of subordinates; but I point out that the essence of the kind of organisation I propose *could* be re-

tained, while *either* shifting the whole of it a step upwards by appointing Principal Secretaries to be in charge of a group of Secretary's Departments, or by shifting the whole of it a step downwards, by putting Departments in charge of Deputy Secretaries with a single Secretary in charge of a group of such Departments. To simplify matters I refer hereafter to "Units" instead of "Departments". (Paras. 43 and 44).

24. It has proved extremely difficult to secure agreement either as to the number of "Units" or the distribution of business between them. I have drafted and circulated two distribution lists- the first drawn in terms of the items in the three Lists in the 7th Schedule to the Constitution Act, and the second, which I think gives a better picture, drawn in more general terms, but with references in brackets where possible to the entries in that Schedule. Certain transfers of business from one Department to another have been proposed; all Departments have been consulted; but complete agreement has not been secured and a number of important points are submitted for orders. My final proposals are attached as Appendix I. (Paras. 45 to 47).

25. This Appendix contemplates 19 "Units", including the Railway Department, but not counting the Finance and War Departments. These two Departments are or have been, the subject of separate re-organizations of their own, which place them rather outside my terms of reference; but it is obvious that each of them contains more than one of my kind of "Unit". The only new "Units" proposed, although I am doubtful whether Industries and Supply will prove a single manageable charge, are -

- (a) Works, Mines and power, to be split off from Labour;
- (b) Marine, to be split off from Commerce; and
- (c) Services, to be split off from Home.

The first of these proposals was the subject of my separate Report No. III. The second is, I think, justified by the present size of the Commerce Department, the ease with which it *can* be divided into Commerce and Marine, and the very large amount of important work, especially in the international field, that lies before it. The third is a more temporary requirement arising from the particularly heavy work connected at present with post-war problems of recruitment to the I. C. S. etc.

Against these three new Units, my list includes—

- (a) Information and Broadcasting. (b) Planning and Development; and
- (c) Food, none of which, in my opinion, should form part of our permanent set up. The reasons for this opinion to which I adhere, are given in my earlier Report No. II. (Para 48).

26. I have indicated on the departmental lists in Appendix I the main changes that have been made and the items with regard to which complete agreement has not been secured.

PART IV -- SYSTEM OF WORK AND ESTABLISHMENTS REQUIRED

27. Office procedure being as matter of detail, I have put my suggestions under this head in a separate Appendix II. The most important recommendations therein are that the practice of sending files from one Department to another should cease and be replaced by written communications or oral discussion, and that a big effort should be made to improve our "indexing" on certain lines.

I also attach importance to the rewriting of our present Secretariat Instructions and have made some general suggestions as to the form that the new publication should take. There are a number of other recommendations on points of detail and I hope the whole subject will receive the consideration that its importance deserves. (Para. 49).

28. In order to give a rough idea of the number of officers, in different grades who would be needed if the principle of my proposals is accepted, I work on the figure of 25 as the number of "Units" required. This figure is

made up of 17 Units, as against the figure of 19 given at the end of Part III, to provide for the *permanent* set up outside the Finance and War Departments, with an addition of 8 Units to provide for those two large Departments because they cannot be split up into separate charges. Applying my "type design ration" of one top officer, two middle officers and four lower officers for each Units, we get the figure of 175 made up of 25 Secretaries, 50 Deputy Secretaries and 100 Under Secretaries. To this figure I suggest that 12 or 13 lower grade officers should be added, to provide for Private Secretaries to Honourable Members, and about 17 officers of the middle grade, to provide for Public Relations officers in various Departments (I also recommend that each Secretary should have a proper Personal Assistant, but these might be drawn from our present Superintendent's grade and are therefore not included in the above estimate of number of "officers" required). With these additions and providing one top officer, three middle officers and eleven lower officers for the proposed Central Administrative Office, the total comes to 220—26 top officers, 70 middle officers and 124 lower officers. (Paras. 50—53.)

29. This figure compares (Para. 53) with—

(1) 1939—

Top officers (9 Secretaries and 8 Joint Secretaries)	17
Middle officers (Deputy Secretaries)	12
Lower officers (Under and Assistant Secretaries)	20
Total	<u>49</u>

(2) 1945 (approximate figures)—

Top officers (19 Secretaries, 6 Additional Secretaries and 26 Joint Secretaries)	51
Middle officers (Deputy Secretaries)	51
Lower officers (Under Secretaries 42 and Assistant Secretaries 61)	103
Total	<u>205</u>

(3) Mr. Rowland's Report on future I.C.S. requirements for the Centre—

Superior posts	191
Inferior posts	25
Total	<u>216</u>

30. If my general views are accepted on other points, I am inclined to think that this figure would be sufficient without attempting much more than a fairly drastic reduction of our "office" and weeding out the unfit. If, however, a more radical reform is considered necessary, I would apply to the "office" the same principle of the "manageability of charges" that I have already applied to the officer ranks. (Paras. 54 & 55).

31. Before the war the Secretariat contained 76 Superintendents and Assistants-in-charge and 493 Assistants—a total of about 570. The corresponding figures in November 1945 were 341 and 1,645 respectively—a total of nearly 2,000. Assuming that each Under or Assistant Secretary deals, on the average, with $1\frac{1}{2}$ Sections and that the normal strength of each Section is one superintendent and about 7 Assistants, the future strength of our "office" would be 150 Superintendents and 1,050 Assistants. This number of Assistants, in my opinion, would be excessive. My suggestion, therefore, is very broadly, that each Under Secretary's Branch should contain two Sections and each Section should consist of one Superintendent and three Assistants. This would give a total of about 200 Superintendents (plus 25 as Personal Assistants to Secretaries) and about 600 Assistants. Each Superintendent would have a smaller charge, but would be expected to do much more original work. He would not just supervise the work of a large number of Assistants. (Paras 56 & 57.)

32. Under a scheme of this kind there would be a case—

(a) for breaking up the Imperial Secretariat Service into a Class I Service (Superintendents) and a Class II Service (Assistants) ;

(b) for giving those in Class I a new name—perhaps Principals on the U.K. model—and empowering them to dispose of certain classes of routine work in the name of “Government”;

(c) for recruiting Class I from at least three different sources, *e.g.*—to make a purely tentative suggestion

(i) 50 per cent. by direct recruitment through F.P.S.C. examination ;

(ii) 20 per cent. by promotion from Class II ; and

(iii) 30 per cent. by transfer from other Services ;

(d) for giving Class I fairly liberal chances of promotion to the higher Secretariat posts of Under Secretary and Deputy Secretary—perhaps 20 per cent. in each Department in course of time ; and

(e) for providing for the deputation on a fairly liberal scale of officers from Class I to Boards, Directorates and other appointments outside the Secretariat proper.

On this basis, and making liberal provision for a leave and training reserve, the total strength of such a new Service might eventually reach about 400. (Para. 58.)

33. These combined proposals would produce a “Secretariat proper” (omitting the Central Administrative Office) consisting of about “25 Units”, and employing about 430 “officers” and 600 “Assistants”, with a proper complement of routine clerks, as against—

(a) a pre-war Secretariat of about 50 officers and 570 Superintendents and Assistants ; and

(b) a present Secretariat (still carrying a considerable load of war work) of about 200 officers and 2,000 Superintendents and Assistants.

Whatever view may be taken of the numbers involved, something on these lines would I claim, go as far as is practicable to solve the dilemma between the need for Secretariat experience, and the need for Administrative experience, by dovetailing the two classes into each other, and also to provide the higher-powered machine to which I referred in Part I. (Para 59.)

PART V.—HOW TO OBTAIN THE OFFICERS WITH DUE REGARD TO PROVINCIAL NEEDS

34. On the conclusion reached that it will be impossible to make any net reduction in the number of officers now employed at the Centre, there is no simple solution of the present Provincial difficulty. The I. C. S. officer is the crucial commodity, which must be rationed. That Service is considerably under-strength owing to the cessation of recruitment during the war and the Centre is now employing almost double the number of I. C. S. officers it is strictly entitled to. I regard it as fundamental that the needs of the Provinces will be at least as important as our own during the next few years and that they must be given a fair share of the best man-power available, even though the process may involve a very real sacrifice on our part. (Part. 60.)

35. After making a series of somewhat confusing calculations [Paras. 61 to 66), based partly on the figures themselves and partly on a rough analysis of the posts now held by I. C. S. officers at the Centre, I come to the conclusions (Para. 67.)

(a) that we should make every effort to return about 50 senior I. C. S. officers (25 from the Secretariat and 25 from outside) to their Provinces within the next year or so, without replacement by other officers from the Provinces ; but

(b) that this can only be done if we can succeed in getting about 75 new junior officers of I. C. S. standard or the nearest possible approach thereto.

The justification for these proposals, apart from the pressing need of the Provinces themselves, is my belief that the work now being done by a number of our Joint Secretaries and officers of similar rank *could* be done by officers of the true Deputy Secretary's grade and, similarly, that much of the work now being done by our Deputy Secretaries and officers of similar rank *could* be done by officers of the true Under Secretary's grade.

36. The calculations are confusing, partly because we have to consider appointments both inside and outside the Secretariat, partly because some of these are held by I. C. S. officers and others are not, and partly because the I. C. S. officers in the Finance and Commerce "Pool" and the Indian Political Service (which serve some of our Departments) presumably *cannot* be returned to their Provinces. The figures on which my calculations are based are summarized in the following tabular Statements, in which "Provision" means the allowance made for deputations to the Centre in the provincial I. C. S. cadres; "top officers" include Secretaries, Additional Secretaries and Joint Secretaries and; "lower officers" include Under and Assistant Secretaries; and "General Secretariat" means the Departments of the Governor General in Council minus Finance and Commerce (which are served by the "Pool") and External Affairs, (which is served from the Political Service).

(I) *I. C. S. at the Centre*

	Actual Provision Excess		
1. Indian Political Service	52	31	21
2. Finance and Commerce Pool (in and outside Secretariat)	35	32	3
3. Secretariat Departments (excluding External Affairs Department and Governor General's Secretariats) ...	78	44	34
4. Posts outside Secretariat under Departments included in 3	58	18	57
5. Miscellaneous (<i>e. g.</i> , Members of Council, Governor General's Secretariats, Military duty, etc.)	17		
Totals	240	125	115

(II) *Whole Secretariat—I. C. S. and non-I. C. S. Officers*

	Top	Middle	Lower	Total
1. 1945 figures	51	51	103	205
2. Estimated requirements for 25 "Units" plus Central Administrative Office ...	26	70	124	220
	+25	-19	-21	-15

(III) *Whole Secretariat minus External Affairs Department—Present I. C. S. position*

	Top	Middle	Lower	Total
1. Finance and Commerce Pool or List	13	11	4	28
2. Others	34	37	7	78
3. Total	47	48	11	106

(IV) *General Secretariat—Possible reduction of I. C. S. Officers*

	Top	Middle	Lower	Total
1. Total requirements for about 19 existing Units and C. A. O.	20	40	80	140
2. Suggested allotment of I. C. S. officers (excluding Pool Departments and E. A. D.)	17	29	54	100
3. Present I. C. S. distribution	34	37	7	78
4. Excess or Deficit between 2 and 3	+17	+8	-47	-22

NOTE.—Another 28 Lower officers may be required for Finance, Commerce and External Affairs Departments.

(V) *Non-Secretariat posts now held by I. C. S.*

	Top	Middle	Lower	Total
1. Pool	0	5	2	7
2. Others	19	32	7	58
3. Total	19	37	9	65
4. Minimum requirements against 2 ...				33
5. Excess				25

37. If returns plus fresh recruitment of these dimensions are to be attempted, the first necessity is a short term scheme which will produce the best officers we can get for Under Secretaries' posts, but which will not prejudice the working of long terms plans for bringing the I. C. S. up to strength and increasing that strength (and, perhaps, the strength of other Services) to meet future Central requirements. It is proposed accordingly to select a "Pool" of about 100 of the best officers that can be secured from certain sources on certain conditions. In order not to block the way for the operation of long term plans, this Pool should contain a proper proportion of older men. The sources mainly to be tapped are the Armed Forces and the various temporary executive organizations outside the Secretariat, especially under the Supply Department, which have grown up during the war to meet purely war time needs. This scheme is being sponsored by the Home Department and a description of it is given in an Annexure. Although the figure of 100 is in excess of my stated requirements of 75 new good junior officers, any surplus actually obtained could be placed elsewhere without difficulty. On the success of this scheme will depend our ability to return the stated number of 50 senior I. C. S. officers to their Provinces. The actual selection of individual officers for return will have to be done departmentally or by a high-powered committee, which will consult the different Departments. (Paras. 68 to 72.)

38. As regards the building up of the proposed Imperial Secretariat Service Class I, the main object should be to avoid too large a measure of promotion from the ranks of our existing Superintendents and Assistants. The first nucleus will again depend on the success of the "Pool" scheme described in the previous paragraph, since whatever number of good officers can be obtained under that scheme will set free a certain number of our existing Under and Assistant Secretaries to form the basis of the new Imperial Secretariat Service Class I. Under the recommendations made in Part IV, not more than 80 out of the possible 400, which may form the ultimate strength of this Service, would be obtained by promotion from the existing Imperial Secretariat Service. This number may have to be slightly increased to start with, but I would fix 100 as the outside figure. A further contingent of about 50 suitable officers might possibly be found from

existing Directorates and Services outside the Secretariat and it is conceivable that we might get a few more from the Army. Direct recruitment by open F. P. S. C. examination, which should eventually contribute the main quota, can hardly be expected to produce more than 20 or 30 men in the first year or so. (Para 73.)

39. On these premises, and in preference to lowering the standard or dispersing over too large an area such good material as we may be able to secure, I suggest that we should not aim during the first stage at a total strength of more than 200 for the new Service. This could be done, *either* by not attempting to begin with to provide men for appointments outside the Secretariat, *or* by restricting the scope of the scheme in the first instance to a limited number of Secretariat Departments and their Attached Offices and by leaving the remainder to function as at present until the new Service can be properly developed and expanded. On the whole I would prefer the second alternative since it would enable the new system to be tried out in a limited number of Departments where the change is most needed and would ease the practical problems of retrenchment and readjustment of staff that are involved in the scheme as a whole. (Para 74)

40. In conclusion I explain why I have not attempted the task of assessing the actual strength of the staff required by individual Departments or giving a financial estimate of the cost of my proposals. I give some reasons, however, for believing that they will not entail any material increase to our present pay bill, if they are accepted completely. The proposals that will meet with most obstruction are clearly those which entail a reduction in the strength of our ministerial establishments; but I believe that reductions on the scale proposed will be in the public interest and can fairly be set against the increased opportunities which my scheme provides for better careers for officers of the right type. (Paras. 75 and 76.)

LIST OF IMPORTANT RECOMMENDATIONS

(NOTE 1.—My proposals are *not* designed for a Ministerial form of Government, although they take that possibility into account.)

NOTE 2.—My reports take no account of the Political Department under the Crown Representative or of the Governor-General's Secretariats.

NOTE 3.—In the references in brackets the first figure denotes the number of my Report and the second the number of the paragraph therein.)

General

1. It is desirable "to renounce the old conception of Government as a regulatory, policing and taxing mechanism, and openly to adopt the conception of Government as the nation's common instrument for expanding its social and economic welfare in all those spheres where individuals or private associations cannot achieve equally effective results". (II. 5.)

2. Taking it that the essential components of the Government are (1) the Member (or Minister), (2) the Secretary, and (3) the Executive Head, there should be an agreed conception of the functions, and an agreed nomenclature for the charges, of these components. Broadly speaking, I suggest that the function of the Member (or Minister) in charge of a Portfolio (or Ministry) is to decide policy; of the Secretary in charge of a Department to provide the material on which to reach such decisions and to see that they are followed up; and of the Executive Head in charge of a Service or Directorate, to carry the decisions into effect. (II. 7.)

3. There should be an agreed conception of the duties of the different grades of Secretariat officers and an agreed nomenclature for each grade and for the charge of each grade. I suggest three main grades—

(1) the Secretary in charge of a Department, and the Additional or Joint Secretary in charge of a Wing of a Department in the few cases where these may be necessary;

(2) the Deputy Secretary in charge of a Division of a Department;

(3) the Under Secretary in charge of a Branch of a Division;

to these may be added, if it is decided to convert Superintendents into Principals.

(4) the Principal in charge of a Section of a Branch.

The Additional or Joint Secretary should not be either a cheap Secretary or an expensive Deputy Secretary and should only be required in those Departments which cannot be split up. The importance of the Deputy Secretary should be exalted. The grade of Assistant Secretary should be abolished. The gap between the pay of the different grades, and also between the pay of Secretariat and District Officers, should be reduced. (IV. 1.)

The Executive Council (or Ministry)

4. The distribution of the business of Government should be based as far as possible on vertical rather than on horizontal divisions. (II. 15.)

5. On this basis the future Portfolios might be (II. 20 and Appendix I)—

(1) War or Defence (combining the War and Defence Departments);

(2) External Affairs (containing the External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations Departments, which might be renamed Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Affairs);

(3) Home (containing a Law & Order Department and a Services Department);

(4) Commerce and Marine (containing a Commerce Department and a Marine Department);

(5) Industries and Supply (combining the Supply and Industries and Civil Supplies Departments);

(6) Transport and Communications (containing the Railway, War Transport and Posts and Air Departments, the last two of which should be renamed Transport and Communications);

(7) Labour and Works (containing a Labour Department and a Department of Works, Mines and Power);

(8) Agriculture and Food (combining the two present Departments);

(9) Education and Health (containing the two present Departments);

(10) Finance;

to which probably should be added;

(11) Law;

to which again may be added for a limited period;

(12) Development.

In addition (II. 20 to 22) there should be a Member without a "departmental" Portfolio, leading eventually to a Chief Minister's Department, in which could be placed a number of "common agencies" either—

(a) for coordination (standing committees of Council, etc), or

(b) for the supply of specialized information or advice to, or the performance of common services for, all Departments (e.g., a Bureau of Economic Advice and Statistics, or a Bureau of Publicity, or a Central Administrative Office).

6. There should be no separate Portfolio for Scientific Research (II. 14 and 21); the necessity for continuing the Law Portfolio may be considered (II. 17); Art should not be added to Information and Broadcasting and that Portfolio should cease to exist, the Department being converted into a Bureau of Information and Publicity (II. 18 and IV. 48); and the Portfolio of Planning and Development should in due course be absorbed in the coordinating structure of Government. (II. 19 and IV. 48.)

7. The Members (or Ministers) should be provided with Private Secretaries, who should be young officers drawn from the Indian Civil Service or other Services and appointed for a limited tenure. (IV. 51.)

The Secretariat

8. The present method of recruiting Secretariat officers down to and including the majority of the grade of Under Secretary should continue; but

(a) officers should be drawn in future from all Services and not exclusively from the the Indian Civil Service, and

(b) the tenure system should not apply to officers of proved Secretariat ability appointed after a particular length of service, which I would put at anything between 15 and 20 years (IV. 9.)

9. It is important that the machinery for the selection of Secretariat officers etc. should come as far as possible under the umbrella of the Public Service Commission. (IV. 28.)

10. Every effort should be made to confine the work of the Secretariat to genuine public business in the policy sphere [IV. 16 (1)]—

(a) by making a proper division between the Secretariat Departments and Executive Services and Directorates and by giving liberal powers to the Heads of the latter—see Nos. 22 to 25 below;

(b) by setting up a Central Administrative Office to perform certain common services and relieve Departments of housekeeping work—see No. 32 below;

(c) by expanding the functions of the Public Service Commission with the object of relieving Secretariat officers of work on "personal cases"—see No. 36 below; and

(d) by a review of the relations between the Finance Department and the spending Departments which should be carried out by the former with the object of reducing the number of references to the Finance Department on the lines, perhaps, of paragraphs 268 to 276 of the Rowlands Committee's Report. (IV. 39.)

11. The remaining work should be divided among a suitable number of Units designed to give the head of each Unit a manageable charge—a rough yardstick of manageability being the amount of work produced by two real Deputies each with two real Under Secretaries [IV. 16 (2) and 43]. The Head of a "Unit" should be a Secretary, but could if thought more desirable be a Deputy Secretary. In the former case two or more Units could be placed under a Principal Secretary functioning as a Deputy Member or Minister; in the latter case two or more Units could be placed under a Secretary. (IV. 44.)

12. On the above basis—

(a) the Defence Department should be abolished (I.—accepted and carried out);

(b) the present Labour Department should be divided into a "Labour" Unit and a Unit for "Works, Mines and Power" (III.—accepted in principle);

(c) the present Commerce Department should be divided into a "Commerce" Unit and a "Marine" Unit (IV. 48);

(d) the present Home Department should be divided into a "Law and Order" Unit and a "Services" Unit. (IV. 48);

(e) the Information and Broadcasting Department should be converted into a Bureau of Information and Publicity in the Central Administrative Office (II. 18 and IV. 48);

(f) the Planning and Development Department should eventually be absorbed in the co-ordinating machinery (II. 19 and IV. 48); and

(g) the Food Department should eventually be absorbed in the Department of Agriculture (II. 3 and IV. 48).

13. The War and Finance Departments obviously contain more than one Unit each but cannot be split up into separate charges and must remain subject to their own schemes of reorganization. (IV. 50)

14. The distribution of business between the various Units should be as shown in Appendix I, in which there are several points for decision.

15. The Secretariat Instructions should be re-written and the system of office procedure should be altered in certain respects, the most important of which are—

(a) the abolition of the practice of sending files bodily from one Department to another, and

(b) a radical improvement in the methods of "indexing" (IV. 49 and Appendix II).

16. Secretaries should be provided with proper Personal Assistants, who may be drawn from the Imperial Secretariat Service. (IV. 51)

17. Those Departments that require them should be provided with Public Relations Officers, who should preferably be trained officials rather than journalists employed on contracts. (IV. 51)

18. On the basis of recommendations 8 to 14 the Secretariat of the future may be divided into roughly 25 Units requiring 25 top officers, 67 middle officers, 113 lower officers, making a total of 205. (IV. 53)

19. Applying the same principle of the manageability of charges to the "office" and on the basis that each Under Secretary should deal with about

two Sections and that each Section should consist of a Superintendent and about three Assistants, the future strength of the office should be about 225 Superintendents and 600 Assistants. (IV. 57)

20. There is a case for converting the Superintendents into a new Imperial Secretariat Service Class I, the members of which might be called "Principals". If so, the new Service should be recruited in certain ways, and be given certain powers and certain opportunities for promotion to the higher grades. It should also provide officers to work on deputation in Offices outside the Secretariat. The ultimate strength of such a Service might be about 400. (IV. 58)

21. In order to give Provinces a fair share of the best man power available, every possible effort should be made to return from the Secretariat within the next year or so about 25 senior Indian Civil Service officers without replacement by officers of similar standing from the Provinces, but this can only be done by securing the services of about 75 officers of the Indian Civil Service standard, or the nearest possible approach to it, to fill appointments in the Under Secretary's grade—see also No 37 below. (IV. 63 and 64)

22. In order to cover the requirement in 21, with a suitable margin, every effort should be made to recruit as soon as possible a Pool of about 100 suitable officers mainly from the Armed Forces and various civil war organizations on certain terms. (IV. 72)

23. At the same time efforts should be made to build up the nucleus of the new Imperial Secretariat Service Class I by certain methods, but the number to be aimed at in the first stage should not exceed 200, of whom not more than 100 should be promoted from the existing Service. Of these 100 a considerable proportion should be men near the end of their service (IV. 73)

24. During the first stage it may be preferable to introduce the new system and employ the officers of the new Imperial Secretariat Service Class I only in a limited number of Departments, which require them most, and in their Attached Offices. (IV. 74)

Organizations outside the Secretariat

25. The importance of the headquarter offices of Executive Services or Directorates outside the Secretariat should be magnified and their respective Heads should be given the highest possible status and powers considered suitable. (IV. 18 and 19)

26. Boards should be formed under those Departments whose work lies mainly in the provincial field and the relations between the Heads of such Boards and the Secretariat should be similar to those between the Secretariat and executive Heads (IV. 20)

27. These organizations, besides administering executive Central Services where they exist, should function also partly as the workshops of policy in close liaison with the Secretariat and should contain all the experts required. The principle of important proposals should be settled by discussion, where possible, between the Head of the organization and the Member and/or Secretary and the finished scheme in such cases should not be required to run the gauntlet of the lower Secretariat batteries. (IV. 18)

28. The officer staff of these organizations should be provided partly by the executive Services concerned (Central or Provincial) and partly by the proposed Imperial Secretariat Service Class I. Where a regular executive Service does not exist and there is a case for creating one (e.g., Commerce and Industries, or a Diplomatic Service) there is everything to be said for doing so. (IV. 19)

29. Where such headquarter offices can be properly staffed and their relations with the Secretariat properly defined and conducted, the Secretariat staff employed *vis-a-vis* the particular activity in question may be comparatively small ; but there is still need for a Secretariat for the proper determination of policy. (IV. 18)

30. It may be desirable to create a headquarter office, to be attached, perhaps, to the Home Department, to form the link which is at present missing between the Central Government and some at any rate of the Chief Commissioners' Provinces. (IV. 22).

31. The present distinction between "Attached" and "Subordinate" offices should be abolished and there should be a levelling upwards of the rates of pay accompanied by an increase in the number of officers and a decrease in the strength of the ministerial staffs. (IV. 24)

32. A Central Administrative Office should be set up under a Director General and not as a separate Secretariat Department. It should take over a list of house-keeping items and certain existing "common agencies" and should be organized under three main Divisions —

- (1) Accommodation and equipment ;
- (2) Office procedure and training ; and
- (3) Personnel and general.

A fourth Division for publicity could be added later if the Information and Broadcasting Department disappears.

It should not take over "establishment" work except for certain aspects of the internal administration of the Imperial Secretariat Service. (IV. 25 to 26)

33. The Whitley Council System should be introduced in the Secretariat, subject to certain conditions, under the general control of the Head of the Central Administrative Office. (IV. 30)

34. The head of the Central Administrative Office should be given the maximum authority within the sphere of his functions ; the officers should be specially selected for aptitude for the work ; there should be an adequate inspecting staff ; and every effort should be made to keep the organization compact and to aim at Quality, Efficiency and Simplicity. (IV. 35 to 37)

35. There may be a separate Administrative Office for Naval, Army and Air Headquarters if necessary. (IV. 37)

36. The recommendations of the inter-departmental committee which has been set up to consider the extension of the functions of the Federal Public Service Commission may be awaited ; but the Commission itself should be kept for the present outside the departmental structure of the Government and its function should continue to be confined to the advisory sphere. (IV. 38)

37. Every effort should be made to return, without replacement by officers of similar standing from the Provinces, about 25 I. C. S officers now employed in posts outside the Secretariat (IV. 66)—see also No. 21 above.

OKDISCD