

(1) Number of pages 56(2) Date of repair 12/86(3) Initials of the Referencer lms ✓**TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES**

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU**P.W.D DEPARTMENT**

G.O. No.	2879 —w	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.

Dated

14-12-1880 197.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Main

287/2

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

14th December 1880, No. 2,879 W.

General.
Establishment.

Read the following papers:—

No. 54. From F. N. THOROWGOOD, Esq., M. Inst. C.E., Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 9th November 1880, No. 53 W.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt, on October 29th, of your memorandum No. 595 of October 27th, together with the disallowance list containing remarks of mine which are objected to by Major D. H. Trail, R.E., Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

2. I hoped to be able to reply at an earlier date, but have deferred doing so until

* Copy herewith.

I had received an answer from Major Trail to my letter No. 61 C,* of October

29th, written immediately on receipt of your memorandum. I have sent a reminder on November 3rd, asking for an answer, but up to the present time have not received one. I am therefore unable to say whether Major Trail approves of the remarks as altered.

3. In explanation of my extreme annoyance at having my action so summarily rendered void after having received the sanction of the Harbour Committee, I can only say that I consider such reversals of decision are very detrimental to the interests of this work, as they place the chief of the staff in a ridiculous position, which is fatal to proper discipline. With regard to the particular question at issue, I am still unable to see why the payment in question is disallowed.

4. For a brief period of extra work of a considerable amount I was anxious to give to three clerks some extra pay, bearing in mind that in 1877 for similar conditions I applied for, and received, permission to grant a similar reward to Mr. W. Allen, Foreman Diver, who was serving on a covenant with the Secretary of State.

5. Had the Harbour Works Committee not been in existence I should have made my application in the present case direct to Government, but the powers granted to the Committee of sanctioning salaries up to Rs. 60 placed the matter within their jurisdiction, as I believed.

6. The Examiner does not deny that if the increases, which I asked for over a period of not more than three months, had been *permanent* salaries he would have allowed them. But he disallows them, without leaving any choice of reference to Government, for a period of six weeks, because no "officiating" pay can be granted while a man is absent on privilege leave. To this I would reply that what I asked for need not be considered "officiating" pay, because it is clearly impossible for three clerks all to be officiating for one who is absent.

7. Major Trail has objected to my remarking that this case (on receipt of his reply which is awaited) would, after reference to the Harbour Committee, be forwarded direct to Government. I respectfully submit that I can see nothing to object to in this. Most transactions of the Committee are forwarded, by the Secretary, to Government for record. Moreover, I feel confident in a case of this sort, where my recommendation to the Committee and their sanction of the recommendation is put aside by the Examiner, that I am as free to appeal to Government as the Examiner is.

8. It is with much regret that I find Major Trail, ignoring my questions and letters, should find it necessary to refer my tone to Government. Whether the alterations I have made in the remarks are satisfactory I do not yet know, but I can only say I am perfectly willing to alter the wording in any way he may suggest, provided that the meaning as a whole is not altered, for I still believe that if the word "officiating" were put aside the extra pay would be admitted.

9. I can only repeat again that my tone of extreme annoyance, which I regret has called forth this correspondence, arose from my conviction that it is most injurious to the good working of this staff, that wages which have been fairly earned, duly sanctioned, (as I never doubted) and fully paid, should ten days afterwards be disallowed by the Examiner.

10. In doing this, your memorandum informs me he was doing what was right, and, of course, to this decision I willingly submit. But with regard to the sum disallowed, I trust that I shall be guilty of no disrespect if I prefer to bear the charge myself rather than have the appearance of going back from my word supported by the Harbour Committee.

No. 54-A. From the same Officer, dated Madras, 24th November 1880, No. 57 W.

I HAVE the honor to ask for instructions regarding the interpretation of G.O., No. 2,016 W., of July 31st 1879, by which certain powers are conferred upon the Harbour Works Committee, of sanctioning salaries of this establishment, up to Rs. 60 per mensem.

2. I have hitherto believed that this power was conferred on the Committee in order to save reference to Government, and that it applied to any appointment on this Office Establishment.

3. The Examiner of Public Works Accounts, however, informs me that it does not apply to the Office Establishment, which has taken me greatly by surprise. I therefore respectfully ask to be informed as to what the precise power of the Committee is.

No. 55. ORDER THEREON, 14th December 1880, No. 2,879 W.

THE Examiner is authorized to pass the charges objected to.

2. In future it will be understood that the powers delegated to the Harbour Works Committee by G.O., No. 2,016 W., of 31st July 1879, apply to Office Establishment as well as to "Petty" or "Works" Establishment, within the limits named.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts.
" Secretary, Harbour Works Committee.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

GENERAL
ESTABLISHMENT.

Gobt. of (1880) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE SUPERINTENDENT, MADRAS
HARBOUR WORKS.

&c., &c., &c.

Dated December, 14th.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 14th December 1880, No. 2,879 W.

DECEMBER.

Nos. 54-55.

Temporary increase of salaries to Clerks in the Office Establishment of the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.—The Examiner authorized to pass the —. In future the power delegated to the Harbour Works Committee to apply to "Office" Establishment as well as to "Petty" or "Works" Establishment within the limits named.

No. 5378

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT,
MADRAS HARBOUR WORKS.

To

Colonel R. H. Sankey, C. B. R. E.
Secretary to Government
Public Works Dept.
MADRAS, 9th November 1880

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt on October 29th of your memorandum No. 595 of October 27th together with the Disallowance List containing remarks of mine which are objected to by Major D. H. Trail, R. E. Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

2. I hoped to be able to reply at an earlier date, but have deferred doing so until I had received an answer from Major Trail to my letter No. 61 C of October 29th written immediately on receipt of your memorandum. I have sent a reminder on November 3rd asking for an answer but up to the present time have not received one. I am therefore unable to say whether Major Trail approves of the remarks as altered.

3. In explanation of my extreme annoyance at having my action so summarily rendered void after having received the sanction of the Harbour Committee I can only say that I consider such reversals of decision are very detrimental

detrimental to the interests of this work as they place the chief of the staff in a ridiculous position, which is fatal to proper discipline. With regard to the particular question at issue I am still unable to see why the payment in question is disallowed.

4. For a brief period of extra work of a considerable amount, I was anxious to give to three clerks some extra pay, bearing in mind that in 1877 for similar conditions I applied for, and received, permission to grant a similar reward to Mr. W. Allen, Foreman of the Secretary of State.

5. Had the Harbour Works Committee not been in existence I should have made my application in the present case direct to Government, but the powers granted to the Committee of sanctioning salaries up to £60 placed the matter within their jurisdiction, as I believed.

6. The Examiner does not deny that if the increases, which I asked for over a period of not more than three months, had been permanent salaries he would have allowed them. But he disallows them, without leaving any choice of reference to Government, for a period of 6 weeks because
no

no "officiating" pay can be granted while a man is absent on Privilege Leave. To this I would reply that what I asked for need not be considered "officiating" pay, because it is clearly impossible for three clerks all to be officiating for one who is absent.

7. Major Trail has objected to my remarking that this case (on receipt of his reply which is awaited,) would, after reference to the Harbour Committee, be forwarded direct to Government. I respectfully submit that I can see nothing to object to in this. Most transactions of the Committee are forwarded, by the Secretary, to Government for record. Moreover I feel confident in a case of this sort, where my recommendation to the Committee and their sanction of the recommendation is put aside by the Examiner, that I am as free to appeal to Government as the Examiner is.

8. It is with much regret that I find Major Trail, ignoring my questions and letters, should find it necessary to refer my tone to Government. Whether the alterations I have made in the remarks are satisfactory I do not yet know, but I can only say I am perfectly willing to alter the wording in any way he may suggest provided that

that the meaning as a whole is not altered; for I still believe that if the word "officiating" were put aside the extra pay would be admitted.

Q. I can only repeat - again - that my tone of extreme annoyance which I regret has called forth this correspondence, arose from my conviction that it is most injurious to the good working of this staff, that wages which have been fairly earned, duly sanctioned, (as I never doubted) and fully paid should ten days afterwards be disallowed by the Examiners.

11. In doing this, your memorandum informs me he was doing what was right, and, of course, to this decision I willingly submit. But with regard to the sum disallowed I trust that I shall be guilty of no disrespect if I prefer to bear the charge myself rather than have the appearance of going back from my word supported by the Harbour Committee.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most Obed^t Servant

J. H. Mowgood m. d. n. t. l. c.

Superintendent
M. H. Work

P.W.D.
10 NOV 80

ND

Establishment
P.W.D.

From
10 Nov 80
No. 53 W
The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works

No. 53 W
Dated 9th November 1880

Enclosure one

Disallowance List.

Submits remarks regarding
the temporary increase of
salaries to clerks in his
office disallowed by the
Examiner.

Cir. 2. 12. 80. B. 11. 11. 80.

No. 53 W

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT,
MADRAS HARBOUR WORKS,

To Colonel R. H. Sankey, C.B.R.E.
Secretary to Government P.W. Dept.
Fort Saint George

MADRAS, 24th November 1880

SIR,

I have the honor to ask for
instructions regarding the interpre-
tation of G. O. No. 2016 W of July
31st 1879, by which certain powers
are conferred upon the Harbour
Works Committee, of sanctioning
salaries of this Establishment, up
to Rs. 60 per mensem.

2. I have hitherto believed that
this power was conferred on the
Committee in order to save reference
to Government, and that it applied
to any appointment on this office
Establishment.

3. The Examiner of Public Works
Accounts, however, informs me
that it does not apply to the
Office Establishment, which has
taken greatly by surprise - I

therefore

P.O. 21st 8. 31. 7. 79.
Cr. 595 - 27. 10. 80.

P. W. C. A. 7485.
Establishment

From
The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works

N^o 57 W
Dated 24th November 1880
Rec^d 25th

Requests to know what
the powers of the Harbour
Committee are in
respect to Harbour
Establishment.

Recd 9. 12. 80. P.M. 12.
Cir 2. 12. 80. P.M. 6. 12. 80.
Cir 2. 12. 80. P.M. 12.

N^o 616.

From
The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works
To
The Examiners
Public Works Accounts

Madras 29 October 1880

Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter N^o 5972 of the 26th instant, and this morning I received from Colonel Sankin the Disallowance List bearing my remarks to which you take such strong exception. I forward the list herewith.

2. I am requested to cancel the remarks that appear objectionable to you, and I have altered the wording in such a manner as I trust will satisfy you. The spirit of my objections I cannot alter, because I am very anxious to learn exactly what the Harbour Works Committee can or cannot do. I am at present completely at a loss as to what course to pursue, and can only see with regret that salaries paid by me in perfectly good faith and

1
Therefore respectfully ask to be
informed as to what the precise
power of the Committee is.

I have the honor to be,
Sir

Your most Obedt. Servant,

W. H. Brown. M. Inst. C. E.
Superintendent
Mt. Wake

W. H. B.
Ed. B.

Dec. 2. 1880

P.O. 2015 D. 31. 7. 79.
Cr. 595-27. 10. 80.

P. W. C. A. 71-85.
Establishment

From
The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works

No 57 W
Dated 24th November 1880
Recd 25th

Requests to know what
the powers of the Harbour
Committee are in
respect to Harbour
Establishment.

Recd 9. 12. 80. P. 10. 12.
Cir 2. 12. 80. P. 10. 12. 80.
Cir 2. 12. 80. P. 10. 12. 80.

No 61 C.

From
The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works
To
The Examiners
Public Works Accounts

Madras 29 October 1880

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 597x of the 26th instant, and this morning I received from Colonel Sankey the Disallowance List bearing my remarks to which you take such strong exception. I forward the list herewith.

2. I am requested to cancel the remarks that appear objectionable to you, and I have altered the wording in such a manner as I trust will satisfy you. The spirit of my objections I cannot alter, because I am very anxious to learn exactly what the Harbour Works Committee can or cannot do. I am at present completely at a loss as to what course to pursue, and can only see with regret that salaries paid by me in perfectly good faith and

with the recorded approval of the appointed Committee are cancelled by your office ten days after they have been paid. Of course the effect of such reversals is injurious to the staff as well as humiliating to those who appeared to have authority.

3. The question of Mr. De Caster being absent, and the expression "officiating allowance" may be laid aside for a moment while I state my views of the case:-

I have asked for and obtained sanction from the Committee to raise the salary of three clerks in this office. I do not ask that this increase shall be permanent, but only for a certain time of extra work. If I had asked for a permanent increase to these clerks' salaries, within a limit of Rs 60 per month, I cannot conceive it possible that your office would have disallowed it. Unfortunately I have not yet received an answer to this all important question as first stated in the Disallowance List. I believe, however, until corrected, that the permanent salaries would have been passed while the temporary pay for extra work is disallowed. Surely this is not reasonable.

4. I do not profess to understand the spirit of disallowance statements because to my mind they seem to adhere to the letter of rules which are at times contrary to the spirit of economy. A case of that occurred some time ago when I asked for Rs 3.12. for a journey to Ambathoor and back. This was disallowed, but I was informed that I could have Rs 5 instead. This was no doubt in strict accordance with some rule, but it cannot but appear unreasonable to outsiders, and not to the advantage of the state.

5. In the present case of disallowing the extra pay which has been given to Messrs. De Vaz, Boyle and Pereira I shall be glad if you will inform me whether I am to pay the extra charge myself, or whether I must ask Government to sanction the charge. I, naturally, believed the Committee were in these matters equivalent to Government.

6. With regard to your underlining my remarks in the Disallowance List I have no conception what there is

objectionable in my saying that the Harbour Works Committee's remarks would be forwarded to Government. They are always forwarded to Government and no exception would be made in such a typical case as the present.

7. In conclusion I trust that the length of this discussion will not prevent you from telling me if I am correct in believing that you would have passed these salaries if they had not been only a temporary charge during Mr De Caster's absence.

I have recd
(Signed) F. N. Thoroughgood
Superintendent
M. H. Works

(A true copy.)
F. N. Thoroughgood, M. Inst. C.E.
Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works

P.W.D.
10/11/80
110

Ser C. No. 7139.

No. 537

GOVT.

OF MADRAS. }

1880.

P. W.

DEPT.

SECRETARY.

Chepauk,

1880.

OFFICE NOTE
Rh. 786
19/11/80

Incl: 8.

To

C Please send for reference, Disallowance List and all official correspondence on the subject of letter from the Superintendant Madras Harbour Works No. 61 C of 29 October.

L
b.j.w.

To W. 24/11/80

Herewith

See copy off C

12/11

7139

The Swallowance
Lith - with the remarks
thereon have not
been forwarded. They
appear to be with C.

R.B.
16/11

Wm. C. C.

L.C.

To. W. C. C. to office
Note No. 5379 17.11.80

17/11 M

6/12

No 58. C dated 25th October
perintendent Marine Harbour Works
I. W. Accounts.
to your letter No 568 & of 23rd
sorry that you consider the tone of my
objectionable, but I am still in
for a reply to my question.
considers my tone and expressions
objectionable, if, as I believe, your
have passed the permanent salaries
has charge, and got an account of
I believe the Harbour Committee
the increase sanctioned by the
-posed of in your office by the
allowance, which reaches the top
have been paid.
hope to state that as I am
the Works department I consider
the Committee as greater authorities
No doubt, if I am wrong in this
I

Copy of letter No 58. C dated 25th October 1880.
from the Superintendent Thomas Harbors Works
to the Examiner L. W. Accounts.

In reply to your letter No 5684 of 23rd
October, I am sorry that you consider the tone of my
remarks so very objectionable, but I am still ex-
tremely anxious for a reply to my questions.

2. I myself consider my tone and expressions
perfectly justifiable, if, as I believe, your
office would have passed the permanent salaries
involving a higher charge, and got an account of
some one (which I believe the Harbors Committee
can overrule) the increase sanctioned by the
Committee, is disposed of in your office by the
single word "Disallowed," which reaches the top
after the salaries have been paid.

3. I ought perhaps to state that as I am
not in the Public Works Department I consider
the Harbors Works Committee as greater authorities
than your office. No doubt, if I am wrong in this
I

I shall be duly instructed to the contrary.
4. If I were in the Public Works Department
I should perhaps think otherwise.

(Enc. Copy)

W. T. Jackson
Public Works Department

Copy of letter from the Superintendent
Madras Harbor Works, to the Examiner P. M. Accounts,
N. B. C. dated 27th October 1880.

I have the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter N^o. 577 of the 26th instant
and this morning I received from Colonel Sastry
the Disallowance List bearing my remarks to which
you take such strong exception. I forward the list
herewith.

2. I am requested to cancel the remarks
that appear objectionable to you, and I have altered
the wording in such a manner as I trust will satisfy
you. The spirit of my objections I cannot alter, because
I am very anxious to learn exactly what the Harbor
Works Committee can or cannot do. I am at
present completely at a loss as to what course to
pursue, and can only see with regret that Salaries
paid by me in perfect good faith and with the re-
corded approval of the appointed Committee are
cancelled by your office ten days after they have
been paid. of course the effect of such reversals is
injurious to the staff as well as humiliating to
them.

those who appeared to have authority.

3. The question of Mr. de Castro being absent, and the expression 'officiating' allowed may be laid aside for a moment while I state my views of the case. I have asked for, and obtained sanction, from the Committee to raise the salary of three clerks in this office. I do not ask that this increase shall be permanent, but only a certain time of extra work. If I had asked for a permanent increase to these clerks salaries within a limit of Rs. 60/- per month, I cannot conceive it possible that your office would have disallowed it. Unfortunately I have not received an answer to this all important question as first stated in the Disallowance List. I believe, however, until corrected that the permanent salaries would have been passed while the temporary pay for extra work is disallowed. Surely this is not reasonable.

4. I do not profess to understand the spirit of disallowance statements, because to my mind they seem to adhere to the letter of rules which are at times contrary to the spirit of economy. a case of that occurred some time ago when I asked for Rs. 3, 12 for a journey to Ambathoor and back. This was disallowed, but I was informed that I could have

have Rs. 3/- instead. This was no doubt in strict accordance with some rule, but it cannot but appear unreasonable to outsiders, and not to the advantage of the state.

5. In the present case of disallowing the extra pay, which has been given to Messrs. de'Vaz, Borges, and Pereira, I shall be glad if you will inform me whether I am to pay the extra charge myself, or whether I must ask Government to sanction the charge. I naturally believed the Committee were in these matters equivalent to Government.

6. With regard to your underlining my remarks in the Disallowance List, I have no conception what there is objectionable in my saying that the Harbour Works Committee's remarks would be forwarded to Government. They are always forwarded to Government and no exception would be made in such a typical case as the present.

7. In conclusion I trust that the length of this discussion will not prevent you from telling me if I am correct in believing that you would have passed these salaries if they had not been only a temporary charge during Mr. de Castro's absence.

(True Copy)

W. T. Jackson

Suppl. Correspondence Branch
10/2/11

Copy of letter from the Superintendent,
Madras Harbor Works, to the Examines P.M. Accounts,
No. 57 C. dated 22. October 1880.

I have the honor to remind you
that I returned to you on 14th instant the list of
disallowances from this office Salary bill for September
last, and in the column set apart for my remarks I
asked for an early reply to what appeared to me
a very simple question.

2. I shall esteem it a favour if you will
give me an answer to the question before Monday
next, that I may place the answer before the Harbor
Works Committee.

3. You will remember that the question
is this. Whether your office would have disallowed
the increase of pay to Messrs. D'Vaz, Boyle and Pereira
if such increase had been permanent instead of
temporary, or in other words if it had involved an
extra charge to the state (say) 18 times as much as
the sum you at present disallow although sanctioned
by the committee. (True Copy)

W. T. Jackson

Supdt. Correspondence Branch

106.
13/11

Copy of letter No. 5772 dated 26th October 80
from the Examiner I. G. Accounts to the
Superintendent Madras Harbour Works.

With reference to your No. 57.C.
and 58.C. dated 25th October 1880,
of the 22nd October 1880, I have the honor to state
that the disallowance of the officiating allow-
-ances in behalf of Messrs B. Vaj. Boyle and
Perris referred to in item (b) of Disallowances
List No. 257 in the salary bill of the Madras
Harbour Works for September 80, did not
bring into question the powers of the Harbour
Works Committee to fill vacant appointments,
but merely pointed out the departure from
existing rules in the present case, under which
leave can only be granted to officers in receipt
of salaries less than Rs. 100. per mensem on the
condition that the State is put to no
Extra Expense thereby).

2. When officiating allowance was therefore
claimed.

claimed a belief of the men above referred to, who were appointed to officiate in higher appointments viz. Mr De'Gata as clerk on.

No 80 per mensem absent on three months

Privilege leave, this office had no alternative but to disallow the claims under Section 3 to Supplement F. of the Civil Service Code.

3. The disallowance list referred to is herewith returned.

(True Copy)

W. J. Jackson

Asst. Comptroller Genl

Disallowance list
\$10257 & the -
Salary Bill for
September 1880 -

Copy of letter No 116. W. dated
23 October 1880 from the Examiner I. W.
Accounts to the Secretary to Government
I. W. Department.

I have the honor to enclose
the documents as per margin and
to request that such orders may be
issued to Mr. Thompson as will
ensure his addressing the office in
a proper tone of official courtesy. I
would specially draw attention to the
portion of Mr. Thompson's remarks,
underlined with red which are specially
called for when it is remembered that
this office is only acting in the usual
audit order.

(True Copy)

W. J. Jackson

Asst. Comptroller Genl

Copy of letter from the Examiner?
Public Works Accounts to the Superintendent,
Madras Harbor Works N^o 558X. dated 23rd
October 1880.

In reply to your N^o 57C. dated
22nd October, I have the honor to inform you
that the tone of your remarks of the 14th October
1880 is so objectionable that they have been for-
warded for the orders of Government.

I shall be happy to give any in-
formation asked for in a tone of courtesy to
which this as well as every other office is entitled.

(True Copy)

W. T. Jackson

Superintendent,

Correspondence Branch.

recd.
23/11

Copy of letter from the Examiner P.M.
Accounts, to the Superintendent, Madras Harbor Works,
N. 6682, dated 20th November 1880.

With reference to your letter N. 61. C.
dated 29th October 1880, I have the honor to state that
the powers conferred on the Harbor Works Committee
and the Superintendent, Madras Harbor Works by G. O.
N. 2016 W. dated 31st July 1879, can, I consider, refer to
only Works Establishment and not to Office Establishment
which, under existing rules, which are quoted in the
Madras P.M.D. Code } margin can be sanctioned or
chap. I. paras 43-45 } modified by only the Local
Government if chargeable to Provincial, or by the Govern-
ment of India if to Imperial Funds. Under these
circumstances the increases referred to by you would
have been objected to by this Office, if even given perma-
nently to the clerks in question, if no vacancy
existed at the time.

(True Copy)

W. T. Jackson

Superintendent Branch

106
24/11

Dr. W.

I have gone carefully
over these papers and
cannot but consider
the Examiner is clearly
correct in his interpretation
of the rules of Court as
noted in Am No 668 x
of 20 Nov. 1880, and
in regard to the bonus
conferred by S.O. of
31st July 1879 No 2016 W
which only related to
"Jury" and "Work Estab."
not to "Office" Clerks

In the de-centralization order
of 1 Res. 3334 of 14 Dec. 1870
it is said "The Govt reserves
to itself the right to forbid
alterations in rates of pay, or
allowances, which in its opinion
would produce inconvenience
in other provinces"

In J of I have always
been extremely stringent
about fixing scales in
Office, and cannot
the leaders Govt. and
the power to delegate
their authority to
the Executive Committee

(which I am inclined
to doubt) it is clear
they have not done
so — and even I myself
as Chief Engineer will
have no power to
authorize increases
of clerks pay as the
Committee have
done

It may seem that
I am not quite con-
sistent in this opinion
as I have only a day
or two ago authorized
a change of pay in
reply to the 1st & 2d
Ass't of my own office
but (1) this appeared
to have been in accordance
with previous practice
and (2) if objected
to by the Enamined
I shall not think
of disputing his right

To do so I should
be anxious to fulfil
every wish as far as
in conscientiously as
possible — changing his clerks
as Government auditors
and is exposed to
much undeserved
and mistaken criti-
cism as evinced by
the present correspondence
No doubt he has
acted in
perfect good faith
but it will serve
himself and the Office
if Govt. much unnecessary
irritation if when the
Enamined makes an
objection on technical points
he affords such explanation
as he has to give without
supposing that the
Enamined has disallowed
a change in other than

valid reasons —

In the present instance
all he had to do was
to say that the extra
charge had been sanctioned
by the Harbour Committee
under the authority of
S.O. No 2016 W — Not
another word was necessary —
The matter would then
have been referred to and
settled by this Office without
any irritating word being
exchanged.

From all I can see the
proposed increases of
pay are necessary and
if a note detailing the
reasons be drawn up
in circulation to the
H. C. and recommending
the same be adopted
I shall be happy to
sign it.

27/11/80 *W. H. C.*

P. W. DEPARTMENT

Read the following:—

From the Supt. Madras Harbour Works
Nos 53 W & 57 W, of 9th & 24th Nov. 1880.

FOR ORDERS.

In the first of
the two cases herewith
submitted the Examiner
has disallowed the increase
to the salaries of certain
clerks on the ground that
such allowances cannot
be given to men acting
for others on leave, when
the salaries are less
than Rs 100 per month.

2. In the second case
the Superintendent,
Madras Harbour Works

requests information as to whether the powers conferred on the Harbour Works Committee by G.O. No. 2016 W of 31st July 1899 were intended to apply to office establishment as well as to "Petty" or "Works" establishment, and orders are required upon this point.

3. If the latter question be answered in the affirmative the former requires no separate reply, as the power to sanction permanent increase of salary must necessarily cover that to sanction temporary increase. If the latter question be answered in the negative it is

As the U.S. is under the impression it must be taken by the letter of the G.O. and the general tenor of all Govt. orders in the subject of Office Establishments.

recommended that the Examiner be authorised specially to pass the increased salaries granted to the clerks referred to in the cases which have been approved by the Committee and which appear to be necessary. 4. The papers show that there has been some unpleasant friction between the Examiner's Office and that of the Superintendent, but the undersigned has taken measures which he trusts will prevent any recurrence of such misunderstandings.

C. M. Hawkey Ch. Sec.

Secy. to Govt. S. M. D.
2nd Overpro. L

to be

FOR ORDERS.

2879 W
W.
From Report Mr. W.
dated 50 Nov. 1880
No 53 W.

The dispatch of this
letter has been delayed
pending receipt of the
original disbursement
list which was asked
for on the 14th and
received on the 24th
inst. -

At the same time
a second letter No 57 W.
of 24th inst on a
kindred subject was
just been received - and
the two may be disposed
of together -

8.12.80

I do not suppose we need
pursue further the general
question as between Sir
Pemberton and Mr. Parnell -
The latter has modified
the wording of the
remarks which exception
was taken, and the
former will certainly not
want to press the matter
further -

But as regards the
substance of the controversy
I cannot but think that
Mr. Parnell is right -

The Government have
conferred certain powers
upon the Public Works
Committee, and it would

be almost to suppose that
the latter were intended

as regards "petty" or
"works" not "Office"
Establishment

W.H.

X. The Committee
have not the power
in case of "Office"
Establishment

W.H.

I have the power of
granting a permanent
increase of salary and
not to have that of
granting a temporary
increase - The reason
why the temporary
increase is given is
beside the question,
and so far as appears
in the first set of
papers, if Mr. Parnell
had simply entered
in his report "pay
increased by order of the
H. W. Committee" no
exception would have
been taken -

But it appears from
the second letter that
the Examiner considers
that the powers granted

G. J. O. W 2016 W. 2
31st July were not intended
to apply to office etc in
testament - As a fact they
were intended to apply,
but the wording of the order
leaves this doubtful, and
the point should be settled.

The enclosed draft is
proposed -

D
1879

Imp. 0. 1879

The authority delegated
to the Boston Works Committee
G. J. O. W 2016 W. 2
31st July 1879 was
intended to apply to
office as well as to
Executive establishments,
and it is obvious that
the power to sanction
a temporary permanent
increase, covers that to
sanction a temporary in-
crease, without reference
to the reason for which
that increase is given -

The claims disallowed
by the Examiner will therefore
be paid - D. 1879

copy of W. 2016 W. 2
8.12.80

5
No 26798. *5* *sent*
Estab.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 14th Decr/80.

Read the following:—

From
The Superintendent
Maons Harbour Works (H.E. No 5311d/9th Nov/80)
do do (" " 5711 " 24th)

The Examiner
is authorized to pay the
charges objected to.

2. In future it will
be understood that the
powers delegated to the
Harbour Works Committee
by G.O. No 2016 W of 31st July
1879 apply to office esta-
blishment as well as to
"petty" or "works" establishment,
within the limits named.

3. The power of sanctioning
permanent increases of salary
necessarily covers that of sanc-
tioning temporary increases.

S.M.H. works. 3 5
En R. W. with dis allow ances. *list*
Secy H.W. Committee 3 *sent*
8.12.80
8.12.80

7139

7/1/85

1886
Govt. of Madras

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Encl.

Recd.

Encl.

1886
G. O. to Secy. No. 2879

No. 56505

Temporary increase of
salaries to Clerks in the
Office of the Super-
intendent. The Secy
authorized to pass the
In future the power
delegated to the Harbour
Committee to apply
to Office of the Super-
intendent as well
as to "port" or "dock" salaries
within the limits named.