

188-71, 2815/11/81

ENCLOSURE

13 No 3017 W. 4/5-12-81

207/12

3017 W.

No 3017 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the *5th Decr 81*
Read the following:—

From Comdg ofcht. to Govt: M.G. No 631 of 12th November 1881.
Office Note from Examr M. Acto. No 884 of 30th November 1881.

The retrenchment
against Sub-Conductor
Lennon is correct and
must stand.

From the correspondence
submitted by the Examr.
it is observed that recovery
is being made by in-
stalments and not in
a lump sum as would
appear from the Consult-
ing Architect's letter.

Gr

Ptt

Comdg Architect Govt. V

Examr M. Acto with 25 encls

2/12/81
5-12-81.

A.D. 7427/15/11/81

Encls: 1

No 1008 Naf 14-11-81.
To C

For remarks.

b.w.

No 884 of 30th Nov. 1881

Encls: 4

TO W.

SUB DIVISIONAL ALLOWANCE
FROM 1ST AUGUST TO 22ND NOVEMBER
1880 WAS PASSED PROVISIONALLY TO
SUB CONDUCTOR LENNON BY THIS OFFICE,
PENDING THE APPROVAL OF THE SUPERIN-
TENDING ENGINEER TO THE APPOINTMENT
OF MR. LENNON TO THE SUB DIVISION,
AS PRESCRIBED IN PARA 330 OF THE
P.W. CODE.

2. AFTER SOME CORRESPONDENCE

ITEM (C) OF DISALLOWANCE
LIST NO. 307 OF 1880-81
ON THE SALARY BILL OF
WEST COAST DIVISION
FOR OCTOBER 1880.
ITEM (D) ON REJOINDERS
NO. 1 TO 4 ON THE ABOVE
DISALLOWANCE LIST.

(COPIES
HEREWITH)
THE SUPER-
INTENDING

Entd in Receipt Book

To



ROADS AND BUILDINGS.

P. W. b. No 631

From
The Consulting Architect
to Government,

To
The Chief Engineer, P. W. Department,
Buildings and Roads Branch.

No. 631

Dated 12th November 1881.

Received *14*

No. of ENCLOSURES. /

*Sub Divisional allowance
of Mr Lennon retrenched.*

*
RS. 112.

ENGINEER DECIDED THAT MR. LENNON
WAS NOT ENTITLED TO THE ALLOWANCE,
AND DIRECTED THAT THE AMOUNT HE
HAD DRAWN UNDER A PROVISIONAL
AUDIT SHOULD BE RETRENCHED, BUT
AS MR. LENNON HAD BEEN TRANSFERRED
TO THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT DIVI-
SION PREVIOUS TO THIS DECISION OF
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, THE
BILL OF THE WEST COAST DIVISION
FOR MARCH 1881 WAS LESS AUDITED BY
*
THE AMOUNT INVOLVED, AND CONSULTING
ARCHITECT WAS REQUESTED BY THE
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER WEST COAST
DIVISION TO MAKE THE NECESSARY
RECOVERIES FROM MR. LENNON.

3. A COPY OF DISALLOWANCE LIST
NO. 388 OF 1881-82 ON THE SALARY
BILL OF THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT
DIVISION FOR OCTOBER 1881 IS FOR-
WARDED FOR INFORMATION, WITH REFER-
ENCE TO THE REMARKS OF THE CONSULT-
ING ARCHITECT IN PARA I OF HIS
LETTER, FROM WHICH IT WILL BE OBSERV-
ED THAT A RECOVERY OF ONLY RS. 18-10-8,
(AND NOT 112) WAS MADE FROM MR.
LENNON'S SALARY FOR OCTOBER 1881,
AND THAT THE BALANCE WAS DIRECTED
TO BE RECOVERED IN TWO MONTHLY
INSTALLMENTS.

02



B. Smith
6650

True Copy

W. L. W. L.
Comdg. Asst. to Government.

Engineer held a Sub Division himself was probably exceptional at the time, and if the work was light a Subordinate of junior grade need not have been granted a Sub Divisional allowance.

7 The effect however would be to prevent the Executive Engineer ever having an experienced Sub Divisional Officer at Head Qrs as long as the system lasted.

8 It could hardly have been intended to deprive Mr. Sub. Engineer Lennon of the allowance he had hitherto drawn, and I have no doubt if the Examiners Letter No. 637 SE^d of the 26th October 1880 to this Division, in which he states that Mr. Lennon is entitled to Sub Divisional allowance under para 42 of the Code, be brought forward, the retrenchment will be withdrawn.

9 Of the three Sub Divisional allowances only two have been usually drawn viz, one in Canara and one on the Neilgherries, the Subordinate at Cannanore, where an Asst. Engineer is in charge, does not under the Code draw Sub Divisional Allowance unless he is on leave.

I have the honor to be
sir
your most obedt. servt.
Signed A. J. Fraser Major R.E.
Executive Engr. West
Coast Division



From

The Executive Engineer
West coast Division

To

The Consulting Architect
to Government Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor in transferring the sum of
Rs. 112 Mr. Lennon's Sub Divisional allowance as
directed by the Examiner to remark as follows.

2 Government Order No. 265 W of the 3 February
1880 fixed three Sub Divisional allowances for
this Division, and four Sub Divisions, one of
which was apparently to be held under the
Executive Engineer's personal charge assisted
by what was termed an "attached Officer"

3 Mr. Lennon was up to August 1880 in
charge of the Cochin Sub Division.

4 On the formation of the South Canara
Sub Division, the former merged in the Calicut
or Head Quarters Sub Division, with the same
area duties except that the Executive Engg.
had Head quarters at Calicut.

5 Mr. Lennon continued to draw Sub
Divisional allowance.

6 The arrangement by which the Executive

the matter to his notice and explained the result
of the new Organization.

No doubt the allowance should never have
been passed to Mr. Lennon, but considering the
date on which it ceased was a date arbitrarily
fixed by Government to change the name
and not (so far as he was concerned) the nature
of things, it appears to me to be just one of those
contingencies which arise during a reorganiza-
-tion, and which might be fairly passed as
such.

Under any circumstances I must respectfully
protest against the retrenchment being made
in my division except by exceedingly small sums.

I have the honor to be

sir

your most obedt. servt

B. H. H. H.

Cons. Architect to Govt.



ROADS AND BUILDINGS.

No. 631

CONSULTING ARCHITECT'S OFFICE,
Chopank, 12 November 1871

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO GOVERNMENT,

To

THE CHIEF ENGINEER, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH.

SIR,

I have the honor to inform you that acting under Orders of the Examiner Public Works Accts. I have deducted the large sum of Rupees 112 from Mr. Lennon's pay on account of Sub Divisional allowance drawn by him and duly passed to him in the beginning of last year. I need scarcely bring to your notice that such a proceeding is objectionable from every point of view, and that if the sum is eventually to be recovered, it should be recovered in very small sums.

2 The facts, as I gather them from Major Fraser's letter annexed, are, that Mr. Lennon held charge of a duly authorized Sub Division, and that without any change of duties or reduction of area, his charge ceased to be a Sub Division as a result of the Reorganization Scheme.

3 The Examiner, (inadvertently it appears) passed Sub Divisional allowance under para 42 of the Code but subsequently retrenched the sum when the Superintending Engineer brought

Enclosures.

1 Letter

C.W. 6650

C.W.

There seems no alternative but to direct the recovery of the allowance which was improperly drawn?

R.S.

1-12.

C.W.

For recovery must apparently be made

1-12-81

S.M.