

No. 313, dated Fort St. George, 7th February, 1916.  
From-The HON'BLE DIWAN BAHADUR P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIVAR  
AVARGAL,  
C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of Madras, Judicial Department,  
To-The Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.

I am instructed to forward, for transmission to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, the accompanying memorials from fifty-four officers of the Madras Police praying for an improvement in the conditions of their service.

2. The requests in the memorials are not very clearly defined, but the case may be stated as follows:- that service in the Police is as arduous as in any other department, that the pay given is only two-thirds of that given in the Forest, Public Works and Telegraph Departments, and that the rule which prevents retirement except upon medical certificate until completion of thirty years' service inflicts great hardship on the officers, while it reduces the efficiency of the service.

3. The memorialists claim that they have avoided exaggeration, but this is a claim which this Government cannot accept. They have no reason to believe that every officer who is recruited bitterly regrets within a year that he ever entered the service, that the present rates of pay do not afford a living wage, that the majority of officers are financially embarrassed and that married officers are in serious difficulties, and that few officers survive in health to draw their pensions. Nor is it the fact that the pay of officers in the Police is only two-thirds of that of officers in the Public Works or Forest Departments. One half of the memorialists entered the service before effect was given to the recommendation of the Police Commission that the pay should be raised in order to attract a better type of officer and the pay and prospects which they accepted were much less favourable than those they now enjoy.

4. The memorialists also make a special complaint of the fact that they are required to serve for 30 years in order to earn a retiring pension. The rules to which they are subject are not rules of exceptional hardship applicable to the police; they are the rules applicable to all ordinary services. The rules which the memorialists wish to have applied to them are the special rules framed for the officers of services who undergo special training before coming out to India. In other words, a police officer for the first two years of his service is being paid and trained by the Indian Government, and qualifying for pension meanwhile, while a potential officer of one of the other services is still undergoing a training partly, if

not wholly, at his own expense, and that in some cases without any certainty of appointment. If the pay of police officers be compared with that of officers in the other services who entered service at the time the police officers completed their probation, the comparison will be found not unfavourable.

5. This Government have no information as to the basis on which the special minimum time scale which was communicated with the Home Department letter No. 355-C., dated the 21st January 1915, was drawn up, but they would observe that up to the eighth and in the tenth year of service it guarantees a police officer two-thirds of the salary, not of the services with which the memorialists invite comparison, but of the Covenanted Civil Service which they consider has been treated with great liberality. So far, therefore, the fact that it has not been resorted to is a matter for congratulation, not complaint. In the later years it is certainly less favourable, and this Government would welcome an amendment of it if the Government of India find any amendment practicable.

6. Other than this, the Governor in Council has no recommendation to make on the memorialists' behalf, pending examination of the questions raised as a result of the enquiries of the Royal Commission on Public Services in India.

---