In all political systems, the public recruitment is the cornerstone of its public services. However, the process of recruitment is so delicate that it becomes prone to the manipulations. The modern societies with its complex problems require the large number of personnel. The bureaucracies are getting bigger and bigger. On the one hand the functions of the State is becoming manifold and on the other hand, the growing political awakening has led to the establishment of independent institutions. The public opinion is generally becoming suspicious of the Governmental authority and so want curbs and controls over the Government.

These factors has led to think that the public recruitment should be taken out of the hands of the executive and should be handed over to a separate organisation. This organisation is known either as civil service Commission or Public Service Commission.

The Northcote-Trevelyan Report was the first in the history of administration to visualise the need for the establishment of such a body. Naturally, the Great
Britain was the first country to establish the Civil Service Commission in 1855. Next to follow is Canada which established it in 1868. U.S.A. enacted a law in 1883 and established the Civil Service Commission after the assassination of President Garfield. After that, South Africa established this body in 1912, Australia in 1923, India in 1926, Sri Lanka in 1931 and New Zealand in 1948. Besides these, Civil Service Commissions have been established in Bangladesh, Burma, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, Kenya, Thailand, Philippines etc.

The nomenclature, functions and status accorded to this august body vary from country to country. In Britain and U.S.A., it is known as Civil Service Commission; while in India it is known as Public Service Commission. In Britain, the functions of the Civil Service Commission are defined and it is an examining and certificating body for the public recruitment. While in U.S.A., besides recruitment, it administers laws relating to Government employees. At the same time, the Civil Service Commission has been set up under a statute as in U.S.A. or by an executive resolution of the Government as in Great Britain or by the Constitution as in India. It is noteworthy that it was established under
the British influence but now that Britain has merged its Civil Service Commission in the Civil Service Department. This may be viewed as a retrograde step but the fact is that still the Civil Service Commission in Britain has not suffered because of its tradition and integrity.

The authors of the Indian Constitution visualised the Public Service Commission as a bulwark of democracy and as such has accorded the status analogous to the Judiciary and Comptroller and Auditor-General. By according the independent status in the Constitution itself, the fathers of the Constitution agreed with the Lee Commission which pointed out that the Public Service Commission can protect the civil service "so far as possible from political or personal influences and give it that position of stability and security which is vital to its successful working as the impartial and efficient instrument by which Governments, of whatever political complexion, may give effect to their policies."

After giving independence, the constitution-makers have taken care to provide in-built mechanism so that it might not be exposed to manipulations. The elaborate legal precautions have been taken by providing for the
limited tenure and ban on re-employment of the members. This itself is a salutary provision but this has adversely affected the membership. Ban on re-employment has resulted in getting the amateur who has already reached the age of retirement. The youngsters having a expertise in the field and having a vision would not like to join the Commission. The amateur having the experience may help the Commission in the matters of selection but at the same time the amateurs are generally traditionalist and so maintains the status quo.

In Gujarat where the Public Service Commission came into existence in May 1960 had to face the trivial challenges: (1) service problems of the newly established State (2) the adoption of panchayati raj and (3) the problems of developmental activities. It was just difficult for the Commission to tackle these problems with vision and courage. In Gujarat, though the members have been drawn from the various fields and they were experts in their field, almost all of them have been amateur. This has led the Commission to maintain the status quo. The Commission has never thought of the new techniques of selection. It has neither undertaken the research work nor have the innovation in the examination
procedure. It has perhaps kept the 'rascals out' but has not drawn the able and talented candidates for the services. Such a negative approach in the matters of selection has adversely affected the efficiency of administration. Some civil servants have also expressed doubts about the competency of the Commission in the matters of recruitment. Moreover, the Government have not cared to appoint the member in time and so it has often worked with two members as well. From this observation, it is evident that the Commission still works with a traditional approach and has not come up to the expectations.

Constitution makers while defining its functions have adopted the viewpoint of Sir Samuel Hoare who advocated for advisory role. The Commission just assists the Government in the personnel matters. At the same time, the Government exercises its authority by prescribing the qualifications etc. to select the candidates and by determining the rules and regulations for the Commission's operations. Although the constitution makers have given an advisory role to the Commission, the well established conventions can go a long way in strengthening the Commission's position.
In Gujarat, the role of the Commission have been circumscribed by the Gujarat Public Service Commission (Exemption from consultation) Regulations, 1960. The constitution contemplated this provision in order to exempt certain posts from the purview of the Commission. But which type of posts should be exempted? It is a big question. In Gujarat, the Government have resorted to this provision and its inclination is towards exemption rather than inclusion. Although, there is a tradition to consult the Commission before the post is excluded from the purview, it has not been followed with a true spirit. On the contrary, the Government have resorted to the policy of establishing the independent boards and commissions. These boards and commissions are financially assisted by the Gujarat Government. In fact, under Article 321, the State Legislature may provide for the additional functions to the Public Service Commission. The Government of Gujarat has not made use of this Article. The Kerala Government has extended the scope of the Commission under the said Article. In Gujarat, the boards and commissions independently recruit their personnel. This has raised doubts and many suspect the favouritism. Some of the former members of the Commission and the civil servants have expressed their opinion.
in favour of the extension of the functions of the Commi-
ssion. By this, they wanted to bring some of the higher.
posts under the Commission's purview. At the same time,
this tendency of the Government is defended on the
ground that the state being rightist one, it does not
prefer to bring all the activities under the bureaucracy.
However, when the Government spends from the public fund
and when it has undertaken the welfare activities, it
would have been proper if the personnel of these boards
and Commissions would have been brought under the
Commission's purview. This trend has certainly minimised
the role of the Gujarat Public Service Commission.

The field of recruitment which has been assigned to
the Commission is not carried on satisfactorily. The
Commission still adheres to the traditional approach and
has adopted the traditional policies and procedures.
There is no innovation and thoughtful thinking. The
whole examination system requires revitalisation. The
question papers and courses prescribed should be revised
in order to get the talented personnel. Moreover, the
fact that candidate does not require to get the qualifying
marks in a subject but total aggregate marks to stand in
the list of the successful candidates is not proper. The
Commission should have fixed the qualifying marks or
percentages for each paper and after that the aggregate marks should have been counted for ranking the successful candidates.

In the matters of promotion, the Commission has to take the decision on the information provided by the concerned Government Department. In fact Departmental Promotion Committees consisting of the Secretaries prepare the select list and these lists are to be approved by the Commission. Thus the Commission has to either agree or disagree. It would have been proper if a member of the Commission is also associated with the D.P.Cs. Commission also can adopt the policy of interviewing the aspirants for promotion.

In the cases of disciplinary matters, the Commission judge on the reports provided by the inquiry officers who belong to the Government department. In fact, the Commission is not in a position to judge these cases because the nature of these cases is juristic. For such cases, the system of Judicial Tribunal should be adopted and the Commission should be relieved from this duty.

As regards the relationship between the Commission and the Government, the annual reports of the Commission
and the Memorandum presented give the impression that the relation has been cordial. Almost all the Memorandum speaks of the cordial relationship. In fact, the relation between the two is passive. The Members having an eye on the appointment after the retirement does not like to come in conflict with the Government. Some former members did express their views that they do not like to enter into the controversy with the Government. So the Commission after some correspondence leaves the matter as it is and the government pursues the matter as it thinks fit.

Moreover, the staff of the Commission is drawn from the Government Secretariat. The Government and Commission interchange the staff. This staff coming from the Government adopts the bureaucratic attitude in the Commission as well. The nature of work in the Commission is different in the sense that it involves up to a certain extent academic and decision making. To improve the position, it would be better if the Commission has its own staff. It should employ the Controller of Examination and the research officer.

The members' attitude not to enter into the controversy with the Government and position of the staff leads
us to think that the Commission is also one of the Government departments. All these trends has made the commission passive and it has not succeeded in recruiting the able and competent personnel. One gets the impression that the Commission is there because the constitution requires it to be there.

1. Recommendations

(1) The strength of the Gujarat Public Service Commission should be increased from 3 to 5 at least. The present strength was fixed in 1960. After that the work of the Government has increased and so the strength of the public servants as well. Very often the Commission has worked with two members. The Government must not keep the post vacant. The mode of appointment of the members should be changed as suggested by the Study Team of the A.R.C. and the members should be assured of their future appointment.

(2) At present, the Commission is authorised to spend Rs. 3,000/- only for the necessary additional staff. This is a very small amount. It should be increased upto Rs. 10,000/-. 

(3) The staff of the Commission should be independent. Since the Commission also conducts the departmental
and language examinations, the staff of the Commission should be separate. The present set up has created doubts and suspicion. The staff of the Commission may be promoted in the Government department but not from the Government department to the Commission. Moreover, it would add to the efficiency if one controller of examinations and one research officer is appointed.

(4) The exclusion of posts from the purview of the Commission has become controversial in almost all the States of the Indian Union. For this, the suggestion has been made in certain quarters that just as additional functions could be entrusted to the Commissions after the legislation, a similar provision should be made in the Constitution that the exclusion also could be made through the legislation. However, it would be better if some guidelines or principles are evolved as to the categories of posts which can be excluded from the purview of the Commission.

(5) In Gujarat, there are so many independent boards and Commissions which are financed from the public fund. The Government should extend the scope of the Commission
to cover some of the higher posts of these Boards and Commissions. It can also be provided that a member of the Commission will be there on the Selection Boards of these Boards and Commissions.

6) The annual reports of the Commission should be properly written. It should bring out the different points of view which they may have with the Government. It should be published regularly and there should not be delay in presenting the reports to the Legislative Assembly. At present, the reports are presented after three to four years. This has no meaning since by that time either the Government goes out of office or the members forget the issues.

7) The Recruitment Rules should be framed by the Commission as it is in U.K. and U.S.A.

8) Commission should make attractive advertisements. It has to attract the competent candidates. For this, the Commission can also correspond with the educational institutions and thus circulate for the personnel they require.

9) In the competitive examination, the revitalisation is needed. At least 50% marks should be fixed for passing in a particular paper and aggregate 60% should be fixed for ranking successful candidates.
(10) For the purposes of promotion, it is the departmental promotion Committee which prepares the select list and Commission just give the sanction. This is not a proper procedure. One member of the Commission should be represented on the D.P.Cs. In certain cases, the Commission may take interviews for promotion.

(11) The disciplinary matters involve the semi-judicial function. This should be handed over to some other agencies like Administrative Tribunal. The Commission should be relieved from this function.

2. Further Research

This research opens avenues for the future research.

(1) One can undertake the comparative study of the exemption from consultation regulations of the various states of India. This might throw light on the attitude of the Government in this matter. It will also help in evolving the principles regarding the posts to be excluded.

(2) A fruitful study can be undertaken of the personnel administration of the various boards and commissions that work in Gujarat. This may bring in light the issues of favouritism and nepotism. It also can tell us about the political appointments.
(3) A comparative study of the composition of the Commissions of various States can be undertaken. This may help in ascertaining certain qualifications for the appointment as member of the Commission.

The study regarding the various issues, regulations and the controversies between the Commissions and the respective Governments will help in building the competent personnel system. After all, it is the public services which has to administer the policies of the Government. The success of the Government and ultimately the implementation of the welfare and developmental activities rests on the personnel having an ability, the vision and the thoughtfulness.