

Public Service Commission In India : An Inception

Dr Mohan Singh Saggu

Assistant Professor

Baba Farid Law College Faridkot

INTRODUCTION

The modern Indian administrative system, in practice is a legacy of British rule over India. In fact, India remained under the yoke of British colonial rule for more than two centuries. Therefore, it had left a great impact on the social, economic, political, administrative and communal system of India. The bureaucracy in India, had been in existence in early Vedic period. The king generally used to appoint his kins and loyals as officials for different stratas of administration to rule effectively over the masses. It is generally believed that civil services were the strong instruments of East India Company for the spread of their colonial empire purely based on economic view point. The civil service in the third world countries like India is therefore, regarded as of great importance due to its feudal, agrarian, social, economic, administrative and communal factors. In a developing country the administration faces many problems and challenges. This is due to speedy implementation of the policies of ruling government to speed up economic, social, cultural, educational and scientific development of the country for the upliftment of masses. However, the civil service because of its inherent qualities of neutrality, impartiality, accuracy and accountability bring it at par the developed countries. Therefore, the main objective of a Public Service Commission is to provide only deserving, meritorious, efficient, committed and competent civil servants. In the wake of these qualities, they may be able to provide efficient, capable and neutral services to their citizens in order to fulfill the basic programmes of modern welfare state.

The bureaucracy in India has its roots in Vedic period. In fact the territory of the kingdom at that time was very small. Generally, the king who was known as Samrat was the sole protector of life and property of the masses. He used to lead the tribe into war and administered the justice with the help of Purohita (Priest). The people in return voluntarily gave him bali (tribute). "Among the royal officials, the Purohita, Senani (general) and gramani (headman of the village) were the most important. We hear also of dutas (envoy) and spies (Spas)".

But, in later Vedic period big territorial states emerged with huge population. It became very difficult for the king to administer such a larger state with a few officials. Therefore, various new branches and departments of administration were created under the control of officials in order to administer the kingdom smoothly. "The increase in the royal power, due to the growth of large territorial states, is duly reflected in the

enlarged encourage of king. We hear of new officials such as Suta (charoteer), Samgrahiti (treasurer), Akshavapa (Superintendent of dicing), Takshan (carpenter) Rathakar (chariot maker), Kshatri (Chamberlain) and several others whose exact functions cannot be ascertained. These officers as well as Purohita, Senani and Gramani were known as Ratnins (Jewels) and their importance is testified to by the fact that in course of the Rajasuya ceremony the king had to visit on successive days the house of the officials and make offerings to the gods."²

During the Mauryan dynasty especially under the Chandragupta and Ashoka, the kingdom was divided into Pradesh as known as States. Provincial administration was under the immediate control of a prince or a member of the royal family. The terms used in the edicts are Kumara and Aryaputra. The former may have been the title of the sons of the king and the later may have referred to other close relatives. They were generally Viceroys or Governors of the provinces of the empire at the same time to maintain law and order and for the smooth functioning of administrative machinery, all the provinces were further divided into districts known as Sthanas. Notwithstanding the fact that there were many departments under the control of Superintendents who were assisted by other various functionaries. "Provinces were subdivided into districts for the purpose of administration and groups of officials were posted in each district. The group consisted of three major officials, the Pradesika, the Rajuka and Yukta. These were in turn assisted by many others. The functions of Pradesika were similar to those of the Pradestr in Arthashastra. These officers were incharge of the overall administration of a district of a particular province, each district being under one Pradestr." However, Gupta rulers provided effective and efficient administrative system for the masses of their territory though they followed Mauryan administrative system operational at that time, "but the supervision of foreign affairs was entrusted to a new official called Sandhivigrahika. Besides Amatayas who headed the department, a number of new officials called Kumaramatyas were added at the highest level"

Unfortunately, during the rule of Delhi sultanate the administrative system was not well organised because of instability in the rule of Deli Sultanate; in spite of the fact, that the empire was divided into provinces. In fact, Delhi sultanate rulers divided some provinces into shiqs known as districts. "At the head of the Shiq there was Shiqdar. He was probably military officer and his duty was to maintain law and order in his jurisdiction. But among the Mughal rulers, particularly Akbar followed a highly centralised administrative system. The empire was divided into fifteen provinces which were known as subas headed by subedar. "The Nazim, popularly known as Subedar or simply the suba, was appointed by a royal sign manual called the firmani sabati. As an agent and representative of the crown, he concentrated in his hands the civil and military powers of the province. Although Akbar created various new departments under the control of ministers, who were considered only his assistants to administer the empire effectively. Actually he was omnipotent in military, civil, executive and judicial affairs of his kingdom. Though, the Mughal empire was a military empire yet, the civil administration was also controlled and administered by the military department of the empire. "A Mughal Suba or province was divided into a number of Sarkars or districts and each district, in

turn was parcelled out into Parganas or tehsils. A district was governed by a senior Shiqdar (Shiqdar++ Shiqadaran) or Foujdar, Amalguzar, Bitikchi, Khazandar and others. The chief Shiqdar commonly known as Faujdar was primarily a military officer who administered the district with the help of a small contingent

present civil service has come into existence from the legacy of the British rule in India, that emerged at the dawn of East India Company. After the establishment of East India Company on 31 December, 1600 A.D. Subsequently, it set up three factories during the rule of Jahangir and Shah Jahan at Surat (1638), Fort St. George (1643) and Hugli (1656) with their prior approval and permission. "Under the Charter and Acts of Parliament, the Company was given some powers to manage their own affairs, including the powers to raise and equip troops for defensive purpose. Thus, the company's service was divided into two classes 'civil' and 'military'. It is this division that is responsible for giving rise to the term civil service as distinguished from the military service" In the beginning all the servants of the company were divided into five categories viz; apprentice, writer, factor, junior merchants and senior merchants. Not only pay scales of the servants were meager but also conditions of service and rules were very strict. Ordinarily, the officers imposed fines on account of misconduct and violation of rules by the servants as well as insubordination shown by them.

Each factory had a number of civil and military servants, however, they were subordinate to the Governor of the Presidency in which the factory was set up. Further all the Governors and members of the council were controlled by the Court of Directors in England. "The head of a small factory was designated as agent and in case of a large factory the title of President was given, who presided over a council of factors which assisted him in his work. The title of president was first given by the factors of Surat to the head of that factory and which they copied from Dutch". It is evident that the term covenanted civil service came into existence in this period. In the beginning servants generally called covenanted civil servants due to the reason that writers' were required to sign covenants prescribing some rights and obligations while joining the service. "A civil servant of the company started his career as an apprentice. He was appointed by the Court of Directors usually at or about the age of sixteen upon his own petition or request. He was required to sign an indenture and a covenant embodying conditions of service. This is the explanation of the term covenanted servant All the covenanted servants had to furnish securities for prescribed amounts. After seven year's service 'Apprentices could be promoted to the next grade, that of 'writer. Apprentices were not sent out after 1694; henceforth the writers' constituted the lowest grade".¹ The Court of Directors, later on prescribed qualification and procedure pertaining to the selection of covenanted civil servants as well as rationalised the appointments. Subsequently, a boy of sixteen years who have the knowledge of eastern trade was to be selected as apprentice. "Although initially the qualifications required of a writer were limited to good penmanship and skill to serve, after 1682 these were extended to general education, with a knowledge of book-keeping and commercial accounts"¹²

Ordinarily, covenanted servants were promoted on the basis of principle of seniority. It was obligatory for the president and council of each presidency to submit a name and grade wise an annual report to the

Court of Directors pertaining to the performance shown by the covenanted servants of the company. "In 1714, the Court of Directors introduced an improved mode of selection. On being nominated by a Director a candidate had to apply formally for appointment to the Court who referred his application to its committee of accounts for its scrutiny. After the committee's report the Court made the appointment by ballot. This was followed by the appointee being required as before, to furnish two securities of £ 500.

For the first time Mughal emperor granted Diwani rights to the company in three provinces of India namely Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in 1765. This led the Britishers to control revenue administration of these three provinces which resulted in strong emergence of covenanted civil servants in India Further the company appointed English Supervisors in 1769 who were known as 'collectors' to collect revenue at district level in the three Diwani right provinces. Unfortunately, on account of their ignorance about the languages and customs of the country they could not succeed. The company appointed Warren Hastings as Governor of Bengal in 1772. "The creation of a civil service in the modern sense of the term may be said to have been the work of both Warren Hastings and Lord Cornwallis. The former laid the foundations on which the later built up a superstructure. To Warren Hastings goes the credit of reorganisation of the revenue administration, remodeling the judicial system and freeing trade from its abuses". For the first time, Warren Hastings set up civil and criminal courts in every district. Moreover, a Court of appellate was set up at Calcutta. Indian Judges were appointed at the District Courts, to be presided over by a Collector. However, this system was aimed to provide better administration in India.

The Regulating Act of 1773 prohibited private trade for all the civil servants of the company except those engaged in purely mercantile work and taking of any presents by the company's civil servants was declared illegal. Provision was also made for punishment for any crime or offence committed in India by the civil servants" Unfortunately, in 1774, the Collectors were recalled from district headquarters as they were not acquainted with Indian languages and customs. Subsequently their functions pertaining to collection of revenue and civil administration were given to the Indian officers who were known as 'Amils'. However, this system remained prevalent till 1781 the year when provision of Collectorship was reinstated and entrusted its supervision to a committee of revenue. To reform the civil service, the Pitts India Act of 1784 made various suggestions. Besides giving various recommendations, "it also laid down that no covenanted civil servant of the company could be made the Governor-General. The civil servants were made amenable to all courts of justice both in India and England for offences committed while in service in India. Demanding and taking of presents by the company's servants was again prohibited. Though patronage remained with the company, the power was partly modified by giving the Crown power of removing or recalling any servant of the company. Before 1784 there was no age limit for the new entrants to the service of the company. In that year it was, however, resolved that no writer or cadet shall be sent to India under fifteen or above eighteen years of age except such persons as cadets who shall have actually been for one year in his Majesty's service and then not to exceed the age of twenty five years".

It looks very strange that before the implementation of Pitts India Act of 1784, nepotism and favouritism was prevalent in the selections to civil service. Generally a person who had links with higher officials in England could brought orders of direct appointment in India. This system created many troubles among the civil servants in India by distorting their promotion avenues. The act established not only supremacy of the British Parliament but also enhanced the status of Governor General and his council. In this way, all the powers were delegated to Governor General and his Council under the control of the Secretary of State. Then in 1786, Lord Cornwallis was appointed as next Governor General of India. He not only brought historic reforms in the administration of Company but also improved the system of civil and criminal justice in India.

"After 1786 a single officer combined the offices of Collector, Judge and Magistrate, the duties of the latter until 1791 being merely to apprehend and not to try dacoits, robbers and other offenders. The union of these officers and the consequent abandonment of the principle of separating executive from judicial functions, was decided upon by the Directors". However, Cornwallis reformed the system of criminal justice as it was proved defective under the jurisdiction of Nawabs till 1790.

Subsequently, he transferred criminal courts to the magistrates and decided to follow Mohammedan law to take decisions; unfortunately, this system also proved defective on the ground that it was difficult for a single person to perform three different kinds of duties. "To remedy this defect, judicial powers were withdrawn from the Collector in 1793 and transferred to the civil courts. There were thus two chief administrative officers in each district, the Collector, whose duties were confined to the collection of the public dues and the Judge Magistrate, who united in his person the powers of Civil Judge and Magistrate and also controlled the police".

The Charter Act of 1793 provided that all the vacancies of civil service below the rank of council must be recruited by the covenanted civil servants, however, pertaining only to that presidency in which these vacancies would be created. For the first time, Lord Wellesley mooted the idea of giving training to civil servants in order to implement his imperial policies." He founded the college at Fort William in 1800, that did not function so long as Wellesley was somewhat out of favour with the Court of Directors. At first the Court wanted to abolish the college in 1802 but subsequently under pressure they accepted the idea of setting up a training institution at Haileybury in England in 1806". In this way, it was made mandatory for all nominated civil servants to undergo a probationary training at Calcutta for a period of three years.

The Charter Act of 1813 prescribed syllabus, rules and regulations for the training of civil servants to make them well educated, expert, efficient and trained civil servants. "under the Act this institution was given a statutory status according to which the Writers nominated by the Directors of the Company were required to spend two years in the institution and pass an examination before being confirmed as writer. The syllabus of training comprised European classical languages, mathematics, law, political economy, general history and oriental languages."²⁰ However, this new system of recruitment of civil servants proved partial and difficult for Indian candidates on account of the provision of compulsory training at Haileybury. Moreover, this

system of examination was biased and was suitable only to the European candidates. Unfortunately, not even a single Indian aspirant could qualify this examination.

In the meantime, by the "Charter Act of 1833 the principle of limited competition was recognised. Section 103 of the said Act laid down that the Governor-General-in-Council would annually submit a list of vacancies in the company's service to the Court of Directors and the latter were to maintain four candidates for every vacancy subject to the supervision of the Board of Control.² The Act also provided that there would not be any partiality on the basis of religion, race, place of birth and colour to gain service in the company. Unfortunately, till 1837 the system of limited competition could not be started on account of clear differences among the members of the Court of Directors. "In its place in 1837 the Board of Commissioners appointed special examiners who were eminent teachers and had associations with the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. They were requested to take charge of the prevalent entrance examinations".

In spite of that, the Haileybury College functioned as an institution to supply civil servants till 1855, except for the period of 1826 to 1834. In fact, it was a period when London Board of Examiners was functioning as recruiting agency to supply civil servants to the company. In the meantime the British Parliament passed the Charter Act of 1853 depriving the Directors of their patronage altogether and directed that in future the Indian civil servants should be selected through competitive examination, open to British subjects generally. The recommendations of a committee appointed to report upon the recruitment of the Indian Civil Service and headed by Macaulay were accepted in their entirety. Two years after the acceptance of the principle, it was decided to abolish the Haileybury College.³ For the first time under the guidelines of the Macaulay Committee, examination was held in July 1855, but still there were various obstacles in the way of Indians to join civil service. Not only the examination was to be held in England but also maximum age limit for the candidates was 21 years and medium of instruction was only English. Moreover, syllabus was suitable only to the British candidates.

After the Revolt of 1857 the control of India was transferred to the British Crown from the hands of Company. It was done by the enactment of Government of India Act, 1858. After this a new system of recruitment was adopted. Under the new system Civil Service Commissioners were appointed to conduct examinations as well as to prescribe eligibility conditions of the candidates such as age, qualification, physical standard and character. "All papers related to the examinations to be held on 16 July, 1858 were required to be addressed to the secretary to the Civil Service Commissioners, Dean's Yard Westminster. The Government of India Act of 2 August, 1858 which transferred, to the Secretary of State in Council, the powers previously exercised by the Court of Directors and the Board of Control combined in the office of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners the duties previously performed by the Macaulay Committee and the examiners separately. The executive power of making regulations for the conduct of examinations and admission to the civil service of India was vested in the Secretary of State in Council. But the advice and assistance in the framing of such regulations, the control and superintendence of examinations, including the determination of

eligibility and grant of certificates of fitness for appointment remained with the Civil Service Commissioners".

After examination a candidate was to be certified by the Commissioners and was appointed by the Secretary of State. In the beginning the number of Commissioners were three which varied from time to time as the number was not fixed. At the initial stage the Commissioners functioned for the Commission on part time basis. The Commissioners were appointed by her Majesty-in-Council and were required to hold office during her pleasure. Besides, they were removed on account of misbehaviour. However, neither they were to confer the guarantee of independence nor security of tenure. In the case of status of the Commission, it was considered equal to an independent department which was located at Burlington Gardens. As per the Act, Commissioners were made responsible for the selection of candidates for civil service. "The examination was in two parts, with a year's interval between them. Those who topped the test in the first part were selected as probationers and had to take a further examination during their probationary period. The first part consisted of papers in the English language and literature, English composition, history of languages and literature of Greece, Rome, France, Germany and Italy, mathematics, natural science moral sciences, Sanskrit and Arabic languages and literature. It included also a viva voce test. In the second part, the stress was on the vernacular languages of India and the elements of Hindu and Mohammedan law and criminal law of India and Indian history."

Though the Act of 1861 recommended to promote the Indians to higher posts, yet the procedure of Indianisation of civil services was very slow. For the first time an Indian candidate named Satyander Nath Tagore qualified the Indian Civil Service examination in 1863. In 1886 Lord Ripon appointed Aitchison Commission to provide justice to the Indians in civil services and he recommended to raise the age limit from 19 to 23 for competitive examinations. Moreover, the Commission recommended to classify Civil services into three categories, namely, Imperial Services, Provincial Services and Subordinate Services. "The Imperial Services mainly belong to the British nationals, though an infinite percentage was drawn from the highest class of Indian community also. The provincial services recruited entirely from the new middle classes of the Indian society, which had readily taken to the English education, while the subordinate services were drawn from the lower middle classes.

In this way, the British Indian society was divided into three different stratas on account of its representation in these civil services. Moreover, the Commission also recommended the abolition of differences among the prevailing covenanted, statutory and uncovenanted services. Similarly, another Royal Commission was appointed in 1912 under the Chairmanship of Lord Islington to suggest the method of employment of Indians into higher civil services. It recommended the reclassification of the prevalent three categories of civil services into four categories i.e. Imperial Services, Central Services, Provincial Services and Subordinate Services. It also recommended that "the term 'provincial' should not form the official designation to any services organised under the provincial government. This service should bear the name of

its province; for example, U.P. Civil Service, the Bihar Civil Service etc. For Civil Services under the government of India class-I and class-II should be used".

For the first time a central recruitment body named as Staff Selection Board was constituted for recruitment of lower services. The Board functioned as a succeeding Public Service Commission. "The Staff Selection Board consisted of a Chairman, three members and a Secretary. Of the three members, two were Indians. The members were appointed for one year but were eligible for re-appointment. It was stipulated in the constitution of the Staff Selection Board that if a Civil Service Commission was eventually established in India pursuant to the Government of India Act of 1919, the Chairman of the Commission should be the Chairman of the Board who in that event, should hold office for five years. Pending the establishment of Civil Service Commission in India, the Viceroy nominated an interim Chairman"

It was the discretion of the Board to frame rules and regulations pertaining to the functioning of the Board as well as educational qualifications for candidates for each post. Therefore, the Board held written test and viva-voce for the selections to be made by it. It looks very strange that while preparing the list of successful candidates the members of the Board usually kept in mind, whether main section of the society such as Hindus, Muslims and Anglo Indians were adequately represented or not. In this way, the Board played an important role in the field of appointment, promotion and confirmation of lower level civil services.

It is generally supposed that under the policy of the Britishers to provide more responsibility to the Indians in the sphere of administration of the country, the government pronounced to constitute a Public Service Commission in India. The idea to constitute a Public Service Commission in India was for the first time mooted in 1919 in the Government of India despatch on the Indian Constitutional Reforms, dated 5th March, 1919 and stated that:

"In most of the Dominions where responsible government has been established, the need has been felt of protecting the Public Services from political influence by the establishment of some permanent officers, primarily charged with the regulation of service matters. We are not prepared at present to develop the case fully for the establishment in India of a Public Service Commission, but we feel that the prospect that the services may come more under ministerial control affords strong ground for instituting such a body".

The proposed Public Service Commission assumed the functions of a central personnel agency that was to function as an agent of the secretary of state in council for the fulfillment of his policies for India. The Government of India Act of 1919 also recommended to constitute a Public Service Commission in India. It provided that, "there shall be established in India a Public Service Commission which shall discharge in regard to the recruitment and control of the Public Services in India, such functions as may be assigned there to by rules made by the Secretary of State in Council".

In this way, the Public Service Commission as recommended by the Act was to be constituted with a strength of five members and a Chairman who were to be appointed by the Secretary of State in Council. However, the entire recruitment process was to be regulated by this Commission in India. The procedure of selection for civil services was that "a system of competitive examination in India was set up in 1922 under the supervision of Civil Service Commission and the Indian candidates thus selected were required to undergo a probation of two years at an English University It was provided that, the Indian candidate who would qualify this examination was necessarily to undergo probation of one year in London. For the first time in 1922, Indian Civil Service examination was held at Allahabad strictly as per the provisions of this system. In spite of that, the main issue of establishment of Public Service Commission in India remained in the background until the Lee Commission was appointed in 1923.

In addition to this Secretary of State, the Government of India and Local Government were not unanimous on the issue of functions and machinery of the proposed Commission in India. Therefore, all these issues were referred to the Lee Commission for review. The Commission "suggested immediate legislation to set up a Public Service Commission in each province or group of provinces for similar purpose. The report of the Commission was published in 1924 and the Public Service Commission at the centre was established in the autumn of 1926. Its Members were to be men of the highest public standing, detached so far as practicable from all political associations and possessing in the case of two of their number at least high judicial or other legal qualifications. The Commission so established consisted of four Members in addition to the Chairman. Sir Ross Barker, its first Chairman was a Member of the Home Civil Service"

It was provided that the Chairman and Members of the Commission were appointed by the Secretary of the State in Council. Their tenure was fixed for five years, but they could be reappointed. It was also provided that two of the Members of the Commission were required to have minimum ten years' experience of service under the Crown in India. However, only the Secretary of State in Council was empowered to remove them before the expiry of their tenure of office. Apart from this, the Secretary was appointed by the Commission with the approval of the Governor General. He was required to record all the decisions taken by the Commission in the meeting.

The Commission was authorised to take any decision pertaining to the functions of the Commission in a meeting convened by the Chairman. Moreover, the decisions were to be taken by majority of Members present and voting. But the Chairman was vested with veto power. The Chairman of the Commission had power to adjourn the meeting without any advance notice. However, the quorum of the meeting was three.

In the case of provincial administration, it was decided that the Public Service Commission would not interfere at its own. The Commission was to be consulted on the issue pertaining to Provincial Services. In addition to that, the Commission was to conduct examination for recruitment to the All India Services and Central Services. Moreover, it was made mandatory for the Commission to advise the Governor-General. On

the issues of recruitment, qualification, syllabus for examination, "Public Service Commission might tender advice on (i) any question concerned with the pay, allowance, pensions, provident or family pension funds, leave rules or conditions of service generally of any All India Service or a Central Service (i) cases in which members of an All India Service or a Central Service were adversely affected by reason of the abolition of any post or class of posts; and (i) any question referred to it through the Governor General by the secretary of state".

The Commission was to have the status of an advisory and not an executive body. Though it was decided that the Commission would appoint the candidates through competitive examination yet, it was also empowered to appoint candidates by nomination. On the issue of Indianisation of civil services the "Lee Commission recommended that of every hundred Indian Civil Service posts, 40 should be filled by the direct recruitment of Indians and twenty by promotion from the provincial services so that by 1939 half would be held by Indians and half by Europeans".* In addition to that the Commission recommended to re-classify the existing civil services into three categories viz. the All India Services the Central Services and the Provincial Services. In the case of Indian Civil Service and Indian Police Service, it recommended that recruitment for these services should be made through an open competitive examination to be conducted in England. On the issue of other All India Services, the Commission recommended that the candidates selected for these services, however, should be a mixture of Western and Eastern nationalities.

After that the Government of India Act of 1935 recommended to reconstitute Public Service Commission under the name of Federal Public Service Commission, when it came into being in 1937. Actually, under the provisions, the Governor General of India was authorised to appoint Chairman and Members of Federal Public Service Commission. It was the discretionary power of the Governor General to decide not only the number of Members but also their tenure, procedure of removal and conditions of service. However, it was mandatory that atleast half of Members of the Commission must have ten years service experience under the Crown in India. All the Members except the Chairman were eligible for reappointment with the approval of the Governor General. However, for the first time, the Commission was accorded a statutory status, which made it obligatory for the Government of India to consult the Commission on the issues prescribed in Government of India Act of 1935. The Commission, was to conduct examinations for recruitment to various civil services. It was made obligatory for the Federal Commission to assist the provinces on their request in matters of recruitment for Provincial Services.

Besides, the Federal Public Service Commission was to be "consulted on all matters relating to methods of recruitment; on all methods to be followed in making appointments, promotions and transfers and on the suitability of applicants; on disciplinary matters affecting any person in a civil capacity: on claims by such a person for payment of costs incurred in defending legal proceedings and for compensation for injuries incurred on duty and the amount of such pension". Not only the Governor General of India determined

number of permanent personnel in the Commission, but also their conditions of service and salary. As per the provisions senior personnel were appointed by the Commission and junior personnel by Secretary of the Commission.

It looks very strange, that the procedure of selection adopted by the Commission was that, it recommended three names against one vacancy required to be filled. In fact, a memorandum issued in 1946 changed this system by providing that, thereafter the Commission would recommend only one candidate against one post and would keep two or three names in the waiting list. However, this memorandum actually increased the powers of the Federal Public Service Commission.

Moreover, the Government of India Act of 1935 also provided job security for the civil servants. The Act recommended that "every member of a civil service of the Crown in India held his office during his Majesty's pleasure. He was not to be dismissed from his service by any authority subordinate to that by which he was appointed and no such person was to be dismissed or reduced in the rank until he was given a reasonable opportunity of showing cause against the action proposed to be taken in regard to him" However, the Act recommended to reduce the number of All India Services to three, namely, Indian Civil Service, Indian Police Service and Indian (Medical) Civil Service. The first combined competitive examination for Indian Administrative Service, Indian Police Service as well as other Central Services was conducted by Federal Commission in December 1947. In 1947, for the first time a new service named, as Indian Foreign Service was constituted and Indian Civil Service was renamed as Indian Administrative Service, after the independence of India. In the meantime, the Federal Commission continued functioning upto 1950, as per the provisions of Government of India Act of 1935. The Federal Public Service Commission was further renamed as Union Public Service Commission on 26 January, 1950 when India became a Republic.

It looks very strange that, the location of the Commission was a temporary feature in India. The Commission was regularly shifted by the Britishers as per their feasibility or for their environmental suitability in India. "The Commission was first housed in 1926 in Metcalf House at Delhi. The Commission alongwith its office staff moved to Shimla in the summer, like other offices of the Government of India. In 1938, the regular move to Shimla was stopped, but a camp office of the Commission continued to shift there. In November 1941, it was decided to shift the Commission's office from Delhi to Shimla on a long term basis and in winter the Camp office came down to Delhi. It was not until March 1948, that the Commission was shifted back to Delhi, permanently, first accommodated in Parliament House and since April, 1952 has been housed in Dholpur House".

REFERENCES

1. R.C. Majumdar, 'Ancient India ', New Delhi : Motilal Banarsidas, 1994, p. 45.
2. Ibid., pp. 75-76
3. Romila Thapar, "Ashoka and the Decline of the Maurayas", New Delhi Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 100.
4. Ibid., pp. 105-106.
5. R.K. Saprū, "The Civil Service Administration in India", New Delhi Deep& Deep Publications, 1985, p. 102.
6. A.L. Srivastava, "History of India", Agra: Shiv Lal Agarwal and Company, 1994, p. 249.
7. J.L. Mehta, "Advanced Study in the History of Medieval india". No Sterling Publishers, 1994, p. 341. new Delhi
8. Op. cit., p. 344-345.
9. R.K. Saprū, op cit., pp. 105-106.
10. P.N. Mathur, "The Civil Service of India (1731-1894)", Jodhpur: Prabhash Prakashan, 1977, p. 2.
11. A.C. Banerjee, "The Constitutional History of India". Delhi : Macmillan Company of India, 1977, p. 389.
12. B.B. Misra, "The Buroaucracy in India", New Deilhi : Oxtord University Press 1977, p. 43.
13. Ibid., p. 44.
14. L.S.S. O Malley, op cit., p. 23.
15. P.N. Mathur, op cit., p. 11
16. Ibid., pp. 13-14.
17. L.S.S. O Malley, op cit., p. 37.
18. Ibid., p. 38.
19. R.K. Saprū, op cit., p. 110.
20. Ibid.

21. P.N. Mathur, op cit., p. 11.
22. Ibid, p. 36.
23. M.A. Mutalib, "The Union Public Service Commission", New Delhi The Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1967, p. 26.
24. B.B. Misra, "The Administrative History of India (1834-1947)", London: Oxford University Press, 1970, pp. 185-6.
25. M.A. Mutalib, dp. cit., p. 30.
26. A.R. Tyagi, "The Civil Service in a Developing Society', New Delhi : Sterling Publishers, 1969, p. 29.
27. Sriram Maheshwari, "The Evolution of Indian Administration", Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, 1970, p. 72.
28. M.A. Mutalib, op. cit., p. 31.
29. Despatch of the Government of India; March 5, 1919, para 55, p. 20
30. Section 96(c) of the Government of India Act, 1919.
31. L.S.S. O Malley, op. cit., p. 223.
32. B.B. Misra, op. cit., p. 240.
33. M.A. Mutalib, op. cit., p. 37.
34. L. S.S. O Malley, op. cit., p. 224.
35. Arthur Berriedale Keith, "A Constitutional History of India 1600-19 Allahabad: Halcyon Press, 1961, p. 417.
36. B.B. Misra, op. cit., p. 245.
37. M.A. Mutalib, op cit., p. 72.