

All communications
should be addressed
to the Secretary

No. 11774

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

GENERAL.



To
The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.
Simla, 18th June 1887.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No 1371 W, dated 18th May 1887, I am directed to state that, the Government of India is willing to sanction the grant of ^{the} honoraria of a month's pay each to Messrs Gaynor and Calder on the express understanding that no such sanction will hereafter be given for future revisions of the Madras Public Works Code.

2. I am further to state that, the Government of India is of the opinion, that the differences between the Government of India Public Works Code Volume I and the Madras Code are so slight that the former ought to suffice for the Madras Presidency - I am to enquire therefore whether in the interests of economy and convenience, it might not be arranged that the one code should be

be accepted, any purely local orders
being dealt with in a separate volume
if required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

E. H. Walker

Under Secy. to the Govt. of India. 14/29.6.87
11.20/6/87.

No. 2163C d/29 June 1887

To C

For favour of remarks
with respect to the condition
attached to the sanction
in para 1, and to the
proposal in para 2.

Yours

27/6/87. W



[C. No. 8.]

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1887.

{ P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 23rd July 1887.

OFFICE NOTE No. 381.

To

W.

Your Office Note No. 2163C
dated 29th June 1887.

KEEP-WITH

Genl. No.

dated

188

Looking only to the letter
of the condition in para 1 of
the Government of India's
letter No. 1177 G of 18th June
1887, it seems to me a
condition as to which there
can be nothing for me to
say. The Government of
India consents to sanction
the honoraria in the present
instance, but says it will
not do so again.

2. But the fact of this condition being referred to me for an expression of opinion, suggests that you consider that the acceptance of the condition would bind the Madras Government to something more than is expressed in the words of the Government of India letter — possibly to an understanding that all future revisions of the Code must be carried out by the ordinary Establishment without any additional expense. If so, I can only say that it is impossible for me to bind even myself — and much less to bind my successors — to any such understanding.

3. Any ordinary revision — or more properly — re-issu-

of

of the Code could probably be carried out without any additional expense for establishment, or at most with only any trifling additional expense, but I say "probably" with intention, as I cannot undertake to give an absolute pledge on this point; but I think it is more than probable that any apparent saving would be swallowed up by the additional charges for keeping matter in type, which would result from inevitable delays consequent on carrying on the work without sufficient establishment.

4. If any thing more than an ordinary re-issue should be required, — if for instance it should be necessary to completely revise the code and the code forms, with a view to getting out the separate volume which would be required, if the proposal in the second para of the Government of India letter should be adopted, I certainly could not undertake to carry the work through without additional establishment.

5. With regard to the proposal in the second paragraph of the Government of India letter, I am decidedly of opinion that it is not desirable, whether on the score of economy, or on any other ground, to disturb

the

the present arrangements as to Codes. I think the Government of India underrate the difference between the two Codes. It is certain that the acceptance of the Government of India proposal would involve the immediate preparation of the separate volume admittedly required, and a revision of all the code forms and of the references and notes thereon, which would, I think, be a much more serious matter than the revision of the Madras Code, which was carried out only last year. I think the Madras Code is in some points of arrangement and deta

decidedly
24/7.

decidedly better than the
Government of India Codes,
it is handier for reference;
and it is much cheaper. I
doubt whether the adoption
of the Government of India
Code would effect any
economy whatever. On
other grounds too I think
that the separate code is
an advantage. Admitting
fully the necessity for
uniformity as to general
principles, I think a certain
amount of variety in applying
these principles to local
circumstances, is necessary,
and that it can only be
satisfactorily provided for
by allowing the separate
code. I think that the
want of direct touch between
the

the Government of India, and
the working Officers of the
Departments amenable to
these codes, tends to hamper
the gradual development of
the Codes — the removal of
obscurities and ambiguities,
and the elaboration of
details etc — and that
many little improvements,
desirable and even necessary,
are prevented only by the
difficulty of setting in
motion the machinery
competent to deal with
them.

W. C.

No. 2118W

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

8th August 1887

Read the following

From the Govt. of India H.S. No. 1177 of 18. 6. 87.
 " " San. Res. No. 381 of 23. 7. 87.

Payment of the
 honoraria of one month's
 salary each to Messrs
 Haynes & Calder
 is sanctioned.

2. The following letter
 will be addressed to
 the Govt. of India -
 H.S. No. 2119W of 8th August 1887
 for sanction to the Govt. of India.
 Proposed

San. Res. No. 381 of 23. 7. 87 Sir, I am directed

PWC No. 5749

(1)

R 25. 7. 87

Encl

mm
5 Aug

no 2063C. 29. 6. 87
 B. no 1370 W. 18. 5. 87
 1371
 " 907 W. 24. 3. 87
 " 139 W. 18. 1. 87
 Q. 6. 2767 W. 21. 10. 86
 2768
 no 618D. 6. 9. 86
 " 342D. 5. 7. 86
 " 1696C. 4. 5. 86
 " 1595C. 26. 4. 86
 B. no 997 W. 16. 4. 86
 no 1014C. 12. 3. 86
 " 887C. 4. 3. 86
 B. no 530 W. 2. 3. 86
 no 30C. 5. 1. 86
 " 2844D. 17. 12. 83
 " 2522D. 6. 14. 83
 " 424C. 1. 2. 86
 Q. 6. 2479 W. 22. 10. 83
 B. no 2857 W. 11. 10. 83
 " 1814 W. 2. 7. 83
 " 930 W. 21. 3. 83
 " 231 W. 19. 1. 83
 Q. 6. 3349 W. 18. 12. 82
 B. no 2417 W. 18. 9. 82
 " 1869 W. 21. 7. 82
 " 1910 W. 2. 8. 81
 B. no 11029 W. 16. 10. 78
 B. no 849 W. 29. 3. 81
 B. no 83 W. 12. 1. 81
 " 2668 W. 22. 4. 80
 Q. 6. 2215 W. 22. 9. 80
 B. no 1987 W. 14. 8. 80
 B. no 883 W. 6. 4. 80

to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1177 of dated 18th June 1887, and to state that this Govt regret the ^{absolute} condition under which the grant of ~~the~~ honoraria of ~~one month's pay~~ each to Messrs. Sanyal and Calder has been mentioned.

2 Any future ordinary reissue of the Madras P. W. Code could probably be carried out without any additional expense for establishment, but should circumstances arise which ^{would} render necessary a complete revision of the Code and the work of forms

forms, the condition now imposed, would probably necessitate the establishment of extra establishment, the cost of which may be more than that involved by the grant of small honoraria to members of the existing establishment for work out of office hours.

3. In reply to the question in your second paragraph, I am directed to state that this Govt. is decidedly of opinion that neither in the interests of convenience nor ~~and~~ economy is it desirable to disturb the present arrangement under which a separate code of instructions is maintained

Report 1
tained for the Madras
P.W. Dept. It seems to
this Govt, that the Govt
of India under rate
the difference between
the two Codes; and
the acceptance of
the suggestion in your
second paragraph
would involve the
immediate preparation
of the separate volume
of local rulings, together
with a revision of all
the Code forms & other
references & notes
thereon, which would
be a much more
serious undertaking
than the revision of
the Madras Code so
recently carried out.
The inconvenience to
the Dept of having
two

two separate books of
reference needs only to
be mentioned to be
understood. The
Madras Code appears
to this Govt, in some
points of arrangement
and detail, to be
superior to the Govt
of India Code; it is
handier for reference,
and ^{as it} is much cheaper,
~~as the last named~~
~~from the Govt.~~ there
would be no economy
in adopting the Govt.
of India Code - while
admitting the necessity
for uniformity as to
the General principles,
this Govt ^{think} that a certain
amount of variety
in applying those
principles to local
circumstances is
necessary, and that

4-8-87

this can only be satisfactory
provided for, by allowing
a separate Code for this
Presidency.

4. I am therefore
to express a hope that
the Govt. of India will
not press their suggestion
on the acceptance of
this Govt.

Dec
11/8/87

Wm
8.8.87

Desd. to
Sindia
8/8/87

Ch.
8/8/87
10.6.87
11.6.87

4/8/87

No. 4 m. P.P. H. C. L. L. L.

No. 2118 was 8. 6. 87