29-9-05
30-4-06
29-4-10

e taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Depart-ment.	C. No.	Year.			

Financial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 535-6

Dated 9-7-97

INDEXED.

9/7

3/12/97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Requesting the Government of India that its ruling, which included for the purposes of Madras Hill Allowance Code, gazetted officers on H.E. the Governor's staff under the heading First-class officers and which ruling deprived them from drawing travelling allowance for their families which they drew as Second-class officers, may be altered so as to prevent their being placed under a disadvantage.

PRINTED IN G.O., dated 10-4-
Feby 1898, No. 125.

T 12/7/97

of Rs 1,500. The instructions of the

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Financial

Public (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1451

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE
From
8 MAY 1897
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Major J. W. Romilly, D.S.O.
Military Secretary to
H.E. the Governor

Order

No. 170.

Dated 8th May 1897.

Received 8th } May '97

Registered 10th }

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwards a letter on the subject of the travelling allowances of officers on the Staff of H.E. the Governor.

BACK PAPER.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
44:	19.1.97		
800:	20.11.96 P		
R992:	4.9.96		
438/9:	22.7.96		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

...ing allowances of... G.O.No.67 Fin. 29/7/97 Rej...

38

Government House,

Ootacamund,

No. 170. 7th May 1897.

From

Major.F.W.Romilly.D.S.O.,

Military Secretary to

His Excellency the Governor.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,

Stone House Hill.

Ootacamund.

Sir,

P The Government of India in their letter No. 4820.P.of 6th November '96, embodied in G.O.No.800.Financial of 20th Idem, were pleased to sanction the inclusion, in para 4 of the Madras Hill Allowance Code, of Gazetted officers on H.E.the Governor's staff under the heading of "First-class officers".

The reason which led the Government of India to include the officers referred to under that heading, was to place them on an equality with first class officers, in regard to the scale of travelling allowance drawn by the latter for the journey between Mettupolliam and Ootacamund, and vice-versa.

The Accountant-General, however, now points out that as a result of the ruling under reference, the officers in question will be deprived of the advantage of receiving travelling allowances for their families, which they as "Second Class officers" were hitherto entitled to receive.

The effect therefore of the ruling, so far as

PAPER

as a Married officer is concerned, is that he will receive for the up-journey an additional sum of Rs.6/14/ for the portion of the journey from Mettupolliam to Ootacamund, while on the other hand he will be debarred from drawing the travelling allowance hitherto drawn by him for his family-viz: Rs.50 for his wife and for each child not less than 12 years old, and Rs.25 for each child less than 12 and not less than 3 years old.

As obviously it was not the intention of the Government of India, when granting the indulgence referred to in their letter No.4820.P. of 6th November '96, to withhold from Married officers on H.E. the Governor's staff the travelling allowances of their families, I have the honour to request that such steps may be taken as will ensure the latter being continued to them.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

F. Pomeroy Major,

Military Secretary.

Travelling allowances of Officers on the Staff of H.E. the Governor

Financial Dept:

C.No.1481

FOR ORDERS

The Mily. Secy. to H.E. the Governor points out that as a result of the ruling in para 3 of the Govt. of India, Fin: & Com: dept. letter No.4820 P d/ 6th November 1896 (page 3 of G.O.No. 800 Finl., d/ 20th Novr. 1896) which modified para 4 of the Madras Hill Allowance Code by including gazetted officers on the staff of H.E. the Governor amongst first-class officers for the purpose of travelling allowances to the Hills, these officers on the staff of H.E. the Governor will be deprived of the advantage of receiving travelling allowance for their families which they, as second-class officers, were hitherto entitled to. The pecuniary effect on a married officer is that whilst he will receive an additional sum of Rs.6/14 for the road journey from

of Rs 1,500. The instructions of the

Mettupolliem to Ootacamund, he will be debarred from drawing family travelling allowance, namely Rs.50 for his wife and for each child not less than twelve years old and Rs.25 for each child less than 12 and not less than 3 years old. The Mily. Secy. considers that it was obviously not the intention of the Govt. of India when granting the indulgence referred to in their letter No.4820 P., d/ 6th November last, to withhold from married officers on H.E. the Governor's staff the travelling allowances of their families and he requests that such steps may be taken as ~~to~~ will ensure the latter being continued to them.

Cmd 12/5/97

The point now raised did not apparently occur to any one when the reference in G.O 438-39 dated 22nd July 1896 was made to the G of I.

If the claim is considered equitable a reference will have to be made to India. Secretaries and Under Secretaries receive no allowances for wives or families. They did but the allowances were discontinued when the 1881 Code was revised

LP
13/5/97.

Resubmitted to Hon'ble Member with reference to the Governor's note ♂ 23.5.97 (overleaf)

Cmd 26/5/97

LP
26.5.97.

I don't think that officers can claim to be placed in one class for one purpose & in another class for another. They can't run with the hare & hunt with the hounds. It is a case of the burglar hoist with his own petard. Certain officers thought fit (or others did for them) to claim a miserable sum of Rs 6/14 more than they had been drawing & the effect (quite unintended, I admit, and naturally so) is that they find that they have lost more than they have gained. I don't pity them a bit. It serves them right. Quite apart from this, officers on the staff of the Military Secretary & the Surgeon to H.E. are much better off than Under Secretaries & have no claim whatever, in my opinion, to T.A. I regret that I cannot change my opinion that no attempt should be made to get them both terms

HS
27/5/97

I agree with H.E. that a reference should be made to India. It was this A.G. on his own account, that asked the G of I. to make this alteration in the rule & it seems clear to me that neither he nor India had in their minds to stop in with-holding travelling allowances to families. That allowance, whether right or not, has been decided by all to be right, & it should not be disallowed without express order from India. I, myself, think that the allowance should not be taken from officers on the Governor's staff, but should be given to Under Secretaries.

JG
31.5.97

27/5/97

[5]
1,000—8-5-97.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1457.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR.
~~THE HON'BLE MR. BLISS, C.I.E.~~
THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

SUBJECT.

T. A. to Officers on the Staff of H.E. the Governor

FOR ORDERS.

Resubmitted to the Hon'ble Mr. Grose C.I.E. with reference to that portion of his note ♂ 31.5.97 marked X

The papers have been delayed in order to get up any record that would show when Under Secretaries were brought under the ordinary T.A. rules as regards journeys to Ootacamund. Para 2 of G.O. No. 320 Fin: dt 11th March 1898 contains the ruling which inaugurated the present practice There are, however, no papers to show on what this was based. It seems to have arisen out of a proposal of the Finance Committee - vide portion of para 8 (of its report) marked with blue chalk on page 355 Vol. II - The Simla Code (vide rule 3 on page 2) draws the line at officers on salaries of Rs 1,500. The instructions of the

Hon'ble Member are solicited as to whether he requires his note to be circd. further before draft is prepared in accordance with the views of the majority

CWS 6/97

25/6/97.

No, it need not be circ? further. Re any expression of personal opinion. I don't think a case could be made out for India. The effect of the rules in this case of Under Secretaries was what was intended.

25/6/97

c 5.7.97 C 7.7.97
R 6.7.97 R 9.7.97.

Travelling Allowance to Officers on the Staff of H.E. the Governor

1 H.E. the Governor
2 The Hon'ble Sir Henry Bhó K.C.S.I.
1 as dissenting member/

To

The Mily. Secy. to H.E. the Governor (1)
The Acct. Genl. (A)

48

Financial Dept:

C.No.1451

ORDER W° 535 dg 9 July '97

The question will be referred to the Govt. of India for decision.

(from orders)

CWS 2.7.97

Desp 17/7/97

LETTER W° 536 dg 9 July 97.

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of India,
Fin: & Com: Dept: Desp 17/7/97

SIR,

I am directed to refer to the correspondence ending with Mr. Gamble's letter No.4820 P, d/ 6th Novr. ~~las~~ 1896, ~~regarding~~ which the ~~Govt of~~ India sanctioned the inclusion, for the purposes of the Madras Pill Allowance Code, of gazetted officers on H.E. the Governor's Staff under the heading of First-class officers

2. The reason leading to the proposal of this Govt. which was then sanctioned was to place these officers on an equality with first-class officers in regard to the scale of travelling allowance drawn for the journey be[illegible]

Secy Govt 5/7/97

A.9H 6.7.97

P

and Octacamund and vice versa. The Acct. Genl. has however pointed out that as the result of this ruling the officers in question will be deprived of the advantage of receiving travelling allowance for their families which they as Second-class officers drew hitherto. The effect, as far as a married officer is concerned, is that he will receive for the journey an additional sum of Rs.6/14, whilst he will be debarred from drawing the travelling allowance for his family, namely, Rs.50 for his wife and for each child not less than 12 years old and Rs. 25 for each child less than 12 and not less than 3 years old.

3. In these circumstances and as it was ~~not~~ the intention neither of this Govt. nor ~~could it have been that~~ of the Govt. of India ~~that~~, when allowing these officers the concession which was granted to them in Mr. Gamble's letter of November last, to deprive them of advantages which they had hitherto enjoyed, I am directed to refer the question for decision, and to state that, in the opinion of H.E. the Governor in Council, the rule should be so altered as to prevent these officers being placed under a disadvantage.

Cms 2/7/92

/Sam Orders/ 3/7/92

R.O. [illegible] given for copying [illegible]
5,00[illegible] copied [illegible]
[illegible] examined [illegible] 189[illegible].
[illegible] signed [illegible]

Dep[illegible]

[illegible]N G.O., No. 189 , DATED

No.

[illegible]REE TO C. No.

[illegible]RNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
[illegible]OVERNMENT.							
[illegible]T WITH DITTO.							
[illegible]T FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH [illegible] ORIGINAL.							

[illegible] = Copy in full.
[illegible] = Not to be copied.
[illegible] = Copy abstract only.
[illegible] = Copy heading only.