M.R.O. 1—80,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

Bade ~~G.O.~~ No. 17-18 Press ~~Mis.~~

16-17

Dated 6-1. 1857

Bade. No. 16-17

33-34

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GRADES OF SALARIES.

Among the many questions of general interest, the immediate decision of which is necessary, is the question of the propriety of introducing generally a system of gradation of salaries. Such a system was introduced into the Punjab, and, having worked well, has been adopted in Oude. The introduction of the system throughout the country, appears to me indispensably necessary to the adjustment of salaries in proportion to responsibilities, unless there could be a thorough re-adjustment of limits of Districts with a view to equalization in size and sources of labor. This cannot be, and if it could be effected at a moderate cost within a short period, I should be of opinion that no advantage to be gained would atone for the many inconveniences, and the disturbance of existing arrangements, which it would occasion. The alternative is a gradation of salaries, suited to the several grades of Districts and Divisions. But, as the subject was on a former occasion warmly canvassed between the Supreme Government and the Court of Directors, and a gradation system was disapproved by the Court, and some of those who took part in those discussions may be inclined to condemn the plan now, merely because it was so unsparingly condemned then, it appears well to shew that the grounds on which it is brought forward now, were not considered in 1836. The advantage then most prominently discussed was its adaption to the convenient and suitable reward of merit. It is brought forward now as the only available means by which the orders for the regulation of salaries with reference to duties can be carried into effect.

When the system was first submitted for the favorable consideration of the Court of Directors, their disapproval was communicated in the following terms:—"The 55th to the 64th paragaphs of the letter now under reply, relate to a plan proposed by the Governor General for placing the salaries of the Commissioners of Revenue and Circuit, those of the Civil and Sessions Judges, and those of the Collectors and Magistrates, on an entirely new footing. The principal objects proposed in it, are the augmentation of the allowances of the Judges, and the division of the salaries of each of the three orders of functionaries above mentioned into *classes*; the higher salaries not to be attached to particular stations, nor promotion in the class to involve any removal of the officer benefiting. By this arrangement, it is designed to secure the due reward of merit, his Lordship stating that, under the present system, an indifferent officer received as much as an industrious one. It is intended so to construct the new scale as to bring about a saving of Rs. 80,000 on the whole of the salaries subjected to review."

"The plan thus proposed is, in our opinion, open to many and serious objections. After the frequent changes, which the salaries of the Covenanted Civil Service on your establishment have of late undergone, we should deprecate very much the introduction of any other novel principle in the mode of remunerating them, it being most desirable that their minds should not again be unsettled, and their attention called away from their public duties by projects of this description. The plan would, in other respects, we apprehend, be found injurious from its subverting the only sound principle by which allowances and appointments should be governed, namely, that of attaching the highest pecuniary rewards to the most important and responsible offices, and appointing to such offices the most capable individuals. By a strict attention to this system, merit cannot fail to meet its reward, whereas, by endeavouring to recompense individuals in the manner proposed in your letter, offices, the first the hands of the Government. Moreover, I think that the very nice distinctions the Chief Commissioner would draw in allotting salaries to districts, shew that a system of local grades might be very embarrassing.

I admit that, with a system of personal grades, the motives of a Governor in making appointments, are more liable to misconstruction, and though he may personally be quite indifferent to popularity, it is true that unpopularity and discontent are elements of weakness, and that any wise man in power would prefer avoiding them, if to be avoided with honor; but I do not think these considerations sufficient to warrant the rejection of a system, in itself, reasonable and sound.

Lord Dalhousie on two occasions recorded an opinion in favor of a gradation system. Under date the 26th April 1854, his Lordship wrote—"I think the principle is sound of dividing the judicial officers into classes, thus affording an opportunity to them to earn advantage and distinction of merit, and ensuring that exertion must be made, in order to earn advancement at all;" and again on the 27th September 1855—"there is a great and acknowledged value in having a gradation of salaries, whereby a stimulus is given to the exertions of local officers, and the most deserving among them may be rewarded."

I find also the Government of Bombay advocating the system in these words—"The surest way of enlisting zeal, perseverance and integrity, is to hold out a continued prospect of increasing pay, rank and power."

Though some would prefer that the grades of salary should be local, that is attached to particular districts, rather than personal, because with local grades the opportunities for favoritism would be fewer than with personal grades, of all those whom I have consulted, few are decidedly against introduction of the system, and they are not opposed to the principle, while I find several, whose opinions are worthy of much respect, strongly in its favor.

The Board of Revenue at Madras write—"The Board are of opinion, that the public service is benefited by gradations of salary, holding out a prospect of progressive advancement to the officers of Government. They conceive that the absence of such an arrangement is calculated to exercise a depressing effect on those who, having attained a certain rank, see before them no prospect of further advancement. In the case of Sub-Collectors, Head Assistants and Junior Assistants, the Board consider that the grades should be personal as in the Punjaub. With regard, however, to Collectors, there is a difference; these officers are responsible for the order and well-being of their districts, and as the circumstances of different Provinces vary much, and there is sometimes a great disparity in their relative area, population and revenue, it seems better to attach the higher grade of salary, if such exists, to the office, rather than to the person."

Mr. Spankie, Collector and Magistrate of Seharunpore, writes—"It would improve the service. It would act as a spur to individual exertion, and would be a means of procuring more general devotion to the interests of the people, than exists at the present day."

Mr. Mayne, the Collector and Magistrate of Banda, says—"At first sight, on a consideration of the variation of duties and responsibility in the several districts, a specific grade for each district would appear the most desirable and the most just. In a large district, to the management of which greater responsibility is attached, and the work in which requires the undivided attention of the officer in charge, it would appear to be only fair, that a higher rate of salary should be given, than in a district small in size and easy of management, where the work is one of mere duty and routine. Secondly, it may be said that personal grades are much open to favoritism and injustice at the hands of the ruling power. But on further consideration, I am inclined to give my opinion in favor of personal grades. In the generality of cases, the best officer would probably be selected for the larger and more difficult district, and it will always remain with the local Government, if they think fit, to give him, when so placed, the higher grade of salary as soon as opportunity offers, so that the highest grades, although personal, would, in practice, attach themselves to those districts in which the duties and responsibilities are the heaviest. The disadvantage of having specific grades for districts, would be felt in the case of an officer entitled to promotion in charge of a district in the lower grade, where he possessed much local experience, and in which his services were still particularly required. It would be very hard to keep that officer out of his promotion, because it was found expedient to retain him in that particular district, and it would be equally inconvenient to the Government to remove him. Specific grades of salaries for particular districts, would cause many similar difficulties from which a system of personal grades would be comparatively free. The objection urged of the liability of personal grades to an exercise of favoritism is, I think, not of so much consequence as is made out. If Government wish to favor any particular individual, they can do so quite as easily, when the grades are specific for districts, as when they are personal. I am decidedly in favor of personal grades."

I do not agree with Mr. Mayne that favoritism is *quite* as easy with grades of salary attached to districts, as with personal grades, because, with salaries attached to districts, an inefficient person could not easily be favored without risk of damage to the administration, whereas with personal grades, a high rate of salary might be given to an inefficient favorite in charge of an easy district. But these are not times in which a Governor would be guilty of such an abuse. If it be allowed that the system is sound, that it will strengthen the hands of a Governor desirous of doing right, by enabling him to place his men in the positions best suited to them, that it will promote industry and enterprise, and secure reward for the successful, I would not reject it, because the power it would convey to an honest Governor of doing good, might be converted by a dishonest Governor into the means of doing evil.

Mr. Fawcett, the Revenue Commissioner of the Northern Division, Bombay, is of opinion, that personal salary is not so condusive to efficiency, as when salary is attached to the office, and that there should not be different grades of Collectors. The number of Collectors under the Bombay Government being only twelve, a system of grades would be apt to produce more changes than are desirable.

Districts vary so much in all the elements of labor and responsibility, that grades, either local or personal, are indispensable. The revenue of a district varies from Rs. 42,58,031[*] to Rs. 23,316.[†] Population varies from 3,087,174[‡] to 37,897[§]. Area varies from 26,760[||] square mile to 200[¶]. Treasury Receipts vary from Rs. 95,84,256[**] to Rs. 1,70,813.[††] Other equally striking dissimilarities might be mentioned. These are sufficient to show how unsuitable equal salaries must be. It is true that it is quite impossible to adjust salaries exactly in proportion to responsibilities, and it is also true that greater responsibility may attach to the charge of a village, than to the charge of a Province, but the imperfect adjustment attainable is greatly preferable to the universal disproportion of remuneration to responsibilities which now exists.

If a system of personal grades be authorized, the local Governments might *always make the grades local in effect*, if it was thought advisable to do so. They might, I think, safely be left to apply the grades in the manner they considered most conducive to the public good.

---

[*] Tanjore. [†] Simla. [‡] Goruckpore. [§] Sandoway. [||] Hydrabad, Scinde. [¶] Simla. [**] Delhi. [††] Sandoway.

Recd
22 Sept

No.

To,

The Secretary to Government
of Madras

Dated Nynee Tal the 22d Septr 1856

Sir,

I have the honor to submit, for the information of the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council a note con=taining my views on the subject of the introduction of grades of Salaries for Judges Collectors and Magistrates and Joint Magistrates and Deputy Collectors.

2d It may be of material assistance to me if the Right Honorable the Governor in Council will favor me with his views on the question generally and if grades be introduced whether they should be local or personal grades

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed.t Servant
H. Ricketts

Commr. for the revn. of Civil
and Establts. through-
out India

C. 10/11
R. 10/12.

Subjoin 6 January 57
Financial 1856 Depart

From the Commissioner for
the revision of Civil Salaries
& Estabts throughout India

Dated 22 Septr
Recd 14 Octr 1856
1 Encls

No 604

mem

Submits a Note containing
his views on the subject of the
introduction of grades of Salaries
for Judges, Collectors, Magistrates
&c &c and solicits the views of
the Govt. on the question generally

C 15 Oct
R 16 Nov

---

9. 11. 56

The public service cannot fail to be benefitted by holding out a prospect of progressive advancement and I would make this advancement local not personal — I can conceive nothing more injurious to the service than remunerating two officers identical in labor and responsibility at different rates — Yet this is the system which now obtains in this Presidency as regards many of the appointments on the General Staff of the Army — there is not only not progressive advancement to pay rank & power so essential to promote zeal and efficiency — but in many cases the higher & more laborious

and more responsible offices
are worse paid than those
where the labor & responsibility
are far less. I propose at
a future period, to offer this
important question as regards
Military appointments, to the
consideration of Govt.

U. S. Grant

Copy to the Governor 10/11.

Inclosure 6 January 57

Financial 1856 Deptt

Minute by His Excy the Commander in Chief

Dated ——

Recd 9 Novr 1856

No. 652

Records his sentiments on the proposed introduction of graduated salaries, considers that the public service cannot fail to be benefitted by progressive advancements which should be local not personal.

G. 10/11/56

14

9. 11. 56

I am fully impressed with the soundness of the views of the Honble Court quoted by Mr. Ricketts in the 3d Para of his Memm in favor of "attaching the highest pecuniary rewards to the most important and responsible offices & appointing to such offices the most capable individuals" — There is a very great difference in the responsibilities & duties of the Judges & Collectors of this Presidency and I think it but just that a higher rate of allowances should attach to those districts where the duties are most arduous - In general the most efficient and painstaking officer will be selected for the more important posts, and it is but fair that some advantages should be given to such selected men and that inducement should be held out for exertion. For many years this was the case with the Revenue

branch of the Revenue Service & the system worked well - The best men were made Principal Collectors with an augmented pay in the Districts where the responsibility of duty was heaviest and there was the incentive to Districts attended with the necessary hardship - This system was abolished on financial considerations and not in belief of its efficiency to fulfil the object of its introduction - It was for a

and then presumed to its
his continuance modified
in some instances by making
the usufruct personal instead
of local, but it was for the [illegible]
time generally continued
by the members of the service
generally, & that it had lately
a sufficient trial to cause
dissatisfaction —

~~[illegible]~~ If the prin-
ciple of gradation of Salary
be adopted I believe it will
be most efficacious in ex-
citing emulation & securing
good service & thus benefit the
state, by being ~~[illegible]~~ made
applicable to places rather
than to individuals

8/11/58 — Rob Montgomery

Kept before 5th January/57

Financial 1856 Depart

Minute by the Honble Sir H. C. Montgomery Bt

Dated 8th &

Recd 9th Novr 1856.

5. 10/11/56

No. 656.

Notices the soundness of the Hon: Court quoted by Mr Ricketts in his Memo: for attaching the highest pecuniary rewards to the most important and responsible Offices — and believes that if the principle of gradation of Salary be adopted it would be most efficacious in exciting emulation & rewarding good service, and thus benefitting the State.

9.11.56

Mr Ricketts memo refers simply to the principle wh. shd regulate gradation of salaries, i.e. whether the considerations shd be personal or local.

He does not touch upon the point of the relative amt of salaries.

I see much advantage from a plan that should classify all situations in every dept of the public service throughout India.

The first consideration in apportioning the degree of remuneration is undoubtedly that wh. has reference to the degree of labor & responsibility involved in the office.

Such a scale for all India wd not be applicable in all its parts to any one division of the Empire, because the systems of administration differ so considerably in different provinces, as to preclude the application of a uniform scale.

But after such fitting distribution, being arranged, I think a gradation of salaries shd be regulated by personal considerations, because such a rule affords the best means of securing local experience and preventing frequent changes.

The objection is that men might thus be retained on higher salaries in offices of minor importance & that heavy & responsible duties wd be rendered on inadequate remuneration. But this will seldom be the case in practice. The most onerous employment will, for the credit of the Govt, be assigned to the most capable servants, who wd be the most likely to profit by the personal rule.

A system of personal grades is more applicable to a Non-Regulation than to a Regn Province.

In the former there is a more extensive gradation of offices, & less separation of departments. The Chief Commissioner has a large discretion to employ any of his subordinates in any position for wh he may consider them best adapted, this position enabling him to estimate with accuracy their ~~[illegible]~~ degree of fitness & ability. There is no seniority. The individuals stand as they enter the commission, old officers often ~~stand~~ entering far below their juniors. These characteristics furnish a larger & easier field of selection.

In a Regulation Division, there is always a certain degree of consideration allowed to the standing of members of the service. The Govt has not the same direct means of judging of the qualifications of its servants that the Commr possesses of the claims of his subordinates. The steps are fewer and every ~~[illegible]~~ individual looks almost as a matter of certainty to rising to the head of a mofussil office in his own particular branch of the service.

Still I think much benefit will accrue from the possession of the Govt. of the power of remunerating the more deserving judges & Collectors by means of graduated salaries. Such a system could not fail to stimulate to a more zealous discharge of duties, particularly if a relaxation of industry were made to entail a retrograde movement in the scale.

The experiment was partially tried in this Presidency other Senior member of the Bd. of Revenue in the case of promotion to the grade of Principal Collector which in May 1836 + was made a personal not a local distinction. During the 3½ years that it continued, the plan worked well & was only discontinued under the orders of the Ct. of Directors who objected to the principle but never had the opportunity of forming a judgment of its working. Walter Elliot

31/10/56

+ Vide print. of Circ. Ord. Bd. of Rev. 5 May 1836. vol. 1. p206

12.

[illegible]
Financial 1856 Depart.t

Minute by the Honble
W. Elliot Esq.re

Dated 31st Oct.r &
Rec.d 9th Nov.r 1856.

No 655

Notices that Mr. Ricketts'
Memo: refers simply to the
principle which should regulate
the gradation of Salaries - Sees
much advantage from a Plan
which should classify all situations
in every Depart.t of the Public Service
throughout India.

G 10/11/56

Mangalore - 1 Oct.r 1856.

6.12.56

In his letter to the Chf Secy - the
Commiss.r for the Revision of Civil Salaries
encloses a note containing his views
on the subject of the introduction of
[illegible] grades of salaries for Judges - Collectors
& Magistrates & Joint Magistrates
& Deputy Collectors -

the passages not
He remarks. ~~that~~ the views of this
Gov.t on the question generally - & if the
grades be introduced - whether they
should be local or personal".

As the salaries for the several offices above mentioned are already paid on a graduated scale. I presume that the question now proposed for Commission - is 1st - whether there shall be different classes of Judges & Collectors &c. with specified salaries attached to each class - & 2nd if this point be agreed on - whether the classification shall have regard to the circumstances of particular localities - or to the qualifications & merits of individual officers -

Whether it be possible or expedient to construct a classification either personal or local for the whole of India - I am prepared to say, - as I do not possess the information necessary to form an opinion but I should doubt greatly - whether such an arrangement would be made either to be just or to give satisfaction applicable to European officers in a country ~~[illegible]~~ extending over 30 degrees of latitude - & in which the various districts of consequently the requirements &

& expenses of Officers would be so very different -

I will therefore only venture an opinion on the subject - with reference to this Presidency.

On one point - it has already been given - some time ago - by in favour of larger salaries being allotted to the larger Collectorates -

It appears to me - that the extent & quantity of work - which an Officer has to perform ought to be considered in a question of this nature - & so far [illegible]

in favour of a local classification -

But I am by no means ~~disposed~~ wishing to think - that the ~~classification shd~~ increase of salaries should be restricted to localities - great Merit - Energy - Industry - long service - should also receive rewards.

I must confess, however, to looking with considerable distrust - to any plan for personal classification - the arguments urged against it by the Hon'ble Ct. are all valid -

& I am convinced - that if it alone were

adopted - that Governors would be
placed in a most awkward position
- & that great dissatisfaction would probably
be made -

State of adoption in combination with
a local classification. I am disposed
to give the plan a fair trial -

Whether the system of classification
could be carried with advantage to
the subordinate grades of the civil
service appears more [illegible] by [illegible]
the frequent changes which occur and
render it temporary or very uncertain

made - & the trouble to the officers
involved in the proper adjustment
of positions of varying salaries would
be increased -

There can be no question of the
advantage of encouraging exertion by
holding out hopes of promotion &
distinction - but in the discussion
of this subject - I cannot but ~~point~~ mention
~~out~~ two points - which are very
much of vastly more importance
in conducting the affairs of a great

No. 717

Empire

~~of much importance~~ - these are -

1. to adopt every means of increasing capability of every Company and generally in all officers - who shall be permitted to attain to the higher grades.

2. to insure the full employment of all their Engineers in the public Service by giving them ample remuneration for their labours with full consideration for the circumstances in which they are placed -

Harris.

Letter from 6th January 57
of
Financial 1856 Dept.

No. 717

Minute by the Right Honble the President

Dated 1st
Recd 6th } Decr /56

[illegible] No. 17 of [illegible]

15

Minute by His Excellency the Commander in Chief

Minute

The public Service cannot fail to be benefited by holding out a prospect of progressive advancement and I would make this advancement Local not personal. I can conceive nothing more injurious to the Service than remunerating two Offices identical in labor and responsibility at different rates. Yet this is the system which now obtains in this Presidency as regards many of the appointments on the General Staff of the Army there is not only not progressive advancement to pay rank and power sufficient to promote zeal and efficiency but in many cases the higher and more laborious and more responsible Offices are worse paid than those where the labor and responsibility are far less. I propose, at a future period, to offer that important question as regards Military appointments to the consideration of Government.

(Sd) Pat Grant

C. 10/11
No 13/2

Minute by
His Excellency the
Commander in Chief

Read

Minute by the Honorable Sir H. C. Montgomery Bart. dated 8th November 1850.

Minute.

I am fully impressed with the soundness of the views of the Honorable Court quoted by Mr. Ricketts in the 3rd para of his Memo in favor of "attaching the highest pecuniary rewards to the most important and responsible Offices and appointing to such Offices the most capable individuals" — There is a very great difference in the responsibilities and duties of the Judges and Collectors of this Presidency, and I think it but just that a higher rate of allowances should attach to those Districts where the duties are most arduous. In general the most efficient and painstaking Officer will be selected for the more important post, and it is but fair that some advantages should be given to such selected men and that inducement should be held out for exertion. For many years this es the case with the evenue branch of he Madras Service and the system worked well. The best men were made Principal Collectors with augmented pay in the Districts where the responsibility and duty were greatest, and there was the incentive to distinction attended with pecuniary benefit. This System was abolished

on

on financial considerations and not on failure of its efficacy to fulfil the object of its introduction. It was for a shor time previous to its discontinuance modified in some instances by making the benefit personal instead of local, but this change was at the time condemned by the members of the Service generally and tho' it had hardly a sufficient trial it caused dissatisfaction.

If the principle of gradation of salary be adopted I believe it will be most efficacious in exciting emulation and rewarding good service and thus benefitting the State, by being made applicable to places rather than to individuals.

(Sd) H. C. Montgomery

5/11/56.

C 10/11
R 13/12

(Copy)

Minute by
The Hon'ble Sir R C
Montgomery - Bt

18th November 1856 -

Minute by the Hon'ble
Walter Elliot Esq dated
31st October 1856.

Mr Ricketts' minute refers mainly to the principle which should regulate gradation of Salaries - i.e. whether the considerations should be personal or local.

He does not touch upon the point of the relative amount of Salaries.

I see much advantage from a plan that should classify all situations in every department of the public service throughout India.

The first consideration in apportioning the degree of remuneration is undoubtedly that which has reference to the degree of labor and responsibility involved in the Office.

Such a scale for all India would not be applicable in all its parts to any one division of the Empire, because the system of administration differs so considerably in different provinces, as to preclude the application of a uniform scale.

But after such fitting distribution has been made, I think the gradation of salaries should be regulated by personal considerations, because such a scale affords the best means of securing local experience and preventing frequent changes.

The objection is that men might thus be retained in higher salaries in Offices of minor importance and that heavy and responsible duties would be rendered on adequate remuneration. But this will seldom be the case in practice. The most onerous employment will, for the credit of the Government, be assigned to the most capable servants, who would be the most likely to profit by the personal rule.

A system of personal grades is more applicable to a non-Regulation than to a Regulation Province.

In the former there is a more extensive gradation of offices, and leſs separation of departments, the Chief Commiſsioner has a large discretion to employ any of his subordinates in any position for which he may consider him best adapted and his position enables him to estimate with accuracy their degrees of fitness and ability.

The

There is no service seniority. The individuals stand as they enter the Commiſsion, old officers often ranking far below their juniors. These characteristics furnish a larger and easier field of selection.

In a Regulation Division, there is always a certain degree of consideration allowed to the standing of members of the service. The Government has not the same direct means of judging of the qualifications of its servants that the Commiſsioner poſseſses of the claims of his subordinates. The steps are fewer and every individual looks almost as a matter of certainty to rising to the head of a profitable office in his own particular branch of the service.

Still I think much benefit will accrue from the possession by the Government of the power of remunerating the more deserving Judges and Collectors by means of graduated salaries. Such a system could not fail to stimulate to a more zealous discharge of duties, particularly if a relaxation of industry were made to entail a retrograde movement in the scale. The experiment was partially tried in this Presidency when I was a Member of the Board of Revenue in the case of promotion to the grade of Principal Collectors which in ˣMay 1836 was made a personal not a local distinction. During the 3½ years that it continued the plan worked well and it was only discontinued under the orders of the Court of Directors who objected to the principle but never had the opportunity of forming a judgment of its working.

ˣVide para. 7 of Rev. Or. Bd. of Rev. 5th May 1836 – Vol. 1 pp. 206.

31st October 1856.

(signed) Walter Elliot

Exd. G. W. Wilson

Copy

Minute by

The Honorable

Walter Elliot Esqr

Dated 31st October 1856.

Finl. Depmt

No. 617

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation

Dated 30th Decr. 1856

Read the following papers

From the Commissioner for the revision of Civil Salaries and Establts. throughout India } Here enter 22nd Septr. 1856 No. 424

Minute by the Honorable Walter Elliot Esqr. } — " — 31st Octr. " No. 655

Minute by the Honble. Sir H. C. Montgomery Bt. } — " — 8th Novr. " No. 656

Minute by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief } — " — 654

Minute by the Rt. Hon. the President } — " — 1st Decr. " No. 17

No. 17 [illegible] 30th Dec 1856

A
Ly

Ordered that the following letter be despatched.

desp 31st

To H. Ricketts Esqr. No. 618

Commr. for the revn. of Civil Salaries and Establmt. throughout India

Sir,

I am directed by

the Rt. Hon the Govr. in C. to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd Septr. last forwarding a note which contains your views on the subject of the introduction of grades of salaries for Judges, Collectors and Magistrates - Joint Magistrates and Deputy Collectors, - and requesting the opinion of the Govt. on the question generally, and, if grades be introduced, whether they should be local or personal grades -

2 - The Govt. understand the question to be first - whether there should be gradations of salary for each class of Officer

which

which you have named, that is, whether there shall be different grades of Judges, of Collectors, of Dy. Collectors &ca. with specified salaries attached to each grade - and 2dly. if so, whether the gradation should be such that the salaries shall vary according to the circumstances of particular localities or according to the qualifications and merits of individual Officers.

3 - From the concluding passages in your Minute the Govt. are left in doubt whether the grades of salaries there adverted to are to apply to the four Govts. generally - that is, whether there is to

be one scale of grades for all four — or whether each Presidency is to have its own grades —

4 Whether it be possible or expedient to construct a classification either personal or local for the whole of India, this Govt. are not prepared to state — They cannot, however, but greatly doubt whether an arrangement could be so effected either to be just or to give satisfaction, if made applicable to European Officers in a country extending over 30 degrees of latitude, — and in the various districts of which consequently the

the requirements and expenses of Officers must be so very different

5 Viewing the question, however, as it affects this Presidency, the Govt. are decidedly of opinion that the salaries of all Collectorates and Judgeships should not be the same, but that the higher rates of remuneration should be assigned to those which entail the heaviest labors and involve the largest ~~labor and~~ responsibilities —

6 It seems clear that in such a question as this the extent and nature of the business to

be performed must be taken into account and this consideration indicates a local rather than personal classification.

7 It may indeed be urged, and with justice, that great merit, energy, industry and long service should be duly rewarded wherever the immediate scene of employment may be. It will also be an advantage that Govt. should have the means of recompensing these qualities and claims without the necessity of removing their possessor from the locality where he

hitherto

hitherto has been, and might continue to be occupied with the greatest benefit to the public service.

8 The Govt. must, however, confess that they could not but regard with much distrust any plan for *merely* personal classification. The arguments urged against it by the Hon. the Court of Directors seem to them valid. The Govt. in C. is convinced that, if it alone were adopted, the head of the Govt. would be placed in an embarrassing position, and that great dissatisfaction would probably

be occasioned.—

9 If any plan could be devised for combining local and personal classification, it might be tried—but the ~~[illegible]~~ framing of such a scheme would be attended with great difficulties.—

10. On the whole thing, the Madras Govt. are in favor of classification—and that classification, local—as regards the higher classes of offices. Judgeships and Collectorates— They must, however, greatly question whether the system could with advantage be extended to the subordinate grades of the service— It is to be feared that, if there were, say two or three, classes of Depy. Collectors, Joint Magistrates or Head Assts., it would lead to frequent change of appointments or Officiating appointments and much consequent embarrassment to the despatch of business.—

11. In conclusion, I am desired to state that, in the judgment of this Govt., although there can be no question as to the advantage of stimulating exertion by holding out hopes of promotion and distinction, there are two other points which in conducting the affairs of a great Country

seem to them to be of vastly more importance - These are, first, to adopt every means of insuring generally capability of every necessary kind in all officers who are permitted to attain to the higher grades - Secondly, to secure the full employment of all their energies in the public service by giving them ample remuneration for their labours, with full consideration for the circumstances in which they are placed -

JP

Fort St. George,
30th Dec. 1856

In Despatch 6 January /57.

Financial - 1856 Deptt

No 618.

To the Commrs for the revision of Civil Salaries &c &c

D/30th Decr/56.

Financial - 1856 Deptt

No 617.

Extract Mins: of Cons:

D/30th Decr/56.—

7.

h. l.

T.C.

11 @ 16

C 29th Decr
Recd 30th