CHAPTER 3

Attempt at Police Reform and Madras Police Act, 1852

The organisation of Sindh Police by Charles Napier in 1846 on the model of the Royal Irish Constabulary highlighted the defects in other provinces where a hierarchy of revenue-cum-police officers had emerged.¹

Sir John Clerk, Governor of Bombay, was attracted by the features of the Sindh police during his visit to Sindh in 1847. Six years later, the Bombay police was remodelled.² The explosive nature of the findings of the Torture Commission in 1855 made the Madras Government openly admit the unsatisfactory state of police in the Presidency. It is proposed to present in the following pages the efforts made by the Madras Government to evolve a new police system without the earlier defects of the Old police.

In the fifties of the Nineteenth Century, Collectors who were also Magistrates were in charge of the police of

1. 'To secure the peace of the country and avoid disseminating the troops which would render them familiar with the people and possibly diminish the wholesome fear of our power, I established a police of 2400 men, well armed, drilled and divided into three classes, one for the towns, two for the country, the first of all infantry, the two last infantry and cavalry; called the Rural Police. They assist the Collectors but form a distinct body under their own officers.' - Charles Napier, The History of the Madras Police, 260.

2. The Indian Police Journal (Centenary), 1951, 45.
their districts and unlike Bengal, where Collectors and Magistrates were directly placed under the control of Commissioners who were held responsible for revenue and police administration of their divisions, were not subject to any kind of superintendence which was formerly exercised by Revenue Commissioners and the Judges of Sadr Adalat. 3

However, some control still rested with the Sadr Adalat, the Board of Revenue and Heads of some departments.

The police of the Presidency was organised essentially in the same way as in other parts of India, viz., village police, remunerated by lands held on the hereditary principle, and stipendiary police paid by Government, appointed and dismissed by district officers. A suggestion had been made by the Court of Directors to consider the means to reform the police system of the Presidency in the fashion of the Bombay system, which was still in an experimental stage. 4 Thereby, the police establishment was to be placed under the immediate direction and control of a Superintendent of Police in subordination to the Magistrate. The Madras Government responded to this suggestion by seeking full details pertaining to the working of the system in Bombay. 5 Besides, the Government

3. Desp. from CD to MG, 23 August 1854, 8, 5, FRPM, 1.
4. Ibid., 3.
5. By to Judicial Dept to MG, 20 October 1854, 763, PRM, 2.
objected to the condemnation of the Court that there had been no provision for supervision over the officers in charge of the administration of Justice and Police. But in reality, the Government asserted, the powers of superintendence were fully transferred to Sessions Judges after the abolition of Courts of Circuit. The number of supervising authorities was practically doubled but they suffered at length by the wrong selections to such superior posts. Added to this, was the position of Jilah Judges whose position was in no way better than that of those over whom they were supposed to exercise control. They were reluctant to endanger their relations with the Magistrates whose position and remuneration, except for seniority, were equal to their own, by exercising their controlling authority in strict manner; the magistracy and the police officers might be rather sensitive to the control being exercised by an officer of almost equal standing.

Further, the judicial functions exercised by the Magistrates were relatively unimportant. This defect in the administration of Justice was felt by Judges in other parts of India, such as in Bombay, and it was felt that a suitable remedy was to be found in the functioning of an efficient preventive and detective police. The existing system was faulty largely due to the want of

6. Assistant Registrar to the Court of Faujdaree Adalat to By to Judicial Dept. MG, 22 November 1854, 103, 2.

7. Ibid., 4.
efficient supervision exercised by Magistrates whose
attention was constantly drawn by revenue matters. This
could best be remedied by reducing the police functions
of Magistrates to the minimum. This was possible by the
adoption of the Bombay system, namely, by placing the
police under the direct control of an independent officer,
the Superintendent of Police, subordinate to Magistrates. 8

The appointment of Commissioners, contemplated by the
Court of Directors, who were to be the intermediary
authorities between the Collectors and Board of Revenue
like their counterparts in Bengal and the North Western
Provinces, might tend to delay the disposal of business
and to increase correspondence. 9 The efficiency of the
Collectors could best be obtained by reducing the quantum
of their burden and by increasing their numbers with
adequate remuneration. 10 This was reiterated by Lord
Harris, the Governor, who also felt that the appointment
of a Commissioner over Collectors was absolutely
unnecessary. 11

8. Ibid.
10. Ibid., 14.
11. Minute by Lord Harris, 4 May 1855, 26, RPM, 11.
The prevalence of gang robberies and the unjustifiable means adopted by the police officers and peons in the discharge of their duties made the material alteration in the formation and arrangement of the police necessary. Such alteration could best be effected, Harris thought, by adopting the Bombay system. However, the village police must be left to the care of local authorities under the care of Collector in order to suit the peculiar circumstances of the society. The chief of police, preferably a European, was to remain at Madras. His subordinates were to function in each district. Thus, the Governor suggested, the whole Presidency was to be brought under the new police system gradually. A portion of the mounted police was to be stationed at strategic points. The strictest discipline might be enforced and their zeal might be accentuated by means of liberal rewards. The military cantonments were also to be looked after by the new police. The district police officers had to maintain the discipline of the
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force and were required to report even the minute details of their work to the police chief at the Presidency headquarters.  The additional cost to be incurred by the introduction of such system might be compensated adequately by the discontinuance of the use of military troops for civil purposes.  The renovation of the decadent village police and augmentation of stipendiary police establishment which might diminish the range of jurisdiction assigned to each police station, were to be the first step towards insuring increased efficiency.  H.C. Montgomery, Member of the Council, in his minute expressed the view that the control of police was incompatible with the judicial duties of Faujdaree Adalat. The supervision of police work would affect the judicial objectivity of the judges adversely. The police should, therefore, be left under the supervision of a separate officer or agency in communication with the Government.

The new system introduced in Bombay Presidency worked very well both for the prevention and detection of crime. However, the Superintendents of Police in Bombay were mostly military officers but not covenanted civil servants.

18. Ibid., 62.
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20. Minute by Montgomery, 2 June 1855, 15, PRPM, 17.
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The appointment of a Commissioner of Police for the whole Presidency was strongly advocated by the Government. The Court of Directors cautioned Madras Government regarding the appointment as it might lead to frequent collision of authority. They added that was the prime reason for the abolition of a similar type of appointment in the Lower Provinces of Bengal.\(^{23}\) The Commissioner's headquarter were to be in Madras. He was expected to tour extensively in the districts with a view to finding out the actual flaws in the functioning of the new system. In this respect, he had to act as a referee and advisor to the Government; he was to be a channel through whom all matters related to police were to pass to it. In other words, his proposed position was to be similar to that of the Inspector of Prisons in matters relating to jail management. Hence the appointment of a Commissioner was to be the first step towards organisation of the new police. The Superintendents were to be nominated gradually as fit men could be found.\(^{24}\) No change was envisaged in the village police of the Presidency for the time being.\(^{25}\)

T. 4531

The appointment of the Commissioner of Police required the sanction of the Government of India. It was recommended that the salary of the Commissioner of Police

\(^{23}\) CD to GH, 23 July 1856, 12, 7, PRPM, 35.

\(^{24}\) CS to GI, 14 August 1855, 579 B, 30, PRPM, 24.

\(^{25}\) Ibid., 31.
should be not less than Rs. 2500 per month besides travelling allowance. Two grades of Superintendents, 8 in the upper scale and 12 in lower one, in the scale of Rs. 300 and Rs. 600 respectively were to be appointed. A total of 17,636 peons were proposed to be appointed to perform solely police duties at a monthly expense of Rs. 84,342. To secure greater efficiency, the emoluments of the police personnel, both mofussil and village police, were to be raised. Such proposed arrangements were to involve a large charge amounting to Rs. 5,65,600 on the treasury. The Government of Madras thought that it was an indispensable requisite for the fiscal development of the country and for the security of person and property in the Presidency. 26 Even the Court of Directors had firmly directed that all practicable means were to be employed for developing the resources of the country and affording protection to the people against the violence of men setting the law at defiance. 27 The existing police system suffered from a serious defect, namely, the absence of regular communication from one district to another or

26. The expense to be incurred on the appointment of uncovenanted Assistants, Superintendents and Commissioner of Police would amount to Rs. 5,65,600. Uncovenanted Assistants Rs. 3,45,600 Commissioner & Superintendent Rs. 2,20,000
- Ibid., 39.

27. CD to MG, 23 July 1856, 12, 8, PRPM, 35.
to any central office. The want of communication was evidently manifest in the murder of Conolly, the District Magistrates of Malabar. Harris believed firmly that a combination of judicial and police duties would tend to compromise the officer and to endanger the liberty of the subjects. The Collector, by virtue of being the principal executive officer, was to call for the police service when required. He had nothing to do with the internal economy and discipline of the force—a matter to be regulated by the police chief answerable direct to the Government.

Harris recommended that the force should consist of 22000 men on the basis of one policeman to every thousand inhabitants of the Presidency. He insisted on the appointment of one European officer as a Superintendent to each district in order to secure the maximum benefit out of the reorganisation of the force. To ensure uniformity and discipline of action, village police was to be under the general control of the same officer.

28. The assassins of Conolly, prior to the coming of the Act in force, wandered about the district after having escaped from jail, without any hindrance; it was apprehended that they intended to perpetrate some fearful deed. The Tahsildars apparently took no notice of them and did not even inform each other of their movements—Minute by Harris, 11 September 1856, PRPN, 32.

29. Ibid.
This could be done successfully by doing away with the pernicious service inams based on hereditary principle.  
In making the recommendation, Harris was fully supported by Elliot, Member of the Council. Elliot even suggested that a police headman should be appointed in addition to the revenue headman in every village. But obviously such duality of offices in a small unit like village would be unnecessary or even productive of tension.

The Court of Directors suggested that the personnel of the existing police force should not be absorbed in the new police as far as possible; they would be too habituated to corrupt practices. The salaries were to be adequate with a view to raising the status and securing the honesty of the Indian officers of Police. The Court also exhorted the Madras Government to give clear recognition, as elsewhere in India, to the two distinct branches of police duties, namely preventive and detective. The Court fully supported the retention of the village police system under the superintendence of District

30. Ibid.
31. Minute by Elliot, 27 September 1856, PREM, 45.
32. CD to MG, 24 September 1856, 41, 14, PREM, 49.
33. Ibid., 24.
Superintendents of Police. They desired that efforts must be made to revitalise the original institution on a sound footing. The Governor-in-Council sanctioned the salaries and establishment of the superintending officers of the new police at an aggregate cost of Rs. 23,500 per month. The Government of Madras appointed W. Robinson Chief Commissioner of Police on 18 May 1858. He was directed to put before the Government a detailed plan for the implementation of the scheme of the new police.

W. Robinson made detailed enquiries and toured in several districts. He formulated a comprehensive plan for putting the new police on its feet. His recommendations were generally endorsed by the Government. The general control of the police was to be vested in the hands of the Magistrates but they had nothing to do with the internal economy, discipline and management of the force.

34. CD to MG, 30 September 1857, 13, 7. PRFM, 57.

35. Chief Commissioner of Police
   Establishment charges
   20 Superintendents of Police
   at Rs. 700 each
   20 Assistant Superintendents
   of Police at Rs. 500 each
   Rs. 2,500 p.m.
   Rs. 1,000
   Rs. 14,000 p.m.
   Rs. 6,000 p.m.
   $22,500$

G-in-C Resq MFP, 22 December 1857, 5347; Os to Sy to SI (Home), 5 December 1857, 1586, MJP, 3 December 1857, 24.
which was to be administered exclusively by the Chief Commissioner in communication directly with the Government. The existing civil police and revenue peons were wholly untrained, and quite many of them were old and worn out and had proved utterly useless as a force in emergencies. Their arms were mostly unserviceable and the men were not properly instructed in their use. They were utterly unsuitable for a show of power, which was essential to quell riots or disturbances, and consequently the police depended more and more on the military throughout the Presidency.\textsuperscript{35} The Tahsildars were not to be vested with any of the police powers.\textsuperscript{37} A general stipendiary police consisting of constables, sergeants and inspectors, with proper means of training was to substitute the Sibbandi in the Presidency. Mounted and reserve police were to be kept at strategic points. The police was completely stripped of judicial powers such as issuing warrants and taking depositions. However, they had to act in cases affecting the peace and for prevention of crime.\textsuperscript{38}

W. Robinson, the Chief Commissioner of Police, was

36. CC to 3y to GI, 21 January 1859, 6, MJC, 8 February 1859, 45.
37. Minute by Morehead, 4 June 1858, PRPM, 64.
38. CC to CS, 3 December 1858, 60, 14, PRPM, 66.
authorised to effect the changes cautiously and gradually. He was to remain in close communication with the Government about the procedure to be adopted. Initially the change was to be implemented in three districts, North and South Arcot and Chengalpattu. He was allowed to recruit an establishment of inspectors, sergeants and constables with the approval of the Government. Parker, a Member of the Board of Revenue, was deputed to look after the bifurcation of police from revenue establishments, one of the first steps to be taken in the introduction of new police in the three districts.

A new police law appeared to be highly necessary. Preparation of a draft bill was entrusted to J.D. Mayne, the professor of Law in Madras University and Barrister of the Supreme Court. Robinson was directed to meet Forbes, Member for Madras in the Legislative Council at Calcutta, with the draft completed by Mayne and approved by the Government with a view to expediting its passage into law at an early date. Forbes was allowed to record his dissent and the grounds on which it was based.

39. Minute by CS, 4 January 1859, 9, 13, PRPM, 68 and 69.
40. Ibid., 15.
41. Ibid., 17.
42. Forbes, MMLO to CS, 24 February 1859, MJC, 22 March 1859, 17, 7.
Forbes was a strong advocate of the Pro-Consular or paternal system of Government which, he thought, was the fittest and the most suitable one to India. He believed that all powers were to be exercised by one authority. His view was also supported by the Government of Madras in its comments on 24 December 1857 in connection with the revision of Civil salaries. The removal of executive powers from the Magistrates appeared to Forbes to be like severing right arm of the authority and diminishing its influence in the district. He fully subscribed to the views contained in a minute by Halliday, Lieut-Governor of Bengal. He stoutly opposed excessive centralisation of authority in the Chief Commissioner who had to head the entire police force, distributed from Cuttack to Cape Comorin, from his seat at Madras. Such concentration of authority was not found even in the Irish Constabulary upon which W. Robinson had based his system. The supposed 

43. 'The Government consider it very essential, the Chief Secretary said, 'and they believe that everyday's experience shows it to be so that the authority of their local officers should be strengthened rather than decreased.' - CS, 24 December 1857 in connection with the revision of civil salaries, Ibid., 9.

44. 'I myself have held and advocated the opinion which I now very heartily condemn. The opinion to which I allude is this, that Magistrates of every degree should be debarred from all judicial power, and should have nothing but executive duty of preventing and detecting offences and that separate judicial functionaries should receive and try cases of every description committed to them by Magistrates of various degrees.' - Minute by Halliday on the Bengal Police, Ibid., 15.
success of the police system in Bombay convinced Forbes of some of the initial objections raised by him to the proposed police measure, namely, the subservience of the District Superintendents to Magistrates and the placement of village police under the control of Collectors.\(^45\) The preservation of the peace, the prevention of crimes and the detection, apprehension and detention of offenders could not be effected unless the superior officers were also Magistrates. This would conflict with the principle of the separation of police powers from that of the Magistrates.\(^45\) This was done with a view to enabling the Chief Commissioner of Police to conduct the investigations in times of political disturbances which, the Government considered, might be inexpedient to entrust to the ordinary tribunals.\(^47\) The vague and undefined relationship between the police and Magistrate in case of a tumult might evince opposition in the Select Committee and make difficult the passage of the bill.\(^48\) Likewise, placing the power of issue of summons and warrants which were of purely magisterial nature in the hands of police officers appeared to be a departure from the principles

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 37.

\(^{46}\) Forbes, MLC to SY to MG, 25 February 1859, 34, MJP, 4-13 May 1859, 631, 12.

\(^{47}\) Ibid., 12.

\(^{48}\) Ibid., 13.
on which it was founded and might inevitably lead to collision of authority. Harrington, who represented the North-Western Provinces in the Legislative Council raised certain questions at the time of the second reading of the bill, seeking clarification regarding the exact relationship to be expected between the Magistrate and the District Superintendents of Police in matters of suppression of crime and the maintenance of order and the appointment and dismissal of village police. The reply of Forbes did not satisfy him. He moved that the second reading of the bill be postponed for four months. He also suggested that the opinions of the several governments might be collected upon the general principles of the measure. A debate ensued in which almost every member present took part. In course of the debate, a Member of the Legislative Council said that, although he agreed in the general principle of the bill, he was entirely opposed to the centralization which it might eventually establish. Thus, Forbes found it difficult to see the bill through, owing to the lukewarm attitude of the warmest supporters of the bill on a few very basic principles.

49. Ibid., 19.

50. Forbes, MMLC to OS, 14 March 1859, 35, AJC, 4-10 May 1859, 531.

51. Ibid., 15.
At this critical juncture, Charles Edward Trevelyan, the new Governor of Madras, made Forbes' task easy by clearly defining the functions of the Chief Commissioner who was to be styled 'Inspector General.' He also placed the District Superintendents of Police under the orders of the local Magistrates. He further made it clear that the primary object of the plan was to place an improved and disciplined instrument for the prevention and detection of crime at the disposal of the Magistrate. Thus, the explanation sought out by Forbes from the Governor embraced all the minor points raised by Harrington. W. Elliot and W.A. Morehead, the Members of the Madras Council, fully agreed with the Governor with regard to the position, functions and relation of Chief Commissioner and District Superintendents with the magistracy.52

The Legislative Council members felt that the declaration, namely, 'it is expedient to separate throughout the Madras Presidency the judicial functions of the Magistrate from duties relating to matters of Executive Police' found in the preamble, was wholly inconsistent with the views then expressed by the Government.53 Consequently, an

52. Minute by W. Elliot, 5 May 1859, 38; Minute by W.A. Morehead, 5 May 1859, MJP, 20 June 1859, 845–846.

alteration was made in the preamble as follows: 'Whereas it is expedient to make the police force, throughout the Madras Presidency, a more efficient instrument, at the disposal of the Magistrate, for the prevention and detection of crime, and to reorganise the police force and improve the condition of the village police, it is enacted...' The bill ultimately became law on 6 September 1859, with no other material alteration.

The separation of police from the nominal control of Sadr Adalat and placing it on an independent footing under the Governor-in-Council was considered upon, and the office of Chief Commissioner on an annual salary of Rs. 30,000 besides Rs. 12,000 for establishment was sanctioned by the Secretary of State for India on 15 September 1859. W. Robinson was chosen for the office of Inspector General of Police. Sanction had also been granted to the appointment of a Superintendent and an Assistant in each district. A force numbering 22,000 including mounted police, based on the proportion of one to every thousand inhabitants, had also been sanctioned with an annual charge of Rs. 25 lacs. Unlike in other parts of India, the police force of the Presidency must entirely be free

from any kind of military character. The entire force was to discharge all the duties of police, protective, preventive and detective. There was to be no other force to perform any of these functions. On the whole, the British Government approved the principles on which the new police was formed and attached great importance to the observations of the late Governor of Madras, Harris, against any attempts to give to it a character too exclusively military. Some clear and distinct rules were to be prepared for the guidance of Magistrates and District Superintendents in regard to exercise of their powers over the police on the basis of experience afforded by Bombay police.

North Arcot was the first district to come under the purview of the police act. It provided very valuable experience on which the Madras police was built up in due course. Nine districts came under the purview of the said act by the end of 30 April 1860 and the remaining followed suit by the end of the official year 1861. The Act met with no opposition either from the magistracy or from the people; the latter in fact clamoured for a good

55. C05 to G-in-C, MG, 15 September 1859, 16, EJP, 21 October 1859, 83 and 84, 7.

56. Ibid., 8.

57. Ibid., 11 and 12.
police and took real interest in its success. The success and value of the system could best be realised from what the Magistrate of North Arcot wrote: 'Crime does now see the light and makes a stir. We know the worst of ourselves, while, under the old system a great mass of crime was suppressed.' The working of the police created a feeling that the police was a municipal rather than an imperial institution in the minds of the people. This feeling is best illustrated in the Inspector General's note on the working of the new police as follows: 'Vexatious interference with the liberty of the people is now held in check, and the country has been relieved from many burdensome exactions on trade and travellers.'

Besides the formation of general police for the Presidency, separate police force was organised for the towns having an aggregate population of 36,602. Thus, four inspectors and 150 constables were stationed at three principal towns in North Arcot district namely Vellore, Arcot and Palajahpet at an annual cost of Rs. 14,140.

58. 'No single case of jarring had occurred with the magistracy.' - AAR, 1860-61, 49; PRFI, 214.


60. IG to G3, 26 January 1864, 221, MJP, 19 February 1864, 124, 7.
It is interesting that while W. Robinson was busy in developing and organising the new system of police in Madras, a simultaneous effort was being made to evolve another system in Oudh in 1858–59. Both the systems were worked out independently of each other and under very different circumstances. Both of them drew inspiration from a common source, the Sindh Police.

Like the Madras Police, Oudh authorities also adopted Sindh police as the prototype for their Military Police. Its main features, such as, its organisation under its own set of European officers and its separation from the magistracy, were developed by Captain Bruce, who himself had earlier been an officer in the Sindh police. He maintained a close unofficial correspondence about its problems with Bartle Frere, the Commissioner of Sindh.61 The Oudh Military Police was adopted as the civil police for the new province after its reconquest at the end of 1858 and was renamed as Oudh Police.

But the circumstances of the birth and development of the two new systems of police led them to assume different character. Oudh was in the grip of a most widespread revolt of civil population when its police was raised. On the other hand the Madras Police was raised in a period

of profound tranquility. Naturally the military principles was quite dominant in the organisation and working of the Oudh Police. Even after conversion to civil police it could not completely shed some of its military characteristics.62 The Madras Police, on the other hand, carefully eschewed military features, except perhaps in some drill and discipline of its personnel.

Another major difference between the two forces was in the nature of their relationship with the magistracy. The Oudh Police was completely detached from the magistracy. In the troublesome days of the conquest of the province it was considered to be inconvenient to put them under the control of magistrates.63 During 1859 some efforts were made to evolve a system of coordination and co-operation between the two agencies responsible for the administration of law and order in Oudh.64 But up to the time of the passage of the Police Act of 1861, Oudh Police substantially remained independent of the control of magistrates. The peaceful circumstances of the origin and development of the Madras Police did not call for such

62. Ibid., 118-119.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid., 167-172.
a complete separation of the two though original proposals did largely provide for independence of the police. Ultimately the control of the magistrates over the police functions was proclaimed in the preamble itself of the Madras Police Act of 1859.65

The achievements of Oudh Police during the reconquest and repacification of the province were spectacular and Canning was greatly impressed. He, at one stage, even recommended to the governments of the Panjab and the North Western Provinces to adopt it. It also noted its economical basis. By mid-1859 Canning made up his mind to drastically reorganise the police in all the British Provinces on a uniform system. He initiated the process by the appointment of a Police Commission. He chose Bruce as its only full time member and Secretary. Naturally Bruce had a large say in formulating the proposals of the Commission. Being the principal architect of the Oudh Police his views might have influenced the views of other members. Perhaps it was responsible for the retention of a larger military element in drill, discipline and training than that of the Madras Police. The military element in the proposed police was mainly owing to the harrowing experiences of the Revolt of 1857; the view was further strengthened by the presence of Bruce in the Commission. But most of the

65. see Supra.
recommendations of the Commission were based upon the features of the Madras and Oudh police. The recommendation of the Commission led to the passage of Act V of 1861, which, with minor modification, remained the basis of police in India up to the end of British rule and after. 66

The new system of police in India is often called after the Madras system. 67 In fact, in its evolution both Oudh and Madras systems were taken into consideration. It borrowed heavily from the both. Actually the spectacular success of the Oudh Police seemed to have appealed to Canning and Frere, an important Member of the Supreme Council and confidant of Canning, more. Perhaps it was this that led D.B. Trivedi to say that 'Oudh set the pattern of reform of police in India.' 68

Thus, within four years of the completion of the labours of the Torture Commission, the police system in the Presidency was thoroughly overhauled. The new system incorporated many new principles. It provided for the formation of a professional organisation, independent of

66. Ibid., 158-159.

67. Progs. of the Legislative Council, 6 October 1860, PRP, 221.

68. D.B. Trivedi, op. cit., 159.
the control of the overworked civil officers in matters of it organisation, discipline and code of conduct. It was to have its own set officers to look after such matters. The tricky question of the relations with the magistracy was left deliberately vague by providing only for a general control of magistrates over its functioning towards the maintenance of law and order. Perhaps the framers of the Act of 1859 wished that actual details of the relationship would be worked out in actual practice and by the growth of healthy tradition. The Government of Madras had high hopes from the new organisation and a very energetic officer, W. Robinson, was entrusted with the task of putting the new organisation on sound footings. That the new police did not live up to the high expectations, was a different matter.