Original

Public Works (1888) Department.

ORDINARY.

G.O. No. 1352-1353W

DATED 8-5-1888

[Despatch Abstract.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

8TH MAY 1888, Nos. 1352, 1353 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—the following letter from Colonel R. C. B. PEMBERTON, R.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (General), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Calcutta, 10th March 1888, No. 598 G.:—

In forwarding herewith copy of a note by the Finance Committee on the subject of Presidency allowance and house-rent, I am directed to state that the Government of India agrees with the Finance Committee in considering that Presidency allowance (not house-rent) should be abolished at Madras.

2. It is observed that when Presidency allowance was originally sanctioned, the Government of Madras was informed that it could adopt the rule or not according to its option. Apparently the rule was not adopted, but, in lieu of the allowance, a conveyance allowance of Rs. 50 a-month was sanctioned for officers employed at the Presidency Town and for Executive and Assistant Engineers at Bangalore. This conveyance allowance at Madras seems to have continued up to 1881, when the Madras Code of Regulations of that year was issued in which the scale of Calcutta Presidency allowance was embodied. Under the circumstances, it would appear that the allowance was not originally considered essential, and this quite agrees with the conclusion arrived at by the Finance Committee.

3. I am, therefore, to inquire whether His Excellency the Governor will offer any objection to the allowance being abolished, with effect from the 1st April 1888.

4. An early reply is requested.

ORDER—dated 8th May 1888, No. 1352 W., Public Works.

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed:—

(Here enter No. 1353 W., dated 8th May 1888.)

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. O. HASTED, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Financial Department, with copy of letter
and with special reference to para. 7.

LETTER—to the Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 8th May 1888, No. 1353 W.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 598 G., dated 10th March 1888, forwarding copy of a note by the Finance Committee, and inquiring with reference thereto whether there is any objection to the abolition of the Presidency allowance drawn by certain officers of the Public Works Department in Madras.

2. It is stated in para. 2 of your letter that when Presidency allowance was first sanctioned, it was not considered essential by the Government of Madras, who adopted *in lieu* a conveyance allowance for the officers employed at the Presidency Town and at Bangalore, and that the latter allowance was continued up to 1881, when the scale of Calcutta Presidency allowance was adopted. This statement of the case does not, I am to say, seem quite accurate. Presidency allowance was introduced at Calcutta and Bombay in 1865, while carriage allowance to officers in Madras was drawn prior to 1863 as a part of consolidated salary and, thereafter, as a separate allowance, in accordance with the re-organisation scheme sanctioned in G.O. No. 1599, dated 18th June 1863 (copy attached for reference). The grant of Presidency allowance on the present scale came into effect at Madras in 1879, and not 1881. *Vide* G.O. No. 1263 W., dated 1st May 1879.

3. It is observed that the Finance Committee propose to retain the Presidency allowance in Calcutta and Bombay, while abolishing it at Madras. They say, "We have satisfied ourselves that the cost of living in Madras (apart from that of house-rent) is not necessarily greater than that of living in the mofussil."

4. From information which has been laid before him, His Excellency the Governor in Council is disposed to think that the cost of living in Madras, to officers of the classes affected, is by no means less expensive than in Calcutta or Bombay; while as compared with the mofussil, there are many extra items of expenditure which an officer stationed in the Presidency town cannot avoid, and it is always necessary, on account of the very great distance between the Public offices and residences in Madras, for an officer to keep a carriage while in the mofussil, the horses which an officer keeps for travelling, and for which he pays out of travelling allowance, can be used. It must also be remembered that officers of the Public Works Department stationed at Madras draw only the pay of their rank, unlike Civilians whose offices are specially paid. Apart therefore from the Presidency allowance, the selection of an officer of the Public Works Department for duty in Madras would entail on him pecuniary loss by depriving him of all travelling allowances, and if the Presidency allowance is to be done away, it will become necessary to attract the best men to the Secretariat and other posts in Madras by attaching special salaries to those appointments.

5. It is assumed in the Resolution of the Government of India, Department of Finance and Commerce, No. 1705, dated 30th March 1888, that an officer's salary is supposed to include the cost of keeping up such means of conveyance as are requisite for his ordinary duties, if he is of the same standing as persons who in this country ordinarily use such means of conveyance; but I am to point out that there can be no doubt that carriage hire costs much more in Madras than in the mofussil. The Presidency allowance of an Assistant Engineer will not pay the monthly hire of an office carriage, which at Madras is from Rs. 65 to Rs. 75 per mensem. Granting that conveyance allowances, as such, are not claimable, the extra expenditure entailed on officers on this account when transferred to the Presidency town may, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council, be properly considered when judging whether "the cost of living in Madras is not necessarily greater (paragraph 42 of Mr. S. Jacob's note) than that of living in the mofussil."

6. For these reasons, His Excellency the Governor in Council is unable to accept the conclusion at which the Finance Committee have arrived, and sees no reason why Public Works officers in Madras should be treated differently in the matter of Presidency allowance from those stationed in Calcutta or Bombay.

7. The Government of India will, I am to say, be separately addressed on the subject of the Presidency allowances withdrawn from officers of the Survey Department stationed in Madras.

(Signed) J. O. HASTED, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated May, 8th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 8th May 1888, Nos. 1352, 1353 W.

MAY.

Presidency Allowance

Expressing inability to accept the decision of the Finance Committee considering that—should be abolished at Madras.

THIS Note should be sent to the Departments concerned with the following observations:—

Military Allowances.

(1) Allowances held at the Presidency itself should, I think, be left undisturbed (paragraphs 4 and 11 of Note).

(2) Allowances to medical officers in civil employ.—I agree in the proposals of paragraph 12 of the Note, which, I understand, have the concurrence also of the Home Department.

(3) Withdrawal of allowances from officers at hill stations.

I concur in paragraphs 22 *et seq.* of Mr. Jacob's Note. Presidency allowances were given, and are maintained, to meet special expenditure imposed on officers when in the Presidency towns. The Government has laid down (paragraph 28 of the Note) that special allowances will not be given to officers above the grade of clerks to compensate them for residence at Simla. Other officers do not draw special house-rent allowances when at Simla. The maintenance of these allowances in the Military Department at Simla seems to me quite indefensible.

Public Works Department Allowances.

I concur in paragraphs 36 and 37 of the Note, and, for the reasons there given, I think that military officers should draw the Presidency house-rent on the Civilian scale, and that the allowance should not be given at hill stations.

The Bombay and Aden allowances will, I hope, be now referred by the Department of Public Works to the Bombay Government (paragraph 40).

Madras also should be consulted with reference to paragraph 42 of the Note.

Postal Department.

I agree in the proposals in paragraphs 53, 56 and 57. Oders can issue at once.

Telegraph Department.

I agree in paragraph 69, if the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Public Works thinks the proposed extension proper, subject to any reserve as to Madras which may follow on the enquiry suggested in paragraph 42.

A. C.,—12-7-87.

Forwarded to the Public Works Department for consideration with reference to the portions of the Honourable Member's Note which refer to the Public Works Department and Telegraph Department allowances.

S. K. C.—18-7-87.

C. E. M.

O'C.—23-7-87.

To Public Works Department, unofficially.

U. O. No. 3792, dated 25-7-87.

P. W. D. U. O. R. No. 204, dated 27-7-87.

PRESIDENCY HOUSE-RENT AND ALLOWANCE.

The following were the general principles proposed by the Finance Committee for adoption in respect of either Presidency house-rent or Presidency allowance:—

"(1) It should be given only to officers holding appointments of a class which is tenable either in mofussil stations or Presidency towns, not to officers holding appointments which are only tenable at Presidency towns or at the head-quarters of Government, provided that the pay of the latter appointments was not fixed on the understanding that the occupant should also receive house-rent.

11 A

Financially, it is an economy to keep the allowance for residence at the Presidency separate from pay; for thus the allowance is not taken into account in calculating leave allowances, and is not drawn during temporary absence from the Presidency of more than two months' duration.

11. As regards this first point, then, I would say that the military staff allowances come within the proviso laid down by the Finance Committee; that is, they have been fixed, even in cases where the appointment is necessarily held at the Presidency, on the understanding that the occupant would receive house-rent.

12. As regards the second proposal—the withdrawal of house-rent from medical officers in civil employ—the ground of the proposal of the Finance Committee was not any of the general principles stated above, but the special reason that such officers when at the Presidency hold appointments "which are acknowledged to be the prizes of the profession."

The Home Department expresses as its opinion that—

> "Presidency house-rent might be withdrawn from medical officers in civil employ who are allowed the privilege of private practice."

This is, practically, an acceptance of the Finance Committee's proposal, for it is clear, from the reason given by the Committee, that they referred to those officers who were allowed to practise their profession generally at the Presidency.

The Finance Committee's suggestion may be adopted with the restriction proposed by the Home Department to those medical officers who are allowed "the privilege of private practice."

13. The third proposal—the withdrawal of the allowance from officers at a hill station—is one of considerable importance, as it applies not only to the Military Department, but to various other Departments.

14. The reasons assigned by the Finance Committee for their proposal are first—a reason of general application—that the advantages of residence at a hill station are so great that it would be more reasonable to lower an officer's salary on that account than to add to it; and second—a reason, which applies specially to the Military Department—that officess of the Army Head Quarters are not allowed to draw the house-rent when at a hill station.

15. The Military Department communicates the following reply with reference to this proposal:—

> "Attention is invited to Military Department No. 466, dated the 27th September 1869, and to the notes forwarded therewith, in which the reasons for the grant of Presidency house-rent are fully set forth. The withdrawal of house-rent from the officers of the Military Department would be tantamount to a reduction of salaries, which, it is understood, has not been taken up generally by the Finance Committee, and the arguments advanced by that body are not, in the opinion of the Military Department, sufficiently strong to warrant a reconsideration of the question."

16. It appears that in 1869 the Accountant General, Bengal, enquired whether the practice of drawing house-rent when away from the Presidency was to continue in the case of the following officers who had hitherto drawn it:—Assistant Secretaries in the Military Department; Assistant and Under-Secretaries, Public Works Department; Assistant Accountant General, Public Works Department. The Finance Department thereupon enquired from the Military Department under what authority Presidency allowance was drawn by the Assistant Secretaries when away from the Presidency, and, in reply, the Military Department forwarded some Office Notes on the subject, and stated that the Governor-General in Council in that Department was opposed to the withdrawal of the allowance.

17. The reasons given in the Office Notes for the continuance of the allowance during absence from the Presidency are summarised below:—

(1) The officers are put to very heavy expense in leaving Calcutta and setting up again; if they have houses in Calcutta, they are compelled to break up and sell off at a great sacrifice, or run the chance of renting during their absence.

(2) The house-rent, though only given in aid, goes but a very small way to meet the expense of house accommodation for a married officer if even in the position only of an Assistant or Under-Secretary.

(3) In 1834, with special reference to the item of house-rent, (*a*) the decision was given that the allowances of the Military Secretariat were not to be in any way affected during temporary absence from the Presidency with the Governor-General.

(4) In 1839 this principle was again affirmed, and the reason for it given, *viz.*, to place these officers on a footing with the Secretaries in the Civil Department, whose salaries suffer no reduction when absent from the Presidency.

(5) At that time, though there was a general rule that house-rent was not to be drawn when tents were supplied, it was ruled that when tents were supplied to officers of the Military Secretariat, they were still to draw the house-rent, because officers in Civil Departments occupied public tents without deduction from their pay on that account.

(6) It is to be presumed that the element of Presidency house-rent was taken into consideration in fixing the salaries of the Civil Secretaries, and it is merely the accident of the division of military pay into its component parts, such as extra batta, pay, tentage, and house-rent, which appears to give the Military Secretariat officers an advantage as regards house-rent.

(7) In point of fact, the Presidency house-rent has for many years past been considered an integral portion of the pay of officers of the Military Secretariat, and to withdraw it would place Military and Public Works officers on a worse footing than members of other Secretariats.

18. The Secretary in the Military Department summed up as follows:—

> "The Secretary has a consolidated salary and never draws Presidency house-rent, but the Deputy and Assistants are required to lead a most expensive life.
>
> "Six years ago they received, besides their Presidency house-rent, all their travelling expenses, and Rs. 150 per mensem tour allowance while absent from the Presidency. The latter have been merged into Rs. 200 per mensem while absent to cover all expenses. This has put them in a worse position than formerly; and I certainly think they are not so overpaid as to call for a further reduction.
>
> "At all events the grant of Presidency house-rent has for the last 35 years been an understood portion of the emoluments of the Deputy and Assistant Secretaries, and when I have with difficulty found capable and willing candidates for the Secretariat, I have always, in telling them of the pay they would receive, referred to what was given, under competent authority, in the shape of presidency house-rent.
>
> "I submit that it should not be withdrawn when the Secretariat officers are absent on duty from the Presidency."

19. The Finance Department at first drafted a Resolution withdrawing the Presidency allowance for future incumbents when away from the Presidency, on the ground that it was granted for a special purpose which ceased when the Presidency was left, and that if the emoluments were not sufficient, that might be a ground for revising pay, but not for retaining the special allowances.

This draft was objected to by the Honouble Member in the Military Department, and the matter came up in Council, the Council order being recorded as below:—

> "The total allowances of the officers of the Military Secretariat not being more than adequate, the Governor General in Council will not withdraw from them the item of Presidency allowance."

20. The Military Department apparently considers that the arguments used in 1869 are still applicable; and especially adopts the view that the Presidency allowances are an integral portion of the salaries, so that the withdrawal of them would be tantamount to a reduction of salaries.

(*a*) The rate of house-rent at this time was that shown in paragraph 3 for officers drawing regimental pay and allowances in addition to staff salary, and so was on the whole much lower than the present Staff Corps rates.

21. I have in paragraph 17 given the arguments as much as possible in the words of the original notes, because it is instructive to notice how every rule restricting the grant of the Presidency allowance was gradually relaxed in the case of the Military Secretariat. These relaxations have now been extended to those Military offices which are attached to the Military Secretariat, such as those of the Commissary-General and Director-General of Ordnance, &c. Stated briefly, the arguments are—

(1) The Presidency allowance is an integral portion of salary.
(2) Officers of the Military Secretariat must get the same pay and allowances at Simla as at Calcutta, because Civil officers do.
(3) The pay and allowances of the Military Secretariat appointments are not more than sufficient to induce suitable officers to take up those appointments.

22. To the first argument I would reply that a reference to the orders of 1863, under which the staff salaries were sanctioned and the new rates of Presidency allowance were granted, shows that the latter was not in any sense an integral portion of the pay of the officers who might become entitled to it. The staff salaries were specifically fixed (as shown in paragraph 8 of this Note) proportionately to the work; while the Presidency allowances were granted as expressly with reference to the "expensive rates of living in Presidency towns."

The precedents of 1834 and 1839 seem to have no bearing on the question now raised for several reasons :—

(1) the salaries were then fixed on a different principle ;
(2) the rates of Presidency allowance admissible were very much lower ;
(3) the Government did not then leave Calcutta regularly every year and proceed to a hill station to reside there for 7 or 8 months.

The question must, therefore, be considered with reference to the orders of 1863, and no earlier orders can affect it.

No lapse of time can alter the nature of an allowance granted for a definite specified purpose ; and it is open to Government to consider at any time whether the allowance is required or not, even if no question of a general revision of salaries is under consideration.

23. As regards the second point, it seems to me that the comparison with the Civil Secretariat Officers is irrelevant. Military officers and civil officers are in many respects under different rules as regards pay and various allowances. The pay is fixed on different principles; the allowances are governed by distinct rules. Leave rules, pension rules, and acting allowance rules are essentially different for the two classes. In some cases one set of rules may be more favourable than the others ; but this is so from the nature of things, and it is impossible to argue from one to the other. In considering the justice or injustice of any rule, we must refer to its origin and history, and not institute comparisons with rules based on an entirely different condition of affairs.

24. If any comparison at all is made, I would submit that the comparison suggested by the Finance Committee with the officers of Army Head Quarters is both relevant and reasonable. There are various offices, the salaries of which were at the same time, and under the same orders, fixed at the same amount—an amount intended to be proportionate to the work; and yet the incumbents of one class of offices, when serving alongside of incumbents of another class, of the same military rank and at the same station, are drawing higher allowances, merely because they are attached to or are serving directly under the Military Secretariat, while the others are attached to Army Head Quarters.

In the discussion of 1869, the arguments numbered (1) and (2) in paragraph 17 were brought forward to show that there was a reason for the distinction made between the officers of Army Head Quarters and those of the Secretariat. But whatever may have been the case then, the Government of India is now so regularly and for such a length of time at Simla, that the distinction between the two classes seems very slight, and quite insufficient to justify the grant of an allowance of this kind to one class which is denied to the other.

25. The third argument (of paragraph 21)—as to the total emoluments, including the allowance, being not more than sufficient—seems somewhat irrelevant (as stated in the Financial Department draft Resolution of 1869, though it was apparently that on which the final decision of the Government was based in 1869. If this argument be admitted now, it would be cheaper (looking at the subject from the point of view of Government expenditure as a whole, and not merely as it affects the Military Department—see paragraph 10) to raise the staff salaries, which are considered to be insufficient, than to continue the allowance at Simla, in one Department, which must necessarily lead to its retention in other Departments.

26. I do not suppose, however, that this argument could be put forward now on general grounds. There does not appear to be anything in the absolute amount of the staff salaries themselves to justify the view that they are insufficient. The 1st Deputy Secretary's allowance (Rs. 1,000) is the same as is given to heads of some Departments and to such officers as Deputy Quartermaster-General and Deputy Adjutant-General ; the 2nd Deputy Secretary receives a staff allowance which is considerably higher than that given to the officer in command of a regiment. And so with all the other appointments in the Military Secretariat and in the Departments immediately subordinate to it ; a comparison of the salaries with those allowed in other Departments in military service justifies the view that they are fixed, as they profess to be, proportionately to the amount of work.

27. This argument can, therefore, only be put forward with reference to the special conditions of residence at Simla ; and, if this view be correct, the question lay within the purview of the Finance Committee, and may be considered quite independently of any general reduction of salaries.

On this point the Finance Committee's view is that the advantages of residence at a hill station are so great that it would be more reasonable to lower an officer's salary on that account than to add to it. And I submit that all experience confirms the view that, at any rate, an officer would, as a general rule (and especially a married officer—see some of the arguments used) choose to reside at a hill station, if he could do so without any actual loss of pay. In some cases officers are permitted to reside at a hill station on the express condition that no extra expense is occasioned to Government ; in such cases they bear the cost of their own travelling expenses and of such of their clerks as accompany them, and sometimes also pay allawances to such clerks out of their own pockets. In the Military Departments (Quartermaster General's office for instance) unpaid attaches are allowed to come to the hills on the salary they would draw in the plains, and no difficulty is, as I understand, experienced in obtaining officers to come up on these terms.

28. It was only in 1870 that the Government of India laid down as a principle to be followed in the grant of allowances for residence at Simla, that—

> "the Government will not make any allowance to officers above the grade of clerks to compensate them for being ordered to reside at Simla during the hot season and the rains."

Prior to this (see paragraph 14 of Finance Committee's Note on Simla Allowances), extra allowances had been given to higher officers in all Departments for such residence. The decision of 1869 was, therefore, come to when extra allowances were generally given, and is not of the same force as a precedent as if it had been arrived at since that time.

29. To sum up then, the arrangements against the allowance are—

(1) it does not form a part of salary, but is specially granted to compensate for the expense of living at the Presidency ;
(2) it is refused to officers at Simla other than those attached to or immediately under the Secretariat ;
(3) the advantages of residence at Simla are such as to render unnecessary any compensation for living there.

I submit that on these grounds the allowance should be withdrawn during the period of absence from Calcutta.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT ALLOWANCES.

30. In the Public Works Department there are two classes of allowances coming under the general term of Presidency allowance, which are distinguished as Presidency house-rent and Presidency allowance.

31. Presidency house-rent is drawn by military officers on the scale laid down by the military rules (see paragraph 3), and by Civilians on a special scale as detailed below, which is considerably lower on the whole than the military scale :—

	Rs.
Chief Engineers, 2nd and 3rd classes	60
Superintending Engineers	
Examiners, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd classes	
Executive Engineers	45
Examiners, 4th class	
Deputy Examiners, 1st grade	
Assistant Engineers, 1st grade	30
Deputy Examiners, 2nd „	
Assistant Engineers, 2nd and 3rd grades, and Apprentices	20
„ Examiners, 1st and 2nd „ „	
Sub-Engineers	
Accountants, 1st and 2nd grades	
Supervisors and Overseers	10
Accountants, 3rd and 4th grades	

32. The proposals made by the Finance Committee in respect of the house-rent were :—

(1) that military officers should draw it on the Civilian scale ;

(2) that it should not be given at hill stations.

33. As regards these two proposals, the Public Works Department remarks that the saving caused by (1) would be Rs. 2,320 and by (2) Rs. 2,360, making a total of only Rs. 4,680 ; and they add—

> "After a careful consideration of the Committee's Note, this Department is of opinion that the small saving which would be effected by the adoption of the proposals contained in paragraph 9 is not commensurate with the irritation that would be caused."

34. This reply virtually admits that the Finance Committee's proposals are in principle unassailable ; the only grounds urged for their rejection are that the amount saved will be small, and that irritation will be caused by their adoption.

35. In calculating the saving the Public Works Department has taken account only of Calcutta and Simla, and not of Bombay and Madras. The Finance Committee estimated the saving at Rs. 3,500 and Rs. 4,000, and the whole saving would certainly not be less than this ; for the allowances even at Calcutta might often be larger than their present figure as given by the Public Works Department. I observe, for instance, that in the case of Simla no allowance for the Deputy Accountant-General is shown in the account.

36. The difference between the civil and military scales is considerable in many of the rates, amounting to as much as Rs. 65 or even Rs. 80 a month in some instances. The military scale of house-rent, though termed Presidency house-rent, was originally framed (see paragraph 8) to compensate not merely for the higher rate of rent, but for the generally greater expense of living at the Presidency. A military officer who draws the military scale of house-rent and the special additional scale of Presidency allowance (which is given to all Public Works officers, military and civil alike, below Executive Engineer, 1st grade) draws compensation twice over. These are, I submit, sufficiently weighty reasons to justify the incurring of the irritation which would be caused by the proposed change.

37. The question of the withdrawal of the house-rent at hill stations does not apply to the Public Works Department alone. It has a much wider application ; and the fact that the saving in that Department is small can have but little bearing on the decision of the general question. The saving in other Departments by the withdrawal of the house-rent will be considerable. It need only be noted here that no special ground is put forward for their continuance in the Public Works Department. And for the general reasons urged in dealing with the military house-rent, the concession should, it is submitted, be withdrawn here also.

38. Presidency allowance, as distinguished from house-rent, is drawn at Calcutta and Madras at the following scale :—

	Rs.
Executive Engineers, below the 1st grade (pay Rs. 600 to Rs. 800)	100
Examiners, 4th class, 2nd and 3rd grades („ „ 650 to „ 800)	
Deputy Examiners, 1st grade (pay Rs. 550)	
Assistant Engineers (pay Rs. 250 to Rs. 500)	50
Deputy Examiners, 2nd grade (pay Rs. 450)	
Assistant „ (pay Rs. 250 and Rs. 350	
Upper Subordinates („ „ 85 to „ 250)	
Accountants, 2nd and 3rd grades (pay Rs. 160 to Rs. 340)	
Accountants, 4th grade (pay Rs. 80 to Rs. 150)	30
Accountants, 1st grade, whose salaries are less than Rs. 400 (pay of grade Rs. 350 to Rs. 450)	Difference between salary and Rs. 400.

At Bombay and Aden a different scale is in force for the Engineer Branch, as detailed below :—

Engineers (Assistant and Executive) below 1st grade Executive	Draw the pay of the next higher grade.
Upper Subordinates below 1st grade Sub-Engineer	
Lower „ „ 1st „	

But officers of the Accounts and Railway Branch draw at Bombay on the same scale as at Calcutta and Madras.

On the whole the special Bombay scale is higher ; it is also anomalous (as pointed out in paragraph 12 of the Committee's Note) because the amount of the allowance is determined by the accident of a greater or less difference between the pay of the consecutive grades. In some instances also officers are refused allowances at Bombay when they would be entitled to them at Calcutta, and *vice versâ*.

39. The Committee's proposals were :—

(1) to assimilate the Bombay and Aden rate to the Calcutta rate ;

(2) to abolish the allowance in Madras.

40. The Public Works Department presumes that these points will be dealt with by the Governments of Bombay and Madras ; but it has not apparently been referred to them, as probably the Finance Department thought it would, and as has been done in other similar cases by other Departments.

The Public Works Department adds that it agrees in the desirability of the first proposal.

As regards the second proposal, it gives the following history of the allowance, but expresses no opinion as to its abolition :—

> "When the Presidency allowance was originally established, the Madras Government elected not to adopt it, but sanctioned instead a conveyance allowance of Rs. 50 to its officers at the Presidency and Bangalore. This went on till 1881, when a new Code of Regulations for the Public Works Department was issued by the Madras Government, in which the Calcutta allowances were embodied."

41. The difference in the Bombay rates is thus explained by the Finance Committee :—

> "These Bombay rules are the same as those which were in force for the Bengal Presidency from 1864 to 1869 ; but when they were modified in 1869, the change was not communicated to Bombay. There seems to be no other reason than this accident for the difference between the two Presidencies."

It will probably smooth matters if the Bombay Government be consulted before any change is introduced ; but there can be little doubt that the Calcutta scale should be extended to Bombay.

42. The ground for the second proposal is thus stated by the Finance Committee :—

> "We have satisfied ourselves that the cost of living in Madras (apart from that of house-rent) is not necessarily greater than that of living in the mofussil."

There can be little doubt that this is the case. In some Departments in which allowances are granted in Bombay and Calcutta, no allowances whatever are given for residence in Madras : see, for instance, the allowances granted in the Postal Department. This view has also been recently affirmed by the Madras Government, which, with reference to the enquiries of the Finance Committee regarding local allowances, decided that the special allowances granted to Survey officers for residence at Madras were not necessary, and directed their discontinuance with effect from the 1st April 1887. This decision indeed seems to go much further than the proposal of the Finance Committee, for the allowances in question were the only extra allowances granted to the Survey officers, who thus receive the same salary at Madras as elsewhere in the Presidency. The Finance Committee left the house-rent allowances at Madras untouched. It will be necessary, I suppose, to make a reference to Madras before deciding even to withdraw the Presidency allowance ; but perhaps the reference might go beyond this, and enquire, with reference to the above decision, whether Presidency allowances of all kinds (Military and Public Works house-rent, &c.) might not also be withdrawn. Special allowances were not granted in the Military Department for residence at Madras till 1863, and the grounds on which this concession was extended to Madras are not given in the Secretaries' Report (see quotation in paragraph 8 of this Note). The Public Works Department followed the rules of the Military Department in granting the same allowances for Madras as for Calcutta.

POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

43. The proposals of the Finance Committee regarding the Postal Department were—

(1) that the allowance of the Postmasters General, Bengal and Bombay, should be cut down from Rs. 200 to Rs. 125, the highest rate allowed in any other Department ;

(2) that with regard to each of the following posts, as the appointment implies a residence in Calcutta or Bombay, and the extra expense of house-rent is one of the incidents of the appointment, the allowance should be retrenched, unless it could be shown by the Department that the pay of the office was fixed at the same time as or after the grant of Presidency allowance was decided on, in which case it might be urged that the allowance was treated as part of the pay :—

	Rs.
1. Assistant Director General, Calcutta (and Simla) .	200
2. Ditto, Railway Mail Service, Calcutta (and Simla) .	200
3. Ditto Foreign Post, Calcutta (and Simla)	100
4. Secretary to Director General, Calcutta (and Simla)	100
5. Comptroller, Calcutta	200
6. Deputy Comptroller, Calcutta	200
7. Deputy Postmaster, Calcutta (and Bombay) . .	100
8. Assistant Postmaster, Calcutta	50
9. Ditto, Bombay	100

(3) that all the allowances should be withdrawn at Simla.

44. As regards the first point, the Director General refers to a report received from the Postmaster General, Bengal, whose arguments against the proposed reduction may be summarised as follows :—

(i) The local allowance may rightly, to quote the Committee's own words regarding the Accountants General of Calcutta and Bengal, be held "to compensate for the heavier work and greater responsibility as well as for the increased cost of living."

(ii) The house-rent having been fixed at the same time as the pay should be considered as part of the salary, and should not be held liable to reduction any more than to abolition.

(iii) The amount of the allowance is not excessive, having regard to the difference between the house-rent and cost of living at Calcutta and at mofussil stations. In 1878 the Postmaster General, Bengal, gave his opinion that the allowance should not in fairness be less than Rs. 300 per mensem.

(iv) It is incorrect to say that Rs. 125 is the highest allowance given in any other Department, as the following allowances mentioned by the Committee are higher :—

	Rs.
Accountants General, Bombay and Bengal . .	250
Collector of Bombay	200
Collector of Customs, Bombay	200

The Chairman of the Corporation of Calcutta is granted by the Municipality an allowance of Rs. 500 for house-rent.

(v) It is unreasonable to cut down such allowances in one Department, because they exceed the scale given in another Department, in which the allowance is given under different circumstances and it is attached to a different scale of pay. It would be as reasonable to level up the lower to the highest scale.

45. The Director General does not refer to arguments (iii) to (v) of the preceding paragraph in his own letter, but supports arguments (i) and (ii) in the following terms :—

> "There can be no question that the duties and responsibilities of the Postmaster General in Calcutta and Bombay are greater than those of the other Postmasters General, and that this additional labour might fairly be compensated by special allowances, as in the case of the Accountants General at those two Presidency towns. A reference to the history of this allowance shows that in the year 1867, Mr. Monteath, when proposing a revision in the rates of pay given to the Postmasters General, advised that—
>
> 'a local or house-rent allowance of Rs. 200 should be attached to each of the Postmaster Generalships of Bengal and Bombay in recognition of the confessedly greater expense of living in Calcutta and Bombay.'
>
> "He adds that—
>
> 'Without some such local allowance the Postmaster Generalships of these two important circles (Bengal and Bombay) will always be comparatively worse paid than the corresponding officers in other parts of India.'
>
> "The Government fully endorsed Mr. Monteath's recommendations, and the allowances in question were sanctioned.
>
> "As contended, therefore, by Mr. Kisch, these allowances, having been fixed at the same time as the pay, should, according to the Committee's own principles, be treated as part of the pay.
>
> "I would strongly deprecate any reduction in these allowances."

46. The quotation from Mr. Monteath's proposals, given by the Director General, seems to dispose of the suggestion that the allowance was given to compensate for heavier work ; the only reason mentioned at the time was "the confessedly greater expense of living."

The allowance must, therefore, I think, be taken, as its name indicates, as a house-rent allowance and nothing more.

47. It appears proper, therefore, to consider the amount of the allowance with reference to the special grounds on which it was granted.

The fact that the allowance was granted at the same time as the pay does not, as it seems to me, estop this consideration. The Committee thought that this fact would justify the grant of an allowance, even where, on the general principles which it laid down, such an allowance would not be ordinarily admissible; but the question of the proper amount of such allowance seems distinct from the question of its admissibility; and it seems to me that at whatever time the allowance may have been granted, the Government has at any time a right to consider whether its amount is excessive, having regard to the special purposes for which it is given; and that such consideration is eminently proper when Government is making a general enquiry into all local allowances granted on similar grounds to those on which Presidency allowances are given.

48. In deciding this question, it appears reasonable to compare the allowances in one Department with those granted in other Departments under similar circumstances. In such cases it seems to me more reasonable to assume that the lower scales are sufficient than that the higher scales are insufficient, especially when the lower scales apply to very numerous classes of officers and to several Departments, while the higher apply to a few officers only in a single Department.

49. The allowances of the Accountants General of Bengal and Bombay and of the Collector of Bombay and the Collector of Customs (lately amalgamated) are not similar to those granted to the Postmasters General; the former are granted partly, at any rate, as compensation for heavier work; and the latter because they are or were special appointments, out of the ordinary run of Collectorships in Bombay, which it was found expedient to grade with the ordinary appointments, giving extra remuneration in the shape of a local allowance. The grant to the Chairman of the Calcutta Corporation is irrelevant because it is not a Government grant, and because it is given to meet the whole charge for rent, and not merely to compensate for the difference between the charge for rent at Calcutta and elsewhere.

50. The specially high rate granted to the Postmasters General is objectionable as raising the standard for the Department generally. There can be little doubt that these allowances to the Postmasters General have formed the precedent for, and led to the grant of, the various other allowances of Rs. 200 a month which are quoted in paragraph 43 (2) of this Note.

51. Taking house-rent and Presidency allowance together, the highest Presidency allowance that could be drawn would be that of an Executive Engineer of the 2nd grade, who would draw on both accounts together Rs. 145. But the higher officers in the Public Works Department would draw much smaller allowances. The allowance of Rs. 125 a month drawn by the higher military officers under the title of house-rent (though that allowance also was granted on account of the generally higher cost of living at the Presidency) seems to correspond much more closely than any other with the allowance granted to these Postmasters General, and I therefore submit that this lower scale of allowance should be granted to them as proposed by the Finance Committee.

52. Of the various allowances mentioned in paragraph 43 (2), the Director General shows that all are admissible on the ground that they were granted at the time when the appointment either was created or was transferred to Calcutta, or had additional work attached to it. It seems unnecessary to go into details regarding each appointment. The allowances may be held to be admissible.

53. But, for the reasons already stated, I think that the allowances of Rs. 200 should in every case be reduced to Rs. 125 for future incumbents. There can be little doubt that they were fixed on the precedent afforded by the allowances of the Postmasters General, and they seem reducible on the grounds urged with reference to those allowances.

54. The only allowances that need be referred to in detail are those of the Comptroller and the Deputy and Assistant Postmasters, Bombay.

55. With reference to the Comptroller, the Director General says:—

> "In the year 1877, the Government was pleased to reduce the maximum pay of the Comptroller, Post Offices, from Rs. 1,400 to Rs. 1,200, with the object of making a saving, to be utilised in giving a house-rent allowance of Rs. 200 per mensem to the appointment. Should the Government now deem it undesirable to continue this house-rent, the former maximum pay of the appointment can be reverted to."

A reference to the proceedings shows that the above statement does not give a correct view of the effect of the alteration which was carried out in 1877. The maximum pay of the Comptroller was indeed reduced by Rs. 200, and this amount was utilised in giving a house-rent of that amount; but this was not the only change that was effected, and the net result of the arrangement was a considerable increase of cost. The pay had previously been Rs. 800 rising to Rs. 1,400 by 12 yearly increments of Rs. 50; the new pay was fixed at Rs. 800 rising to Rs. 1,200 by 5 yearly increments of Rs. 80. It was thought at the time by the Director General that the effect of the change was to cause a net increase of Rs. 100 a month; but this was on the erroneous assumption that the mean between the maximum and minimum represented the value of the appointment without regard to the amount and number of the increments. As a matter of fact, the new pay, even without the house-rent allowance, is slightly more valuable than the old. It is only after 13½ years' service that the old pay would give an average value higher than the new, as is clear from the figures given in the margin. At the end of the thirteenth year, the average value, or the average cost, of the new pay is a little in excess of the old, and at some stages of service the excess value of the new scale amounts to as much as Rs. 75 a month on the average. Considering the nature of the appointment and the period in a man's service when he is likely to obtain it permanently, it is clear that, as a general rule, the new pay is more valuable than the old. The house-rent was therefore in this case, as in the others, a clear addition to pay; and there can be no claim to have the old maximum restored on the withdrawal of the house-rent save on the condition that the old periods of increment are also restored. To this there would be no objection, as the result would be really to diminish the cost apart altogether from the house-rent; but the Comptroller would be ill-advised to elect this in preference to having his house-rent reduced to Rs. 125.

	Old pay. Rs.	New pay. Rs.
1 . . .	800	800
2 . . .	850	880
3 . . .	900	960
4 . . .	950	1,040
5 . . .	1,000	1,120
6 . . .	1,050	1,200
7 . . .	1,100	1,200
8 . . .	1,150	1,200
9 . . .	1,200	1,200
10 . . .	1,250	1,200
11 . . .	1,300	1,200
12 . . .	1,350	1,200
13 . . .	1,400	1,200
	14,300	14,400
Average .	1,100	$1,107\frac{9}{13}$

56. The amount of allowance granted to the Deputy and Assistant Postmasters, Bombay and Calcutta, seems large, compared with their pay.

As regards Calcutta, the allowances were fixed at the same time as the pay.

In Bombay the allowance was granted to the Deputy Postmaster "as an addition to pay in the shape of house-rent * * to compensate him for the additional work and responsibility" thrown on him through the new foreign parcel business.

The Assistant Postmaster, Bombay, it is stated—

> "had free quarters in the Post Office to which he was entitled by the practice of the Department. Owing to demands for space, he was deprived of these free quarters, instead of which he was given an allowance of Rs. 100 per mensem."

I do not think it is necessary to interfere with the amount of any of these allowances save that granted to the Assistant Postmaster, Bombay. It has always been the practice to give the same Presidency allowances at Bombay and Calcutta; and it introduces an awkward precedent to grant a larger allowance to the officer at Bombay in this case.

57. The last question is that of discontinuing the allowances at Simla.

For the general reasons which have been urged in the case of the Military allowances, I do not think that these Postal allowances should be continued.

It is clear that all of them are something more in reality than mere house-rent allowances; and it must be remembered that in the Public Works Department, where the house-rent and Presidency allowance are granted separately, the latter have not been drawn at Simla, but only the house-rent, which is comparatively very small. The argument is, therefore, in some degree stronger against the Postal allowances than against the Public Works Department allowances.

The Director General endeavours to draw a distinction between two of the cases and the rest. He urges that the allowances to the Assistant Director General of the Post Office and to the Secretary to the Director-General were granted as "local allowances" and not as Presidency allowances, and that they were expressly sanctioned "owing to the expense of living in Calcutta and Simla."

I do not think, however, that the distinction will hold good. It must be borne in mind that when the orders in these cases were passed, an allowance granted for Calcutta was drawn at Simla. The addition of the words "at Simla" was therefore mere surplusage, and does not, I think, alter the character of these two allowances.

58. In concluding the remarks on the Postal allowances, the following observations of the Director General must be brought prominently to the notice of Government. He says :—

> "It will be seen that I am not able to support any of the recommendations of the Committee for the abolition or reduction of these special allowances. The Post Office in India is administered with an economy which amounts almost to parsimony; and, having regard to the duties and responsibilities involved, almost every post is underpaid. The allowances referred to cannot be retrenched or diminished without injustice to the individuals concerned and injury to the Department."

59. This, as the view of the head of the Department, is entitled to the utmost consideration. Of the economy with which the Department is administered generally there can be no question; but this general argument cannot be allowed to bar an enquiry into individual cases in which there may appear to be extravagance. The appointments to which these allowances are attached are just those in which economy seems least to have been studied. No question of "duties or responsibilities" is involved in these allowances; they are not charge allowances given for extra or important duties, but local allowances given for the special expensiveness of living in certain localities. It would create a very awkward precedent either to maintain the allowances for residence at Calcutta at an abnormally high rate, as compared with other Departments, or to permit them to be drawn at Simla when they are withdrawn from all other Departments serving at that place. It is not proposed in the preceding remarks to withdraw entirely any of these allowances. The assertion that they cannot be "diminished without injustice to the individuals concerned and injury to the Department" must be allowed the weight to which it is entitled as the expression of the view of the responsible head of the Department; but I submit that it is not supported by the remarks which precede it, or by a consideration of the allowances granted on similar grounds in other Departments.

TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

60. The Finance Committee did not suggest any alteration in the allowances granted in this Department.

But a communication was received last year from the Public Works Department advocating the extension to the Telegraph Department of the Public Works rules in respect of Presidency house-rent and allowance, and special allowances in other localities, such as Burma and Assam. The consideration of this question was deferred, pending the result of the enquiry which had been instituted into local allowances generally. A note on local allowances, other than Presidency allowances, is being separately submitted; it was recently promised that the question of the extension of the Presidency house and allowance rules should be taken up in connection with this case.

61. This is by no means the first occasion on which this extension has been advocated. The first application was made in 1869, very shortly after the Public Works Department rules had been promulgated; and other applications have been made from time to time since then.

They have been refused on various grounds, such as the recent improvement of the pay generally throughout the Department, the sufficiency of the pay as it stood to attract suitable candidates for employments, the state of deficit in the Telegraph Department, and the objectionable character of such allowances generally.

62. The last application, dated November 1885, was submitted with special reference to the case of a Superintendent in Assam; but the Director General, after stating that transfer to Assam was looked on as a grievance, if not an absolute punishment, adds :—

> "The same remark applies in great measure to service in British Burma and in Presidency towns, and I would strongly urge the policy, no less than the equity, of conceding to Telegraph officers the privileges enjoyed by officers in the Public Works Department of corresponding rank while serving in these special localities."

63. The only grounds urged in the Public Works notes as affecting Presidency allowances are—

(1) the cost of living is as high for Telegraph as for Public Works officers;

(2) the Telegraph Department is nearer solvency now than it was when the previous refusals were made.

64. In the letter of the Superintendent in Assam, it is also urged that—

> "it is admitted that officers of this Department have the same rights and privileges as are enjoyed by Public Works officers; the superior grades of both services have for some years been similarly recruited from England, and all furlough and pension rules granted to the one Department are extended to the other."

65. The Hon'ble Member in the Public Works Department remarked :—

> "The question of Presidency allowances stands on a different footing from Assam and Burma allowances, and seems to suffer by being mixed up with them. There can be no question of the extra cost of living at the Presidency towns."

And again—

> "I am in favour of these allowances, but I think the case for Presidency allowances distinct from the others, and certainly unanswerable. The grounds on which previous refusals have been based seem to me to a great extent irrelevant as well as antiquated."

66. The above remarks to some extent seem to proceed on the assumption that local allowances are absolutely denied in the Telegraph Department. But this is not the case; some allowances are now granted to Telegraph officers at the Presidency towns (see paragraph 19 of Finance Committee's Note). And the Finance Committee admitted (see paragraph 20) that a Presidency allowance was permissible in their case.

67. The question, therefore, is not whether the allowances should be granted at all, but whether the allowances now granted in the Telegraph Department should be assimilated to those granted in the Public Works Department.

68. If one scale of Presidency allowance were in force for all the other Departments, there could be no reasonable question about applying it to the Telegraph Department. But the rules and rates vary for each Department, and the Finance Committee did not propose to assimilate them.

The Telegraph Department rates, are however, much lower than those in force in any other Department; and though there is no reason *a priori* for levelling up one set of allowances more than levelling down another, yet there can be, I think, but little doubt that the Telegraph allowances do not fairly represent the extra cost of living at Calcutta or Bombay. Taking into consideration the constitution of the Department, the rates of pay in force, and the facts mentioned in the quotation in paragraph 64, it seems to me that the Public Works Department most closely corresponds to the Telegraph Department, and that the rules of the former would most suitably be applied to the latter. The rates prescribed in that Department for Calcutta seem to have been framed with a reasonable regard to the position and status of the officers, and rates proportioned to those of the Military Department would not, on the whole, cost much less, though they would give more to the higher grade officers and less to the lower.

69. I would, therefore, extend to Telegraph Department officers in Calcutta and Bombay the Public Works Presidency allowances now admissible in Calcutta.

I do not think it is necessary to extend the rules to Madras (see paragraph 42); nor has this generally been asked for in previous applications.

It should be understood that the Telegraph Department gives up the 11 special allowances now assignable to Assistant Superintendents if this concession is made.

No officer above the grade of Superintendent, 3rd grade, should get the Presidency allowance as distinguished from the house-rent.

None of these allowance of any description should be drawn at Simla.

70. The extra cost, according to the tables prepared by the Examiner of Telegraph Accounts, would appear to be Rs. 1,800 a month, or Rs. 21,600 a year, as below :—

		Rs.
Cost of proposed allowances		3,460
Deduct—	Rs.	
Cost of existing allowances	1,110	
Eleven special allowances	550	
		1,660
Total		1,800

But this includes on account of Madras Rs. 520, and house-rent allowances for the Deputy Director and the Directors of Traffic and Construction amounting to Rs. 180. These last seem barred by the principle laid down by the Committee that allowances are not admissible for special appointments tenable only at the Presidency. The Directors of Traffic and Construction, it is true, now draw allowances of Rs. 50; but these should be given up, as they would not be admissible to similar officers in the Public Works Department, the rules of which, if applied so as to increase some allowances, must also be applied to reduce or abolish others. For instance, the Under Secretary in the Public Works Department, whose pay is fixed and does not merely depend on his grade in the Department, draws no house-rent. Further, there are two conveyance allowances (of Rs. 50 each) granted to Telegraph officers at Calcutta and Bombay on the ground that they were not entitled to Presidency allowances; these will necessarily lapse if the Public Works rules are extended to the Telegraph Department. Deducting the allowances mentioned (520 + 180 +100=800), the extra cost would be only Rs. 1,000 a month, or Rs. 12,000 a year. And probably this would be reduced by the rule forbidding the house-rent, &c., to be drawn at Simla.

SURVEY DEPARTMENT.

71. In the Survey Department, the Finance Committee proposed—

(1) the reduction of the allowance for an Assistant Superintendent from Rs. 100 to Rs. 60, the amount allowed to a Deputy Superintendent.

(2) the abolition of the house-rent allowances paid to photographers and zincographers and engravers in the Head Office.

72. As regards (1), the Surveyor General points out that the allowance is based on that granted to corresponding officers in the Public Works Department, who, however, also receive Rs. 45 for house-rent in addition; and the Revenue and Agricultural Department advocates the continuance of the allowance. The Assistant Superintendents correspond with Executive Engineers below the 1st grade in the Public Works Department, who receive higher allowances than those above them; and unless this principle is objected to in the Public Works Department, it can hardly be objected to here. The allowance may remain.

It may be observed here that the Madras Government has abolished the similar allowances admissible to Deputy and Assistant Superintendents at that Presidency town.

73. As regards the photographers and zincographers, it is pointed out that the house-rent was fixed at the same time as, and must therefore be reckoned as part of, their pay. It need not therefore be interfered with.

The house-rent for engravers has already been abolished as regards future incumbents. It was continued, on the revision of pay in 1880, to the then existing incumbents till they reached the next higher grade but one.

OTHER CIVIL DEPARTMENTS.

74. The Finance Committee did not object to any of these allowances, and no remarks are therefore required.

~~75. In separate Notes the~~ Finance Committee made some proposals about Presidency allowances in a few special Departments; but these have been left for disposal with the Notes in which they were made. For instance, in the Note on Ecclesiastical charges, it was proposed to reduce the Presidency house-rent of Chaplains; and in the Note on the Geological Survey Department, the reduction of the Curator's house-rent was suggested. In the latter case it has been settled, in communication with the Revenue and Agricultural Department, that the decision shall follow the general decision in this case.

GENERAL SUMMARY.

76. The proposals made in this Note are summed up below :—

(1) Presidency house-rent to be withdrawn from medical officers in civil employ who are allowed the privilege of private practice (paragraph 12).

(2) Presidency allowances of all kinds to be withdrawn from officers of all Departments at the Hills (paragraphs 29, 37, 57).

(3) Military officers in the Public Works Department to draw Presidency house-rent on the civil scale (paragraph 36).

(4) The rates of Presidency allowance in the Public Works Department at Bombay and Aden to be assimilated to the Calcutta rate (paragraph 41).

(5) Presidency allowance in the Public Works Department to be withdrawn at Madras (paragraph 42).

(6) The question whether Presidency house-rent (Military and Public Works) may be also withdrawn at Madras to be raised (paragraph 42).

(7) The Presidency house-rent of Postal officials, when in excess of Rs. 125, to be cut down to that figure (paragraphs 51 and 53).

(8) The Public Works Department rules for Presidency house-rent and allowance to be extended to Telegraph officers at Calcutta and Bombay (paragraph 69).

Suggestions (4), (5) and (6) must apparently be referrred to the Bombay and Madras Governments respectively, before a final decision is come to.

S. J.,—9—6—87.

Government of India Central Printing Office No. 1267, P. W. D.—13-3-88—40.

Read the following letter from

1/p

No. 598 G.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
IN THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Calcutta, the 10th March 1888.

SIR,

In forwarding herewith copy of a note by the Finance Committe on the subject of Presidency allowance and house-rent, I am directed to state that the Government of India agrees with the Finance Committee in considering that Presidency allowance (not house-rent) should be abolished at Madras.

+ Carriage allowance was given 2 years before

2. It is observed that when Presidency allowance was originally sanctioned, the Government of Madras was informed that it could adopt the rule or not according to its option. Apparently the rule was not adopted, but ×in lieu of the allowance, a conveyance allowance of Rs. 50 a month was sanctioned for Officers employed at the Presidency Town, and for Executive and Assistant Engineers at Bangalore. This conveyance allowance at Madras seems to have continued up to 1881,* when the Madras Code of Regulations of that year was issued in which the scale of Calcutta Presidency allowance was embodied. Under the circumstances, it would appear that the allowance was not originally considered essential, and this quite agrees with the conclusion arrived at by the Finance Committee.

*: 1879

3. I am, therefore, to enquire whether His Excellency the Governor will offer any objection to the allowance being abolished, with effect from the 1st April 1888.

4. An early reply is requested.

I have the honour to be,
SIR,
Your most obedient Servant,

R W B Pemberton
Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to the Government of India.

Documents accompanying.
Finance Committee's note referred to.

Government of India Central Printing Office,—No. 664 P. W. D.—10-3-88—51.

52 : 10.11.70.
1263 w 1.5.79.
1256 w 29.4.79.
4431 w 21.11.78
1319. 26.5.76
2114.A. 24.7.75
3335. 25.11.74
2224 : 19.9.72
2502. 30.7.69
2028. 22.6.69
1224 : 14.4.69
315. 1.2.69.
3319. 25.10.67
3667 : 17.11.66.
3314 : 18.10.66
2647. 22.8.66
2646 : 22.8.66.
2526 : 10.8.66
1555. 15.5.66
1474 : 7.5.66.
7. 3.1.66.
6. 3.1.66.
3136 : 20.10.65.
2866 : 27.9.65.
2781. 20.9.65
2458. 23.8.65
2161. 27.7.65
1969. 12.7.65.
1968. 12.7.65
1867. 4.7.65
1786. 27.6.65
1633. 13.6.65
530. 22.2.64
100. 12.1.64
3603. 7.12.63
3357. 18.11.63
1599 18.6.63
1492 w 30.5.79

367 (Finl) 10.1.87
206 (Rev) 17.2.80.
1947-A (Rev) 27.9.79
1947 (Rev) 27.9.79
2086 (Finl) 19.9.83
1107 (Finl) 17.10.87
Finl C. No. 426 of 88
" nos 181-2 of 3/1/83

Files sent to General Records of 25/6/88

O.L.S 20/15
H.M. (7.0) 5.4.88. H.M. 14.4.88. M 4/5/88

C.W. No. 2621

6
4.S.C

R/19.3.88

E.1

(4.S.C)

C. No 2621

RK

See para 2 of India's letter. The reason why the rule was not adopted at the time must be ascertained. The file put up does not show.

R.S.
21-III-88

To
Supdt Genl Record Depts
Can you please put up the orders wanted. C. No. 2621 & file herewith.

D.P.
21.3.88

The file has been completed.
The Presy. allowce refd to in para 2 of India's letter appears to be the allowce alluded to in this No 1256 of 29 April 1879 and having been passed in Bengal from the year 1865.
The reason why the Presy allowce was not adopted in this Presy appears to be given in G.O. No. 52 this of 10 Novr 1870 passed on the proposal of the Contr. P.W. Accts to introduce it in this Presy.
The conveyance allowce of Rs 50 for officers at the Presy Town & for Executive & Asstt Engrs at Bangalore referred to in the current has been
... separately.

in force since 1863 or 2 years previous to sanction of the Presy. Allowce. (vide para 2 of letter to India of 3 Jany 1866 No. 7) & apparently therefore, it was not granted in lieu of Presy allowce. as stated by the G. I..

CD
22/3

W

The letter to the Govt. of India so far as regards Presidency allowance to Public Works officers is submitted, together with the accompanying papers just received from the Financial Dept: on the subject of the local allowances withdrawn from officers of the Survey Dept:

Items 149 & 150 refer to these allowances. The order of Govt. in the Financial Dept No. 36 d/10th Jany. 57 merely says. "The Government are not prepared to continue these allowances, which will accordingly be abolished with effect from the 1st April next".

The allowances were taken up in the Financial Dept in connection with a lengthy statement of other allowances, and it is possible that they did receive that critical scrutiny which they would have got had they come up separately. If the matter is now to be reconsidered as suggested by the Hon. Member, it should apparently be taken up in the Financial Dept. who might see our draft letter to India. The Hon. Member would perhaps decide the course to be adopted.

A. S.
13. IV. 88.

No reasons are given for the abolition of Presidency allowance to Survey officers. It seems to me there is every reason why Survey officers like P.W. officers should receive addl. pay if stationed in Madras.

J. E.
14/4/88

---

that in 1865 or 1870 of

Madras.
March 29. 88.

My dear Col. [illegible].

Baddeley tells me that the Govt. of India, on the suggestion of the Finance Committee, have proposed the abolition of "presidency allowance" in Madras, though not in Bombay or Calcutta, on the ground that living in Madras is less that in 1865 or 1870 of

---

expensive than in the two other towns. As, when my office moves into Madras, I shall be affected by the proposed reduction will you kindly allow me to write a few words on the subject. My excuse for doing so is that I am well acquainted with Calcutta & with the cost of living there, & also to some extent with Bombay, & have considerable experience of the cost of living in Madras, & am thus qualified to express an opinion regarding the relative expenses of living. And I have no hesitation in saying not only that living in Madras, for an officer of the P.W.D below the rank of Ex. Eng 1st grade, is not cheaper than living in Calcutta, but that Madras is the dearer place of the two. In Calcutta everyone who is not someone lives that in 1865 or 1870 it

in a boarding-house, where the cost for a bachelor is about $\overset{150-}{180}$ Rs a month, & for a married couple about Rs 250 – 300. A carriage is not a necessity because good hire-carriages are always available, & a brougham can be taken for the day when required, whereas in Madras a carriage costing Rs 60–75 a month is a necessity. The cheapest way to live in Madras is in a "chummery". I have had experience of several, &

with house-rent & servants, & excluding entertainments & wines, the cost for three comes to not less than from Rs $\overset{150-}{180}$ a head. Living at the Club costs Rs 200 a month or more. I shd then put the unavoidable cost of living in Madras for a bachelor at Rs $\overset{225-}{250}$ a month (i.e. for food, lodging, & carriage) & in Calcutta at Rs 180 to 210 (allowing 1 R a day for carriage hire). And I take it that the same is true as regards Bombay. Many men live permanently in hotels there, & pay 8 annas for an excellent carriage to drive to office. Other items, such as riding-horses, wine, & other luxuries cost the same in all three. For a married couple the relative difference w^{d} be still more marked, for in Madras they must have a house of their own whereas in Calcutta they can be very comfortable in a boarding-house.

But though I think we in Madras can meet the "relative cost argument" with a direct negative, yet it also strikes me that the argument is an unsound one. I have always understood that Presidency All^{ce} is given to compensate for the extra cost of living at head-quarters as compared with the mofussil. If then life in Madras is more expensive than life at Vellore, or Salem, or Tanjore — & no one will deny that it is — then that constitutes a claim to Presidency All^{ce}. Its abolition w^{d} be felt very severely by those who are now entitled to draw it, & I hope it may not be sanctioned. I trust you will not think I have taken a liberty in writing to you on the subject.

— I am applying for 8 weeks priv. leave from May 1st. If I am granted it, I think Ratnasabapathi Pillai wd manage the Dist. very well during my absence, unless there is some other arrangement you wd prefer.

Yours sincerely
C. Vincent

experience

---

that in 1865 or 1870 it was possible to live as cheap in Madras as in the Mofussil; but in 1879 the Madras Govt decided that living in Madras involved more expense than in an upcountry station; and sanctioned Presidency allowance accordingly.

The point at issue therefore is; at the present time is it possible to live as cheap in Madras as up country.

I will not compare the cost of living in 1879 with that in 1888, as every one knows that the expense is greater now than it was ~~then~~ — even neglecting the loss by exchange; but to put the matter fairly I am convinced that in Calcutta & Bombay the cost of living has diminished as compared with out stations, while in Madras, the change has been the other way.

I would therefore urge that because the allowance was not considered essential in the years 1865 to 1879, is no argument at all why it is not necessary at the present time; and I can see no reason why the officers of the Madras PWD should be placed in a far worse position than their confrères in Calcutta & Bombay.

23.3.88

.S 20/IV
(7.0) 5.4.88. H.M. 14.4.88. M4

to keep down as much as possible the cost of the PW establishments, on account of the state of the assignments.

and from the general tenor of the order, it does not seem that the comparative cost of living in Calcutta Bombay & Madras had been very carefully considered -

However in 1879 the Madras Govt in G O No 1263 W of 1st May sanctioned Presidency allowance, ~~and~~ in lieu of carriage allowance, in the case of officers who were in receipt of the latter.

Now I would ask, when the question is one of cost of living, is it reasonable or fair; to go further back than the date on which the allowance was originally sanctioned.

I am quite ready to admit conclusions as to the present cost of living, upon facts that occurred 23 years ago.

It is certain that 23 years ago living in the town of Madras was much cheaper than it is at present -

The Govt of India state ~~that~~ carriage allowance of 50 ~~Rs~~ was granted in lieu of Presidency allowance, this statement is not correct, as the carriage allowance was in force from July 1863 (two years before Presidency allowance was sanctioned by the Govt of India) vide Letter No 7 of 3rd Jan 1866 to the Govt of India PWD.

In G O No 52 dated 10th Nov 1870 the Govt of Madras refused to sanction Presidency allowance, ~~and~~ but the order clearly shows ~~that~~ at the time in question it was necessary

PWC No 2621.

IV

I have put up a note in which I think I have clearly shown that the arguments of the Finance Committee regarding the abolition of Presidency allowance in Madras, while it is still to be drawn ~~&~~ in Calcutta & Bombay, are unsound; and I propose now to consider the arguments of the Govt of India in their letter No 598 G of 10th March 1888

The Govt of India argue that because the rate was not originally adopted in Madras, it cannot be necessary now. Presidency allowance was originally sanctioned in Calcutta & Bombay in 1865 – twenty three years ago, and it is not reasonable to have

---

Abolition of Presidency allowance to officers of the Madras P.W.D.

I The Finance Committee recommend ~~that~~ Presidency allowance be abolished in Madras, while in Calcutta & Bombay it shall still be drawn – at the present ~~Madras~~ Calcutta rates.

II In Bombay it ~~was formerly~~ is now the practice to allow the pay of the next higher grade to officers of the PWD; in place of this, the Committee recommend the issue of Presidency allowance.

III ~~The~~ grounds on which the Committee recommend the abolition of the allowance in Madras are "that they have satisfied themselves that the cost of living in Madras, except house rent, is not necessarily higher than in the Mofussil"

IV The grounds on which the allowance is ~~that~~ to be drawn in Calcutta & Bombay, are not stated, but ~~presumably~~ obviously ~~because~~ are that in the opinion of the Finance Committee ~~the cost of living in Calcutta [illegible]~~ the cost of living in Calcutta & Bombay, including house rent is necessarily higher than in the Mofussil.

V The scale of pay for Officers of the P.W.D.

is the same all over India; and as officers in the Mofussil of the Madras Presidency, draw the same pay and allowances, as officers ~~of~~ in the Mofussils of the Bengal & Bombay Presidencies; it is a logical deduction from the arguments of the Finance Committee; that the cost of living in the town of Madras, is less than in the towns of Calcutta & Bombay. House rent does not enter into the argument, as it has no connection with Presy allowance, and is omitted by the Finance Committee from the cost of living from

they distinctly state ~~that~~ the principle on which house rent is fixed, is to cover the difference between rent in the Mofussil & the Presy towns. If therefore the house rent in Madras is considered too high, or that allowed in Calcutta or Bombay too low, it should be diminished independently,

VI The cost of living must refer to ~~[illegible]~~ any individual officer, apart from any considerations of wife or family; consequently the arguments of the Finance Committee amount to this " An individual officer of the PWD can, apart from the question of house rent, live cheaper in Madras than in Calcutta or Bombay, and therefore he ~~is not to~~ should not draw any Presidency allowance while in Madras

VII In Calcutta an officer can live ~~comfortably~~ in a boarding house for 150 Rs a month, and he can avoid the expense of carriage hire, by using the tramways.

~~In Bombay~~, without my own experience ~~an officer can live comfortably for same~~ less at one of the large hotels, and in the one in which I am residing, the officers kept no conveyance ~~or while it [illegible] a similar appointment in Madras~~

In Madras no officer can live for less than [illegible] 150 ~~Rs~~ at any of the hotels, and as regards means of locomotion, ~~every officer~~ he must keep at least one carriage & horse.

These facts do not at all coincide with the ~~[illegible]~~ statements made by the Finance Committee. X

VIII The words "not necessarily more expensive" take an extremely narrow view of the ~~case~~ subject; the officers of the PWD are expected to take their part in social duties in common with the officers of other Departments, stationed at the Presidency, ~~and~~ to argue that an officer can live in the town of Madras, as cheaply as he can in the district, merely because the prices of ~~[illegible]~~ provisions ~~are~~ are about the same in ~~Cuddalore~~ an up-country station they are in ~~as they are in Madras~~, is an endeavour to carry the point, by ignoring many items of expenditure, which must always be incurred in the Presidency town

them in an up-country station. ~~[illegible]~~
~~Madras [illegible] dressed [illegible]~~

IX ~~In [illegible]~~ In the face of these arguments, there does not appear any sound or just reason why ~~the~~ any P.W. officers who are called upon to serve in Madras should be placed in a far worse position, on equal pay, than ~~[illegible]~~ those of the same rank in Calcutta & Bombay —

~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~

X ~~Also it must be remembered that the~~ The abolition of Presidency allowances, ~~affects~~ may affect ~~every~~ any officer in the P.W. department, not merely the few who are now serving in the town of Madras; for any officer is liable to be called on to take up an appointment in Madras, sometimes only for a few months, and as these Madras P.W. appointments ~~carry~~ have no ~~special~~ fixed pay ~~with them~~ attached to them, ~~[illegible]~~ ~~allowances~~, it is perfectly certain that every officer who is thus called on to serve in Madras, will be considerably out of pocket by doing so.

XI ~~[illegible]~~ It is ~~[illegible] that~~ scarcely an assumption to say the majority of the appointments in the Presidency are those of selected men, ~~and~~ [illegible] if officers are to suffer pecuniary loss by

Owing to Madras there will be difficulty in obtaining ~~[illegible]~~ the best men. As a case in point ~~I know of~~ there is a P W appointment in Madras to which it is proposed to post an ~~[illegible]~~ Executive Engineer 4th grade, on his return from furlough, on account of the satisfactory manner in which he ~~[illegible]~~ conducted the duties of ~~[illegible]~~ that appointment prior to his leaving India. The pay this officer drew formerly was 945 Rs but if on his return, the proposals of the Finance Committee have been carried into effect, his pay will be ~~Rs~~ 645 and I am certain ~~that he~~ will protest most strongly against being obliged to serve in the town of Madras, and will endeavour to be transferred as soon as possible.

XII ~~None of the officers who will be affected by the proposed reduction [illegible] the grade of~~ The proposed reduction will affect no officer above the ~~grade~~ rank of Ex Engr 2nd grade; the Consulting Architect to Government being the senior officer who will suffer, his pay being reduced from 900 to 800; or a reduction of $\frac{1}{9}$; an amount which must make the most serious difference to him; and which is altogether unjustifiable on the grounds upon which the Finance Committee base their proposals.

XIII If it is considered that ~~a principle~~ Presidency allowance, which is admitted to be ~~applicable to~~ necessary in Calcutta & Bombay, is ~~[illegible]~~ objectionable in principle ~~in Madras~~; it seems only fair that the special appointments in P.W.D. in Madras should have ~~[illegible]~~ fixed salaries attached to them sufficiently large to warrant the appointments being held by selected men, as in the case of the ~~Assistant~~ Inspector General of Police, who draws a fixed salary of 900 Rs irrespective of his grade in the Department.

XIV In the P.W.D. the following appointments in Madras ~~[illegible]~~ might reasonably carry special pay if the principle of giving Pres. allowance is objected to ~~XV~~

I Consulting Architect to Govt.

II Under Secretary to Govt. Public Works Dept.

III Under Secretary to Govt. Irrigation Branch.

IV General Supt. P.W. Stores & Workshops.

~~XV~~

XV With regard to other P.W. officers stationed at the Presidency, those who are obliged from the nature of their duties to travel in the town of Madras for inspection works &c. should draw conveyance allowance, as they did from 1st 1851 when Presidency allowance was introduced.

P. W. C. No. 2621.

Presidency Allowance

The Finance Committee recommend that Presidency Allowance be abolished in Madras, while in Calcutta and Bombay it shall still be drawn, at the present Calcutta rates.

The grounds on which this recommendation is made, so far as Madras is concerned are, "that they have satisfied themselves that the cost of living in Madras, except house-rent, is not necessarily higher than in the Mofussil.

The grounds on which the allowance is still to be drawn in Calcutta and Bombay are not stated, but it is obvious that the Finance Committee consider that the cost of living in Madras is less than in Calcutta or Bombay. House rent does not enter ~~with~~ into the question of cost of living, according to the Finance Committee, for they distinctly state that house rent in the Presidency towns is given to cover the difference of cost between rent in the mofussil and in the Presidency.

This seems incorrect. They say it was given not merely to cover higher rent but partly in consn of the greater cost of living

qu. see paras 8 & 36 of Note

For the purpose of this argument, cost of living, will, as intended by the Finance Committee, be considered to include merely the cost of ~~[illegible]~~ food clothes, servants, and locomotion, or, in other words, necessaries of life.

It remains therefore to be seen whether these necessaries of life can be obtained cheaper in Madras, than in Calcutta and Bombay; if not, Madras officers should not be placed on a worse footing than their confreres in the other Presidencies.

or than in the mofussil

Further, the cost of living

must

must refer to the individual officer, apart from any family considerations, therefore to sum up, the arguments of the Finance Committee amount to this; an individual officer can, apart from the question of house-rent, live cheaper in Madras than in Calcutta or Bombay.

In Calcutta, a single man can live in a boarding house for Rs: 150 a month, and he can avoid the expense of carriage hire by using the tramways.

In Bombay, within my own experience, an officer can live for even less, at a large hotel, and also need not keep a conveyance.

In Madras, the hotels are very inferior, and by no means cheap, and owing to the distances and absence of other means of locomotion, a carriage is a necessity.

These facts are sufficient to shew that the grounds upon which the Finance Committee propose to abolish Presidency allowance in Madras, while it is still permitted in Calcutta and Bombay, are most insufficient.

It may now be said that the arguments which I have brought forward, merely tend to prove that Presidency allowance should be abolished in all three Presidency towns, and certainly this should be done, if it is admitted that living in a Presidency town is as cheap as in the mofussil, house-rent being omitted from the question.

It scarcely requires argument to prove that the cost of living in a Presidency town must always be more expensive than up-country, but as the Finance Committee have used the expression "not necessarily more expensive" it is as well to point out that although the price of provisions and necessaries of life may be much the same all over the Presidency; there are many other items of expenditure, which although not included in the necessaries of life, are an essential part of the cost of living, and these are always heavier in a large town than in an up-country station.

It is scarcely an assumption to say that the majority of the officers in a Presidency town are selected men, but if they are to suffer pecuniary loss by so ~~being~~ serving, it is certain that many of the best men will never be contented in Madras, and will use every ndeavour to be transferred to n out station as soon as possible.

The proposed reductions will affect no officer of higher rank than Executive Engineer, 2nd grade; the senior officer who will suffer being the Consulting Architect to Government whose pay will be reduced from Rs: 900 to Rs: 800, or a reduction of 1/9, which is a most serious amount to take away from any ~~senior~~ salary.

To sum up, the Finance Committee base their proposals on a single statement viz:, that the cost of living in Madras is not necessarily greater than in the mofussil.

The arguments against this are:-

I. An officer can live as cheap in Calcutta or Bombay, as he can in Madras.

II The cost of living is greater in a Presidency town than in an up-country station, when all necessary items of expenditure are taken into consideration.

III It is obviously unreasonable to take the cost of the mere necessaries of life, as the basis on which to calculate the total ~~[illegible]~~ expenditure incumbent ~~[illegible]~~ upon any man.

IV. The men who will be affected by the proposed reduction, draw small salaries, and the amount it is proposed to deprive them of, is an excessive proportion of their total pay and allowances.

V. Without Presidency allowance, men will suffer pecuniary loss by being called on to serve in Madras, and there ~~would~~ will be difficulty in obtaining the best men to take up Madras appointments.

In conclusion, if it is considered that Presidency allowance ~~is~~ is wrong in principle, it should be abolished, not only in Madras, but also in Calcutta and Bombay, and the question then arises whether the appointments in Presidency towns, should not have special pay attached to them.

In the Public Works Department the following appointments in Madras might reasonably be specially paid:-

I Consulting Architect to Govt.
II Undersecretary to Govt. P.W.D.
III Undersecretary to Govt. Irrigation Branch.
IV General Superintendent P.W. Stores and Workshops.

In proof that this principle is recognized, I may quote the case of the Assistant Inspector General of Police in Madras, who draws a fixed salary of Rs. 900, irrespective of his grade in the Department.

This has been altered

23.3.88

PWC No 2621

Abolition of Presidency allowance

Notes by Under Secretary PWD.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

Letter from the Government of India. (P.W. No 598. G. of 10th March 1888)

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed.

(P.W. No   of   )

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India
P. W. D.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 598. G., dated 10th March 1888, forwarding copy of a Note by the Finance Committee, and enquiring, with reference thereto, whether there is any objection to the abolition of the Presidency allowance drawn by certain officers of the Public Works Department in Madras.

2. It is stated in para 2 of your letter that when Presidency allowance was first sanctioned, it was not considered essential by the Government of Madras, who adopted *in lieu*, a conveyance allowance for the Officers employed at the Presidency town, and at Bangalore, and that the latter allowance was continued up to 1881, when the scale of Calcutta Presidency allowance was adopted. This statement of the case does not, I am to say, seem accurate. Presidency allowance was introduced at Calcutta and Bombay in 1866, while carriage allowance to officers in Madras was drawn prior to 1863, as a part of consolidated salary, and, thereafter, as a separate allowance, in accordance

with

with the reorganization scheme sanctioned in G. O. 1599. dated 18th June 1863 (copy attached for reference). The grant of Presidency allowance on the present scale came into effect at Madras in 1879, and not 1881, *Vide* G. O. 1263. W. dated 1st May 1879.

3. It is observed that the Finance Committee propose to retain the Presidency allowance in Calcutta and Bombay, while abolishing it at Madras. They say "we have satisfied ourselves that the cost of living in Madras (apart from that of house-rent) is not necessarily greater than that of living in the Mofussil."

4. From information which has been laid before him, His Excellency the Governor-in-Council is disposed to think that the cost of living in Madras, to officers of the classes affected,

is by no means less expensive than in Calcutta or Bombay; while as compared with the Mofussil, there are many extra items of expenditure which an officer stationed in the Presidency town has necessarily to incur, ~~(e.g., a greater outlay on clothing is required)~~ and it is always necessary — on account of the distance to be covered for an officer to keep a carriage to take him to office, while in ~~In~~ the Mofussil, the horses which an officer keeps for travelling, and for which he draws travelling allowance, can be used. The Presidency allowance of an Assistant Engineer will not pay the cost of monthly hire of an office carriage, which at Madras is from Rs: 65 to Rs: 75 per mensem. It must also be remembered that officers of the P. W. Dept. stationed at Madras, while losing travelling allowance, draw

X omit.

X

draw only the pay of their rank, unlike Civilians whose offices are specially paid.

5. For these reasons, His Excellency the Governor-in-Council is unable to ~~does not~~ accept ~~agree with~~ the conclusion at which the Finance Committee have arrived, and sees no reason why Public Works Officers in Madras should be treated differently in the matter of Presidency allowance, from those stationed in Calcutta or Bombay.

11/4/85

The Hon. P. P. Hutchins

The Prop. of the Board in which the abolition of the allowances to the Survey Dept. was recommended is put up. It was expressly ~~[illegible]~~ based on the ground that there is very little difference between prices in Madras and in most Mofussil stations. The case seems to be on all fours with that of P.W.D. officers, and I don't see any ground of distinction. The present standing of survey officers employed in Madras cannot I submit be urged. as it is only a temporary reason. The Govt. of India will meet the argument about cost of conveyance being met up country by means of the Equipages paid for out of travelling allowances by the principle which they have recently laid down that a certain rate of pay (which they take at Rs 300) implies the maintenance of ordinary means of locomotion necessary to enable a man to do his work, and that conveyance allowances are not to be given merely because a man has to keep a carriage to take him to office. If it is desired to maintain the D.P.W. allowances I see nothing for it but to withdraw the recommendn. about those given to Survey Officers.

A comparison between Madras & Calcutta & Bombay, with which we have no concern, is out of place. Clothing is not worth mentioning;

J.H.G.
18 Apr

The ruling of India referred to by the Chief Secy. is one wh. I have only just seen. It deals with conveyance allowances generally & I certainly can see no valid ground for resisting India's proposals, except the great distances of Madras & absolute necessity of a conveyance. I believe P.W. Officers in the Mofussil have no fixed travelling allowance. If not, I think India's proposal must be accepted, but bring to Council.
PPH 19 Apr

O. L.S 20/Tr Hon. 14.4.88. Ch. Secy: 18/4. Ret 18/4
Tr Hon. 18.4.88. Cir: 20.4.88 - Hu. 3.5.88

Order be circulated to
The Hon Mr Master
H.E. the Commander in Chief
H.E. the Governor
Jole
20/4/88
~~The Hon. P. P. Hutchins~~

CHIEF SECRETARY
16 APL 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

I have no objn to this draft but undoubtedly the case wd be much stronger if we cd answer the point made in connection with Survey Officers who seem to be on much the same footing.

Let the draft go to the Chief Secy. for remarks. There may be something as to the Survey Dept in G.O. 7 Dec 86, No. RD on Board's Pro 15 idem, read in Fin. G.O. 10 Jan 87, No 36 Fin. When the draft of that order was passed by me I certainly did not go into the question carefully but took it that the Dept. concerned did not press ~~the point~~ for the continuance of the allowances.

I do not suggest that the question be reconsidered but that if possible the two Depts be distinguished.

I observe that the officers of the Survey Dept. now concerned are very junior & have had rapid promotion.

PPH
16 Apr

No. 54 D.
To The Chief Secretary
For favour of remarks.

16th April 1888
Jole 16/4/88

P. W. C. Nos 2621 & 3629

The allegation of the Finance Committee quoted in paragraph 42 of Mr Jacob's note probably takes its rise in the statement of the Board of Revenue which led to the abandonment of Residency allowances for officers of the Survey Department. That statement viz: that "there is now-a-days very little difference in prices in Madras & elsewhere" was in direct opposition to the ~~statement~~ opinion of the Superintendent Rev Survey to which it was appended for Col. Sargeaunt thought that "the expense of living in Madras is considerably greater than that of living up country." This is also the opinion of the Public Works Department & in my judgement rightly. The Board's view seems to have been accepted

para 3 Resolution 15 Dec 1886 No 2705

para 2 Col. Sargeaunt's letter d/ 8 Dec 1886 No 81 B

G.O. 10 Jan 87. No 36 F.

Major Christie stands up for his accountants or at least some of them. It is not stated what the Secretary thinks on this point. Perhaps some modification will be made if it settled to fight the present question.

CHM
23 Apr

There is in my opinion no doubt that the abolition of the Presidency allowance would place officers of the P.W.D. stationed in Madras at a great disadvantage, as compared with officers of the same grade serving in the Mofussil –

Apart from the question of the relative expense of living in Madras and the Mofussil, they would ~~be~~ suffer pecuniarily by the loss of the travelling allowances they would draw in the Mofussil, and the result I shd think, would be that service at the Hd Qrs of the Dept, instead of being, as it shd be, a boon to be sought for, would, especially in the case of married men, and probably most of the without very much consideration and, in the light of the present representations, shd. I think be brought up again & an amended recommendation made to India.

I am of opinion therefore that the proposal of the Finance Committee (or rather Mr Jacob) shd be resisted in regard to the P.W. Department. The draft will need alteration in the face of C. No 486 Financial dealing with the question of conveyance allowance. Notwithstanding the assumption therein that "an officer's salary is supposed to include the cost of keeping up such means of conveyance as are requisite for his ordinary duties" there can be no doubt that carriage hire costs more

Tr. [illegible] 18.6.88. [illegible] 20.4.88 - [illegible]

as pointed out by the Board in their Pr already quoted

in Madras than in the Mofussil where the distances to be traversed are generally less. ~~Allow.~~ Granting that conveyance allowances – as such – are not claimable, the extra expenditure entailed on officers on this account when transferred to the Presidency Town may properly be considered in judging whether "the cost of living in Madras is not necessarily greater than that of living in the Mofussil" and may therefore be alluded to without being prominently assigned as the reason.

Para 42 of Mr Jacob's note

It was stated at Council on Friday that at all events accountants in the P.W.D. had no right to receive any Residency allowance. I observe that in P.W. C. No 3629, which has not, I think, yet been seen by the Hon'ble Mr Hutchins

Seniors are married, be a punishment to be avoided –

"Living" moreover in Madras must be dearer than in the Mofussil. There are many expenses in a Presidency Town, which can scarcely be put into R.A.P., but which must be incurred, and which are not necessary in the Mofussil.

In my opinion however it is wrong that Mily Officers in the P.W.D. should draw house rent according to the Military rate and the allowance at the Civil rate, for the Military house rent is intended to meet all additional expenses – These Officers should therefore draw both house rent and allowance at the Civilian rate – In the

Draft letter I should feel disposed to omit mention of "Clothing" and for "to keep a Carriage" to substitute "to hire a Carriage"

C.G.C.

23.4.88

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

Letter from the Government of India No. 598 G dated March 10, 1888.

FOR ORDERS.

* For scale of allowances see para 38 of the Note.

It is proposed in these papers to abolish the Presidency allowance* now drawn by Madras Public Works officers. The reason assigned is the following opinion of the Finance Committee, recorded in para 42 of the note:— "We have satisfied ourselves "that the cost of living "in Madras (apart from "that of house-rent) is not "necessarily greater than "that of living in the

"Mofussil."

Presidency allowances were brought into force in Calcutta and Bombay from the 1st April 1865, but were not adopted in Madras till 1st April 1879 - vide G.O. No. 1263W dated 1st May 1879 - a carriage allowance of Rs 50 having here been granted instead, prior to this date.

In 1870, the Controller's proposal to adopt for Madras the scale of Presidency allowances in force in Bombay and Calcutta was negatived on the ground of keeping down the cost of establishment as much as possible. The plea that the cost of living in the Presidency was greatly more expensive than in the Mofussil was on that occasion not admitted. vide G.O. No. 52 dated 10th Nov. 1870.

The Government of India now enquire whether the Madras Govt. will offer any objection to the allowance being abolished with effect from the 1st April 1888.—

Attention is called to the notes by Captain Baddeley & one from Mr. Vincent. It seems to be a disputed point whether the cost of living in Madras is necessarily greater than that of living in the Mofussil. I am disposed to think it is, and that though food & servants may not be dearer, a greater

R.S.

outlay in clothing is ~~necessary~~ expensive and it is always necessary for an officer to keep a carriage to take him to office, which is not the case in the Mofussil, as the horses which an officer keeps for travelling & for which he draws travelling allowance, do this work. The Presidency allowance of an Assist Engineer will not pay the cost of monthly hire of an office carriage.

It appears to have been decided that Presidency allowance is not necessary in Madras but is necessary in Calcutta & Bombay. Mr Vincent & Captain Baddeley having had experience in other Presidencies, shew that living is as expensive in Madras as in Calcutta & therefore there seems no reason why the allowance should be reduced in Madras only.

Propose to point out that the G of I are mistaken about the conveyance allowance, and to say that the Govt. do not agree with the Finance Committee & consider for reasons stated above that the Presidency allowances should be continued.

JoH
5/4/88

O.L.S. 20/IV
H. W.: 5.4.88. Resent 14.4.88

FOR ORDERS.

I agree that we sd. refuse to give up these allowances. Offrs of the P.W.D. at Madras only draw the pay of their rank — unlike civilians whose offices are specially paid — & they lose travelling allowance.

There is, I think, no doubt that the conclusion, as to wh. the F.C. say they satisfied themselves, is opposed to fact. I have known Civilians decline to come to Madras even on a slight increase of pay on the grd of the expense. Certy. there seems to be no reason why Madras sd. be isolated & Bombay & Calcutta left alone. Our distances necessitate carriages.

I sd however like to see the order as to survey officers when the draft is finally submitted. It will be well to meet that point also if possible

PPH
2 apr

Apply for this order before drafting reply to G of I.

JoH
10/4/88

Applied to Finl Deptt 10-IV-88

No. 1552 W. Works Department Genl Estab.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

2 P

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 8th May 1888

READ the following

Letter from the Government of India (H. E. No 598 G. dy 10th March 1888.)

[illegible] the letter then
the enclosures
But give
Financial Deptt
the papers
complete

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed.

(H.E. No 1552 W dy 8th May 88)

3 P

To The Financial Deptt with copy of letter and with special reference to Para 7 with copy of Enclosure

D
1/5/88

PPH
4 may

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India
P. W. D.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 598. G. dated 10th March 1888, forwarding copy of a Note by the Finance Committee, and enquiring with reference thereto, whether there is any objection to the abolition of the Presidency allowance drawn by certain officers of the Public Works Department in Madras.

2. It is stated in para 2 of your letter that when Presidency allowance was first sanctioned, it was not considered essential by the Government of Madras, who adopted in lieu, a conveyance allowance for the officers employed at the Presidency town, and at Bangalore, and that the latter allowance was continued up to 1881, when the scale of Calcutta Presidency allowance was adopted. This statement of the case does not, I am to say, seem quite accurate. Presidency allowance was introduced at Calcutta and Bombay in 1865, while carriage allowance to officers in Madras was drawn prior to 1863 as a part of consolidated salary, and, thereafter, as a separate allowance, in accordance with the

the reorganization scheme sanctioned in G. O. 1599, dated 18th June 1863 (copy attached for reference.) The grant of Presidency allowance on the present scale came into effect at Madras in 1879, and not 1881. Vide G. O. 1263. W. dated 1st May 1879.

3. It is observed that the Finance Committee propose to retain the Presidency allowance in Calcutta and Bombay, while abolishing it at Madras. They say "we have satisfied ourselves that the cost of living in Madras (apart from that of house-rent) is not necessarily greater than that of living in the Mofussil."

4. From information which has been laid before him, His Excellency the Governor-in-Council is

of the Pr
in Ma think that the
2. I g in Madras, to
gon of the classes affected,
by no means less expensive than in Calcutta or Bombay; while as compared with the Mofussil, there are many extra items of expenditure, which an officer stationed in the Presidency town ~~has necessarily to incur~~ cannot avoid, and it is always necessary on account of the very great distances ~~to~~ between the public Offices & residences in Madras — ~~covered~~ for an officer to keep a carriage ~~to take him to office~~, while in the Mofussil, the horses which an officer keeps for travelling, and for which he ~~draws~~ pays out of travelling allowance, can be used. It must also be remembered that officers of the P. W. D. stationed at Madras, ~~while losing travelling~~ a~~llowance~~, draw only the pay

of

of their rank, unlike civi om whose offices are specially pai

Apart therefore from the Presidency allowance the selection of an Officer of the P.W.D. for duty in Madras would entail on him a pecuniary loss by depriving him of all travelling allowances, and if the Presidency allowance is to be done away it will become necessary to attract the best men to the Secretariat & other posts in Madras by attaching special salaries to those appointments.

5. It is assumed in the Resolution of the Government of India, Department of Finance and Commerce, No. 1705, dated 30th March 1888, that an officer's salary is supposed to include the cost of keeping up such means of conveyance as are requisite for his ordinary duties, if he is of the same standing as persons who in this country ordinarily use such means of conveyance, but I am to point out that there can be no doubt that carriage hire costs much more in Madras than in the Mofussil. The Presidency allowance of an Assistant Engineer will not pay the monthly hire of an office carriage, which at Madras,

is

the [illegible] to Rs: 75 per M[illegible] [gr]anting that conveyance [allowa]nces, as such, are not claimable, the extra expenditure entailed on officers on this account when transferred to the Presidency town may, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor-in-Council, be properly considered when judging whether "the cost of living in Madras is not necessarily greater (para 42 of Mr. S. Jacob's note) than that of living in the Mofussil."

6. For these reasons, His Excellency the Governor-in-Council is unable to accept the conclusion at which the Finance Committee have arrived, and sees no reason why Public Works Officers in Madras should be treated differently in the matter of Presidency allowance, from those stationed in Calcutta or Bombay.

16-7-44

7. The Government of India will, I am to say, be separately addressed on the subject of the Presidency allowances withdrawn from officers of the Survey Department stationed in Madras.

30/4/88

3 May

7.5.88

S.C 21/5/88

~~Copy to the Financial Dept with reference to para 7.~~

(See above)

80 Ms. 1352-53 W
8.5.88

16-4-14 ✓
16-9-14 ✓
5-4-19

Presidency Allowances

Revised draft
30-IV-88

[illegible] SECRETARY
30 APL 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Printed form [illegible]
[illegible] to the [illegible]
for [illegible]

B. 11/8/5 –

Despatcher –
Please carefully attend
to Chief's instructions
within –
8/5/88

O.L.S. 20/IV. & 93/IV.
In: Leg: 30/4.
3.5.88
4.5.88

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed
} 191

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
191 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

A A A A A A A

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy Heading only