

[L.M.]

INDEXED.
Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1496 M.

DATED 4-9-96

[Despatch Abstract.]

Allowances

Informing the Munl. Commissioners, Madras, that the proposed local allowance to Mr. Loane, Asst. Mechanical Engineer of the Municipality is not admissible but that there would be no objection to their granting him a special conveyance allowance if they desire to make some addition to his pay.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Enc 2676 4/96

Genl. Dept.
13

G. No. 99

MUNICIPALITY OF MADRAS.

General Department.

Madras, 28 May 1896.
Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 1554/M

From

LIEUT.-COL. G. M. J. MOORE, C. I. E.,

President, Municipal Commission.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

Enclosures
2

With reference to G.O.No.758 M, dated 4" May 1896,

I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of a resolution passed by the Commissioners at their General Meeting held on 27" May 1896 for the sanction of Government. A report of the proceedings of this Meeting as appearing in this morning's issue of the "Madras Times" is also forwarded.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

G. M. J. Moore

Lt.Col.

President, Munl. Commn.

Resolution referred to

G.O., dated 4" May 1896, No.758 M, reviewing the -----
Revised Estimate for 1895-96 and the Budget for 1896-97.

Proposed by M.R.Ry.R.N.Pragasa Mudaliar Avargal and
seconded by M.R.Ry.R.Balakistnama Chetty Garu-

"In recording G.O.No.758 dated 4" May 1896 the Commissioners, in view of the valuable and specially arduous nature of the work performed by Mr. Loane, Asst.Mechanical Engineer, request the sanction of Government for the payment of a Local-allowance of Rs.100 per mensem to the said officer, till such time as the Act is so amended as to legalize the granting of an increase to his present salary!"

Carried.

THE MADRAS MUNICIPALITY.

A GENERAL MEETING of the Municipal Commissioners for the City of Madras was held yesterday evening at the Municipal Office. Present: Lt.-Col. G. M. J. Moore, C. I. E., (President); Mr. P. Theagaraya Chetty, Mr. P. Balakistnama Chetty, Mr. R. N. Pragasa Mudaliar, Mr. Salla Gurusawamy Chetty, Mr. Cowasjee Eduljee, Mr. Haji Mahomed Abdul Hadi Bedsha Sahib, Mr. M. Varadarajulu Chetty, Mr. G. Subbarayalu Chetty, Mr. J. DeCaster, Dr. V. Varadappa Naidu, the Hon'ble Mr. P. Rungiah Naidu, Mr. Rao Bahadur C. Kalyanasundaram Chettiar, Rai Bahadur A. Dhanakoti Mudaliar, Rao Bahadur V. Krishnama Charriar, Mr. M. O. Parthasarathy Iyengar, Mr. G. Subramania Iyer, Surgn.-Major G. L. Walker and Mr. V. C. Desika Charriar.

RE-INSTATEMENT OF A COMMISSIONER.

The PRESIDENT said that the first question before the meeting was whether the Commissioners were prepared to re-instate Mr. B. Lavery, who had vacated his seat owing to absence.

On the motion of Mr. DeCaster the Commissioners resolved to re-instate Mr. Lavery.

THE G.O. ON THE BUDGET.

The PRESIDENT said that the next business was the G. O., dated 4th May, 1896, No. 758M., reviewing the Revised Estimate for 1895-96, and the Budget for 1896-97.

Mr. R. N. PRAGASA MUDALIAR said:—

The Resolution which I propose moving is in these terms:—
“With reference to G. O. No. 758 dated 4th May, 1896, the Commissioners, in view of the valuable and specially arduous nature of the work performed by Mr. Loane, Assistant Mechanical Engineer, request the sanction of Government for the payment of a ‘Local allowance’ of Rs.100 per mensem to the said officer till such time as the Act is so amended as to legalise the granting of an increase to his present salary.”
You will remember, gentlemen, that when the last Budget was submitted to Government, the Commissioners, in appreciation of the valuable services rendered by Mr. Loane and the specially arduous nature of his duties, recommended that a personal allowance of Rs.100 be granted to him. On this Government remark “that Government would willingly sanction the proposed grant of a personal allowance of Rs.100 to the Assistant Mechanical Engineer, but regrets that with reference to the terms of Section 44 of Act I of 1884, it is inadmissible. The question of taking power to increase the pay of this officer should be brought forward when next the Act is under amendment.” It must be a source of gratification to us to find not only that Government appreciates the services of Mr. Loane as much as we and the public do, but has also expressed a willingness to accede to our request if it was permissible under the Act. The Government is perfectly correct in making this remark. For our recommendation to grant a ‘personal allowance’ is not only inadmissible under the Act, but is opposed to the Civil Service Regulations. Section 44 of the Act provides that “The President may, from time to time, appoint all such officers other than those mentioned in sections 37 and 41 as the Commissioners think necessary, and may, out of the Municipal fund, pay such salary not exceeding Rs.400 per mensem to each of the said officers.” Under article 47 c 1. “Personal allowance is treated for the purposes of calculating leave allowances and pensions as a part of an officer’s substantive pay.” It follows, therefore, that when an officer appointed under section 44 draws the maximum pay permissible by the Act, viz. Rs.400, the granting of an additional personal allowance becomes inadmissible under the Code, for any sum paid in the shape of personal allowance is under the Code a part of that officer’s substantive pay. It would be otherwise in the case of an officer who does not draw the maximum salary, viz. Rs.400. For instance, if an officer draws only a salary of Rs.200, and we recommend a personal allowance of Rs.100 in addition, it would certainly be admissible under the Act as well as the Code. Under these difficulties it struck me whether we could not do something by way of encouragement to one of our most deserving officers. The question of taking power as suggested by Government to increase the pay of this officer when next the Act is amended, is a remedy not in the immediate future. Probably the Act may not come under amendment till after Mr. Loane’s retirement, in which case, even if such power is assumed, it could be of no practical use to the present incumbent. Admitted as it is on all sides that Mr. Loane’s services deserve tangible recognition, I have been referring to the Code to see whether it does not contain any provision to get us out of the difficulty. I am glad that it does contain a provision, and I think he might be granted a ‘Local Allowance’ of Rs.100 in addition to his present salary. Under article 38a “a local allowance” is defined to be “an allowance not specially declared to be pay or salary in consideration of exceptional local circumstances or specially arduous nature of the work.” Under article 38 b Local Allowance is not taken into account in calculating leave allowances or pension, and under article 47 c 3 salary does not include a local allowance. Indepen-

1557 modified

dently of the exceptionally good work performed by Mr. Loane in the past, it cannot be denied that his work is specially arduous within the meaning of the Code, the arduousness of the Assistant Engineer's duties being materially enhanced by reason of his being put in charge of the auxiliary mains, and this being so, the granting of such local allowances would be admissible under the Act as well as the Code. Though demonstration is unnecessary to show that the Assistant Mechanical Engineer's duties are of a specially arduous nature, it may be as well to place the following skeleton of information before you. Mr. Loane joined the department in 1873. Extent of water-supply then was 40 miles of pipes and 200 fountains. In 1882 it was extended to 80 miles with 800 fountains. In 1896 it is 125 miles with 1,100 fountains. The house connections in 1873 was nil, now it is about 9,000. Then, as regards steam machinery, in 1873 we had one of 6 H. P., now we have 20 of 220 H. P., besides 4 steam fire engines. As regards the work-shop the annual expenditure in 1873 was about Rs 7,000. Now it is somewhere about 110,000. I think this is sufficient to give you an idea of the arduous duties devolving on Mr. Loane. It may, however, be urged that if a local allowance is granted to Mr. Loane, his successor too would claim it as a matter of right. It is, of course, not difficult to get over this difficulty. If an Assistant Engineer from the Local Engineering College is appointed as Mr. Loane's successor, he cannot expect to start with a salary exceeding Rs 250, or if he is a man from Cooper's Hill College, he cannot expect to start with a salary exceeding Rs 350. As, however, the fixing of the salary will rest with the President under the Act, Mr. Loane's successor need not necessarily start with Rs 250 or 350. Any smaller salary may be fixed as the President thinks proper, exclusive of the local allowance to which he would be entitled. Of course, in due time, if such officer proves deserving, his services would be recognised by granting an increase from time to time till he reaches the maximum. Supposing, for instance, Mr. Loane's successor starts with a salary of Rs 200 plus local allowance of Rs 100, he might, if he shows himself deserving, receive an increment of Rs 50 once in six years. Thus at the end of 24 years he would draw Rs 400, the maximum salary under Section 44, and after putting in 5 years' service on that pay, he would be entitled to a pension of half that amount. It must be admitted, gentlemen, that when we submitted the last Budget we committed a mistake in recommending "a personal allowance"—an allowance inadmissible under the Act as well as the Code. The result would have been otherwise had we recommended a "Local allowance." If you are convinced that Mr. Loane's duties are specially of an arduous nature, and that the satisfactory performance of these duties deserve recognition, I hope that from the remarks I have already offered, I have made out a case, and hope also that you will see your way for supporting my proposition unanimously.

Mr. R. BALAKRISHNAMA CHETTY seconded the resolution.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

It was proposed by Mr. KALIANASUNDARAM CHETTY, seconded by Mr. DeCaster, and carried "that the thanks of the Commissioners be conveyed to Government for the further additional grant of 1½ lakhs of rupees from Provincial funds."

PROCEEDINGS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

The PRESIDENT said that the last business before the meeting was the consideration of the proceedings of the Standing Committee, dated 24th April, 1st and 5th May, 1896.

The proceedings of 24th April contained draft bye-laws about buildings in modification of the bye laws once sent to Government. The bye-laws as drafted were milder than the original one. There was a slight discussion as to the efficacy of those bye-laws, but eventually the Commissioners resolved to apply to Government for their sanction.

The PRESIDENT said that the proceedings of the 15th May contained the question of the application of the Revenue Officer for an assistant in view of the work that he had to do.

Dr. VARADAPAH NAIDU said:—

In connection with the subject of appointing an assistant or transferring the Account Department, which is now under the supervision of the Revenue Officer, to the General Department, I proposed "that the Commissioners consider it inexpedient to appoint an assistant to the Revenue Officer or to transfer the Account Department of the Revenue section to the General Department." I am not in favour of any proposition which will entail an unnecessary expenditure on the Municipal funds, and be an unnecessary burden on the ratepayers, who are groaning already under a heavy Municipal taxation without a corresponding gain to them. In the consideration of the question before us whether we have to allow an assistant to the Revenue Officer or to transfer the Account Department to the General Department, we have to consider whether we are justified as custodians of public money by simply voting to appoint an assistant, whether by doing so we rightly discharge the responsible trust bestowed on us by the ratepayers, whose representatives we are. To know all about the transfer of the Account Department from the

General Department to the Revenue Department, I have to call your attention to the Report of the Establishment Committee appointed on 13th July 1888. This Committee consisted of the President, the Engineer, and the Revenue Officer, who were then called the Vice Presidents the Hon'ble P. Rangiah Naidu, Messrs. E. Thiruvengada Mudali, W. S. Ganiz, Hon'ble Rai Bahadur P. Ananda Charlu, Salem Ramasawmy Mudali, N. Subramaniam, J. F. Nicholas, Dewan Bahadur Ragoonath Row, and Rai Bahadur Runganatha Mudali, M.A. This Establishment Committee actually held eighteen meetings, and after the subject was thoroughly discussed, submitted a very able report which was adopted by the general body of the Commissioners and the Government of Madras. This Committee has submitted their report *vide* para. 12 13. Gentlemen, you will see that the Committee on the representations made by the present Revenue Officer, who sat on the Committee then as a Revenue Vice-President, considered it best to amalgamate the assessment and the Account Departments together. When the Revenue Officer wanted the Account Department to be transferred under him he never proposed any assistant to be given to him. What makes the Revenue Officer to ask for one now? Was there any additional work given to him from that time? Certainly not. As far as I know the routine work, as done by the Revenue Officer then, is the same as it is now. If the Revenue Officer has considered the appointment of an assistant to him very necessary, how is it he never submitted any suggestion about this to the Standing Committee either this year or previous years, although he recommended the salaries of the Superintendent and others to be raised, and some appointments created. Is it not very surprising that this necessity should arise directly. The President impresses on the Revenue Officer the importance of his inspections in the 2nd Division. Then it suggests itself to me whether the Revenue Officer was neglecting his inspection work all along up to the present time, and now to do his work efficiently he is unable without an assistant. Of course, the reason for this is very clear, the very reason I have often urged before you, that is *age*. Time makes a great deal of difference in the capacity of a man for work. It is nearly 8 years since the Revenue Officer insisted that both the Departments, the Collection and the Accounts Departments, must be amalgamated. Of course, 8 years ago he might have been equal to that work, but now, after the lapse of 8 years, he now complains that some work must be taken away from him, or an assistant, at the expense of the rate-payers' money, must be given to him, so that he may not be worried in his old age. This, I think, is not the fault of the person, but of his age. Gentlemen, when I suggested to you, some time ago, that this elderly officer might be allowed to retire and a young, efficient person be employed instead, some of you were of opinion that he was still equal to the most responsible and onerous duties devolving on this officer. The very day that he was reinstated, the President issued an order that he should inspect certain number of houses in the 2nd division daily. Now this is no new order, this important duty of inspecting houses by the Revenue Officer was impressed very strongly in a G.O. so far as 1891. A question now arises whether the Revenue Officer has been inspecting the houses together with his routine duties up to 23rd April last, or neglecting, to do so. He must have been either doing his work well or neglecting, it and now, I think, through physical infirmity he is not able to do all his work, asking for an assistant to make up the defect. Anyhow, the career of the present Revenue Officer will not last for more than 10 months, and it is not wise in our part to burden the Municipality with the salary of an assistant for the sake of simply smoothing the path of this elderly officer. I am almost certain that when a young officer succeeds to the post of the Revenue Officer, no assistant will be required, and it would be unwise to establish a precedent of unnecessary assistance for a young and active successor. Even now, as it is, the routine work of the office is performed by a Superintendent, who got an increase to his salary in this year's Budget, an Assistant Superintendent, a very active, intelligent and hard-working man, a Head Accountant, assisted by half a dozen Accountants, and several others. I hold in my hand a list of the establishment of the Revenue Department with their respective duties well defined. This list was furnished to me at so recent a date as 24th February last. Any one can make out from this list that the routine duties of the Revenue Office could not possibly fall into arrears. If you were to compare a Deputy Collector's Office in charge of general duties of a District, with the Municipal Revenue Office, you will find that our establishment is more than 10 times the strength of a refusal Deputy Collector. The Deputy Collector has to do triple or quadruple of the work of the Municipal Revenue Officer. A Deputy Collector on general duties is not only the Vice-President of the Local Board or Municipality, but he is a Magistrate, a Revenue Officer, he is in charge of the irrigation works, he has to go on circuit through his taluq, he must be on jamabandi, whereas the work of a Revenue Officer is confined to a small area of 27 square miles, he has to be stationed in one place, he has no circuit except to visit a few houses along good roads. So if you compare the work of a Deputy Collector with that of the Revenue Officer of the Madras Municipality, you will, I think, conclude that no assistant is required for him. If you were to think over the subject deeply, I am certain you will never vote for an unnecessary assistant in the Revenue Department. The Head Gumastah on Rs.50

in a Deputy Collector's Office will be able to manage the routine of our Municipal Office without any difficulty. While such being the case, the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent, the Head Accountants with numberless Accountants and clerks under them, can very well manage the work of the office. There is not the least occasion for the appointment of an assistant. It is a matter of great surprise that the question of the necessity for the appointment of an assistant should crop up when an order emanated from the President that the Revenue Officer must go out for inspection of houses. Was this important duty of testing the work of the under paid assessors neglected up to this 23rd April, 1896, when the President issued this order to the Revenue Officer. If it had been neglected up to this date, it is a matter of great regret that such state of affairs had not been amended to long before.

Mr. R. N. PRAGASA MUDALIAR seconded the resolution, but controverted some of the statements made by Mr. Varadapah Naion, and pointed out that his ideas about a Deputy Collector's duties were wrong. The request of the Revenue Officer for an assistant was made as early as 1891, and was not the result of his old age. The present Revenue Officer was one who understood every hook and corner of the city, knew where a particular house was situated and almost its description; he knew where an inspection would be productive of good, and also how and when to inspect. He knew from his own experience of the Abkari Department that daily inspections were not necessary. If the whole responsibility was thrown on the Revenue Officer there was no doubt that he would see the work efficiently carried out. As regards the transfer of the Account Branch to the General Department it was inexpedient, as the duties of the President were so onerous and multifarious that he would hardly have any time to check the thousands of cheques and vouchers that would pass through his hands.

Mr. V. C. DESIKA CHARI suggested that as the Revenue Officer was to retire next year, he might be relieved of the Inspection work, which could be carried on by the Divisional Commissioner. If he was in order, he would move that as an amendment.

The President said that it was hardly an amendment, and even if it was, he would object to it as interfering with his prerogative as to the distribution of work.

Mr. KALIANASUNDARAM CHETTIAR observed that Mr. Ramasamy Chettiar, having served the Municipality for such a long time, should not be dictated to as to what his duties were. It was much better to leave to his own discretion what inspections should be made. It was unbecoming on their part to speak disparagingly of a gentleman who had done so much service for the Municipality and worked sincerely just on the eve of his retirement.

The resolution was then put and carried and the rest of the proceedings were confirmed.

The meeting then terminated.

Local & Municipal Dept.

CURRENT No. 1557/11

TO BE RETURNED
WITH REPLY.

No. 793

From

The President,

Municipal Commission,
Madras.



Referred to the Accountant
General for favour of remarks as
regards the question of whether there
are any objections to the grant of
the allowance proposed.

[Signature]

Under Secretary, P.W.D.
for Chief Secretary

Fort St. George,
d/ 7th July 1896

G. No. 99

Dated 28th May 1896

Received 18th June 1896.

Enclosures 2.

SUBJECT.

Forwarding a copy of a resolution
of the Commissioners at their
meeting held on 27th May 1896,
recommending a local allowance
of Rs. 100 to Mr. Loane, Assistant
Mechanical Engineer, for sanction
of Government.

(with endorsement)

The Accountant General.

To The Hon. Secy
P.W.D. and
for a note
C.L.H.
9/7/96

[Handwritten notes and signatures]

Dup. 9/7/96

31.5.96

91-8-56

the act, I do not think that Government
can accord its sanction to the payment
of the allowance in question.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

William

Offg. Accountant General.

100

LOCAL FUND (1896) DEPARTMENT.

2228h

From

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,

MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Secretary to Government,
Local & Municipal Depart.
Fort Saint George.

No. L.F.D.
224

Dated 31st July 1896.

Received 17 AUG 1896

No.

Subject.

Stating that it is not advisable to accord sanction to the payment of local allowance to Mr. Loane, Asst. Mechanical Engineer of the Madras Municipality.

H.M.
misc.

Order

The Accountant General's remarks in which the Government concurs, will be communicated to the municipal commissioners of Madras.

V.R.
19/8/96

[Signature]

To The President, M.C., Madras.

7/8.

7/8

[G.
25
1,000-5-11-23]

L.M. DEPARTMENT

C. No. 1557-2228h

FOR ORDERS.

Please see the notes on the front of the two currents, & the reference therein. The Acct. Genl. now says that a local allowance is not admissible as it is not included in the definition of the word "salary", or not provided for in Act I of 1884. C.S.R. Art 47 (C) 3 however expressly states that salary does not include local allowance, & in Art 38. local allowance is defined as an allowance given in addition to pay or salary in consideration of exceptional local circumstances. By sec 44 of Act I of 1884 Mr. Loane's salary is not to exceed Rs 200 per mensem, but there seems to be no reason why a local allowance in accordance with the C.S.R. should not be granted to him even though there is no provision for it in the act.

L.R.D.
18.8.96

It would be unfortunate

P.L.O.

Local Allowance to Mr. Loane

91.9
From
recommendation of the
to give Mr. Loane a
ial allowance of Rs 100
month could not be complied
tho. He is an invaluable servant
and I was intimately acquainted
with his work from 1880-1885. His
salary was then what it is now.
It seems to me there is a very
easy way out of the difficulty raised
by the Accountant General who by
the way has I think no power
to bar the grant he objects to.

FOR ORDERS.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR.

THE HON'BLE MR. H. W. BLISS, C.I.E.

THE HON'BLE MR. J. GROSE.

In Act I of 1884 Sec. "Salary means
pay and acting pay or payment
by way of commission, but not
allowances for house-rent, carriage
hire or travelling expenses."

Let Mr. Loane therefore be granted
an allowance of Rs 100 a month
for house rent or carriage ^{hire}, and
there can be ^{no} objection.

MA 26. 8. 96

Let him have it for
carriage hire, if the Comm^r
like to put it in that way.
Explain why local allow can't
be given, i.e., because there are
no special local circ

Rs
287896

x Shall of course not follow
that his successor ^{is to} get the
same pay -

27/8
28/8

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated

189 , No.

Again G.O., dated

189 , No.

Current No. 1537 M

of 1896, dated 28th May, from

Pres. St. Mun. Comm. Madras

" " 2228 M

" 1896, " 31st July, "

Acctt. Genl.

" "

" 189 , " , "

ORDER.

No. 1496 mins of 4-9-96

The Govt reports that it is unable
to accede to the wishes of the Commissioners
in the matter of granting a local allowance
to Mr. Loane, as under the provisions of
Act I of 1884 & the C.S.R. such an
allowance would be inadmissible, there
being no ^{special} local circumstances to justify
it. As, however, the Commissioners
are desirous of making some addition
to Mr. Loane's pay allowances, there
would be no objection to their granting
him a special ^{conveyance} ~~carriage~~ allowance
of Rs. 100, which ^{of course} ~~would~~ need not necessarily
be continued to his successor. If such a
course meets ^{with} ~~their~~ approval, they are
requested to submit their proposals for the
sanction of Govt.

To
The President Mr. Madras
Accountant General
Dy. 9/9/96

(from orders) 1/2
118/56
10/8
31-8-96

Allowance to Mr. Loane

(From orders)

C.S.

When given for copying
When copied *Mar 5-9*
When examined
When signed *8/9* } 1896

AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

RENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.