

but it is not at all clear under what ruling such confirmation was necessary, the standing order quoted by the Examiner (No 201 of 29th December 1882) being obviously inapplicable.

3. The orders quoted in the last part of para 3. of your letter under reply do not appear to have been communicated to this Department.

W. 582 B d/ 10-3-83
 G.O. 1869 W d/ 21-7-82
 " 4498 W d/ 25-11-78
 W. 582 B d/ 10-3-83
 W. 668 B d/ 15-3-83
 W. 639 B d/ 15-3-83
 G.O. 851 W d/ 15-3-83
 " 231 W d/ 1-83
 " 334 W d/ 18-12-82

10/3/83

Add to para 2.
 " Financial Dept
 while para 3. of Resolution No 2679 of 31st August 1878, (P. W. Circular No 93 of 2nd November 1878) distinctly confers upon local governments the power of sanctioning bourses similar to those in question.

B. No 930 W d/ 21-3-83

12/3

Att
 Dep. Secy. to Govt. of India

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

No. 1148

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Calcutta, the 3^d March 1883.

SIR,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 231 W. dated the 19th January 1883, addressed to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Public Works Department, soliciting confirmation of the proceedings of the Government of Madras sanctioning the payment to Messrs. Antho. and Gaynor, accountants in the office of the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, of bonuses of Rs. 500 and Rs. 200, respectively in consideration of the extra labour undergone by them in preparing a revised edition of the Madras Public Works Code.

2. In reply, I am directed to say that the proceedings are confirmed.

3. I am at the same time to request that with the permission of His Excellency the Governor in Council you will be good enough to furnish an explanation of the circumstances under which the sanction of the Government of India was anticipated in this case. I am to add that in view of the frequent occurrence of such cases in Madras, the Governor General in Council considers it desirable to point out that sanction is only to be anticipated in cases where delay would be detrimental to the public service. I am also to call your attention to the fact that instructions to this effect have already been communicated to the Government of Madras, as for instance in the letters from this Department No 1527 of the 4th July 1881, and No 2824 of the 3rd September 1881, and similar instructions have been given from the Public Works Department.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Yours

Secretary to the Govt of India.

o. 844 w of 29.3.82
3349 w of 18.12.82
Opr 230-1 w of 19.1.83

P.W. 1.82 2104

~~Filed~~ papers put up
with letter from the
of India no 456 of 24-
6.83 referring to the
business of the
Anthony & Gargner.

B no 930 w of 21.3.83

582 d of 10.3.83

B no 851 w of 15.3.83

B nos 231 w of 19.3.83
1130 }

A original no 3349 w of 18.12.82

B no 2417 w of 18.3.82

- 1869 w of 21.7.82

A original no 4498 w of
25.11.78

No 9-3-83

No 851 Wap 15th March 83

Extract paras 1 & 2
are furnished to the
Examiner, Public Works
Accounts with reference
to G.O. 3349 W of 18th Dec/82

Diap

To

The Examiner P.W. Acc

with extract paras 1 & 2

Dec 1/13

844 W. 29.3.18

R. 41941 27 12 3 83
No. 582 D. W. C. 23

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1883. { P. DEPT.

Recd 15/3/83

SECRETARY.

Chepak, 190 March 1883

OFFICE NOTE

To

From letter No 1601
of 16th Jan 1883 -

Please explain from
S.O. No 201 of 29.11.82
reurs upon the case in
question -

That S.O. upon
payments from local,
Municipal or similar
funds, and is ob-
viously inapplicable to
the case of a grant from

15 3
The undersigned W. Accl's

12/3. R. 4/3

15/3

with respect to

Provincial Funds to
an officer whose pay
is charged to the same
fund -

S. M.

N^o 1027 dt 15.3.83..

The S.O. lays down
clearly that the officer's
pay must be a Provincial
charge, and that his
total emoluments after
the increase must not
exceed 250/a month.

In the cases in point
the officers' emoluments
were a Provincial charge
true; but they without
even the increase exceeded
250/a month.

The rule is a well
known

known one. This one
of the general conditions
laid down for the
administration of
Provincial services
by local Governments.

Wd.

N^o 960 dt 17.3.83

N^o 608 dt 16/3/83
C.

The question is not
as to the applicability
of the general rule
about increases of
pay, but as to the
applicability of
the particular standing
order (No 20 of 29.12.
82) which you mention.

I think I.O. distinctly
refers to payments from
funds Other than
the permanent funds, and
is obvious (no relation
to such a case as this
where no other funds
than those belonging
to the State are con-
cerned -

It should be noted
that no objection was
raised to the former
course pointed in
J.O. in Dec. N. & 290
which was, although the
general rule referred to
was in said case then
as much as now -

D 16/9

1893 No 2429
N 1033 D 19-3-83
To
Mr

On reconsideration
I admit that the particular
S.C. quoted is not strictly
applicable to the cases
in point and that it was
not quite correct to quote
it. It extends to Local
Incorporated & Local
Excluded funds, a rule
which was previously
applicable to Provincial
Funds in even a stricter
sense.

I was misled by the
expression "Provincial
Charge" and the term "Other
Funds" in para 30 F. I should
have quoted

- (a) F. 2 Res. No 1709 D 22.3.77
- (b) do do No 3353 D 1.10.81.
- (c) do do No 1600 D 9.8.82
- (d) M.C.F. 2 No 985 D 21.8.82.

1893
18/3/83

Ad 17/3/83

H.
This is C's explanation
as this being printed
L.O. No 207 of 29.12.02
in connection with the
houses, & the men of
his office -

Of the four orders which
he now quotes, (a) and (b)
are not on the records
of the Dept. and have
apparently never been
communicated -

(d) is not the original
on which L.O. No 207
(admitted to be inapplicable)
is based -

The only order really
applicable is (c) which
is an interpretation of

a despatch of 1864
written long before the
introduction of the
Provincial Service scheme -
Para 3 of Resolution
No 2679 of 31st August
1878, (L.O. No 10.
No 4430 H. of 25th Nov.
1878) appears conclusive
on the subject, the
power to sanction houses
& officers whose pay does
not exceed Rs 400
per month being distinctly
granted & no
preliminary -

The original draft
shows, I think, for one,
(made in the draft)
with an addition
referring to the resolution

but mentioned -

Drop,

No.

930 W

Government of Madras,

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India
Department of Finance & Commerce

21st March 1883.

SIR,

In reply to para 2 of
your No. 1148 of 3rd instant
I am directed to say that
when the order of this Govt.
(No. 3349. W of 18th December 82)
granting the honoraria in
question was passed, it was
not supposed that the
confirmation of the Govt.
of India was necessary.

2. That confirmation
was asked for, at the
suggestion of the Examiner
of Public Works accounts,
in order to save discussion
and possible misunderstanding.

but Sir,