M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 18

(2) Date of repair 15-5-38

(3) Initials of the Referencer

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

## Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

a—1716/55

G.O. No. 1164 Press Mis.

4-12

Dated 11-6- 1859.

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

1c

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, from 11th to 17th June 1859.*

No. 11. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. BELL, Chief Engineer; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, dated 3rd June 1859, No. 1213.

I have the honor herewith to forward a correspondence with the Civil Auditor as to the meaning of the order of Government of the 14th of March 1859, No. 576, on the subject of the pay of Sub-Overseers.

To Civil Auditor May 20th 1859 No. 681.
From do. May 31st 1859 No. 270.

2. I have stated to the Civil Auditor what I believe to be the meaning of the order, but as he is not satisfied with my interpretation, I request the favor of the decision of Government on the subject.

---

Letter from Lieut.-Colonel J. H. BELL, Chief Engineer; to J. L. LUSHINGTON, Esq., Civil Auditor, dated 20th May 1859, No. 681.

As doubts have been entertained of the precise meaning of the Rules with regard to the service and pay of Sub-Overseers laid down in the order of Government dated March 14th 1859, No. 576, I have the honor to state that it appears to me clear that the intention of Government is that as long as any Sub-Overseer remains in any *class* he shall be entitled to the pay of the higher *Grades* of the class only after five and ten years' service; but that there is nothing in the order of Government to prevent him from being promoted to a higher *class*, without reference to length of service.

2. I shall be obliged by your informing me if you concur in this interpretation of the order, or otherwise in what respect you differ from my view.

---

Letter from J. L. LUSHINGTON, Esq., Civil Auditor; to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. BELL, Chief Engineer, dated 31st May 1859, No. 270.

With reference to your letter of the 20th Instant No. 681, I have the honor to state that the order of Government, dated 14th March last No. 576, is not quite clear on the point raised by you. I can hardly think it is the intention of Government that a Sub-Overseer should not obtain promotion to a higher class under fifteen years, and it seems still less likely that should a Sub-Overseer be promoted to a higher class, that he will not be allowed to draw the allowances of the class to which he may be promoted.

2. As the order is not sufficiently explicit on this point, it would be better for you to make a reference to Government on this subject to remove all doubt.

---

No. 12. ORDER THEREON, 11th June 1859, No. 1444.

The interpretation of the order of March 14 1859 No. 576, given by the Chief Engineer in his letter of the 20th May is perfectly correct. The order did not deal with the subject of the promotion of Sub-Overseers; the rules to regulate that will be found in other orders; in particular in the notification No. 1 of June 23rd 1857 paras. 7 to 10 and the order of March 15 1859, No. 596 para. 7.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
*Secretary to Government.*

Central Office of P.W.
Fort Saint George
20th May 1859.

No. 681

From

The Chief Engineer

To

The Civil Auditor

Sir,

As doubts have been entertained of the precise meaning of the Rules with regard to the service and pay of Sub Overseers laid down in the * No. 576 Order of Government dated March 16th 1859, I have the honor to state that it appears to me clear that the intention of Government is that as long as any Sub Overseer remains in any Class he shall be entitled to the pay of the higher Grades of the Class only after five and ten years' service; but that there is nothing in the Order of Government to prevent him from being promoted to a higher Class, without reference to length of service.

2. I shall be obliged by your informing me if you concur in this interpretation of the Order, or otherwise in what respect you differ

differ from my view —

I have &c
(Signed) J. St. Bell Lieut. Colo
Chief Engineer

P. H. — L.C.

(No 270)

From
J. L. Kushington Esqre
Civil Auditor

To,
Lieutenant Colonel J St. Bell
Chief Engineer
in the Depart of Public Works

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 20th Instant No 681 I have the honor to state that the Order of Government dated 11th March last No 576 is not quite clear on the point raised by you — I can hardly think it is the intention of Government that a Sub Overseer should not obtain promotion to a higher class under fifteen years, & it seems still less likely that should a Sub Overseer be promoted to a higher class, that he will not be allowed to draw the allowances of the class to which he may be promoted. — 5°

2. As the order is not sufficiently explicit on this point, it would be better for you to make a reference to Government on this subject to remove all doubt. —

Civil Auditors Office
Fort Saint George
31st May 1859. —

I have &c
(Signed) J. L. Kushington
Civil Auditor

True Copies

J St Bell Lieut Colonel
Chief Engineer

End P.

Contract Office of 1st Lt.
Fort Point Creek
3d June 1859.

(No 1213)

From
The Chief Engineer

To
The Secretary
to Government

Public.

Sir,

I have the honor herewith to forward a correspondence with the Civil Auditor as to the meaning of the order of Government of the 11th of March 1859, on the subject of the pay of Sub Overseers

2. I have stated to the Civil Auditor what I believe to be the meaning of the Order, but as he is not satisfied with my interpretation I request the favor of the decision of Government on the subject. —

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
W. Lt Lieut Colonel
Chief Engineer

Enclosure
1st Register of letters forwarded
To Civil Auditor dated May 20th 1859 No 681
From do. dated May 30th 1859 No 270

No 576.

Ex Of

Enclosure No 1 to Chief Engineers letter
No 1213 dated 3d June 1859.

Copy of a letter from the Civil Auditor
to the Secretary to Government dated
May 30th 1859 No 270

Sub Overseers are to be paid from the
date of their appointment

Madras 30th May 1859

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 681 dated 20th instant, and in reply to state that I am not aware of any Order of Government which authorizes the payment of Sub Overseers from the date of their appointment.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Civil Auditor

Enclosure No 2 to Chief Engineers letter
No 1213 dated 3d June 1859.

Copy of a letter from the Civil Auditor
to the Secretary to Government dated
May 20th 1859 No 681

Subject as above

Madras 20th May 1859

Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will be pleased to move Government to issue an order authorizing the payment of Sub Overseers from the date of their appointment.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Civil Auditor

9c

P. W. Departt.

No. 1464.

Proceedings of the Madras Government,
Under date the 10th June 1859.

Read the following
letter from the Chief
Engineer

(Here enter 3d June/59 No. 1213)

The interpretation
of the order of March
16/1859 No. 576, given by
the Chief Engineer in his
letter of the 20th May
is perfectly correct. The
order did not deal with
the subject of the pro-
motion of Sub-overseers;
the rules to regulate that
will be found in es
other orders; in partic-
-ular in the notifi-
-cation

Copd 15th Ratchly 8/9 No. 95.

P. W. Dept. 1859 Abstract
No. of Sheet 1459 Page.
Letter No. 1453

From
The Chief Engineer
To
The Chief Secretary
to Government of Fort
St. George.

Dated 3 June 1859
Received 4 June 1859
Consd. No. 1213.

Forwarded (Chief)
Copy of proceedings with the Madras
Govt. on the subject of the orders of
Government on the establishment
of Sub-overseers of Public Works
of the Revised Rules of Promotion
of the Subordinate Establishment
of the Department.

No. 1464 dated 10th June 1859.

Notification No 1 of
June 23d/1857 Paras 5 & 10
and the order of March
15/1859. No. 596. Para 7.

To Copies to the Chief
Engr Civil Dist
Civil Auditors

Public Works 1859 Dept.
Pro: of Govt 17th June.

No 1444.

Pro: of the Madras Govt
Dt 11th June 59.

From the Chief Engineer
26 Sept. 58 C No 2340 in

Chief Engineer's in-
terpretation of the order
on the pay of sub overseers,
is correct, this order did
not deal with the sub-
ject of their promotion -

No 11 & 12.