(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 58

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 9.8.88.

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணித் துறை

அரசாணை எண். / ~~மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.~~ 3152-3153 அச்சகம் / பலவகை

நாள் : 8.10.1888. ~~198~~.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண. கா-1—10,000—15-6-87.

8th October 1888, Nos. 3152, 3153 W., Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

Read—the following papers :—

From H. S TAYLOR, Esq., Executive Engineer, No. 1, Periyár Division, to the Superintending Engineer, Periyár Project Works, dated Periyár, 6th September 1888, No. 25 C.

I have the honor to forward herewith the disallowance list on the salary bill for July, which included the arrears of Periyár allowances from the beginning of the work.

2. I included in the bill the Periyár allowances for the whole uninterrupted period from the date of each individual member joining the division. I did this for the following reasons :—

(1) The G.O., No. 2180 W., dated 18th July 1888, says that the allowances are granted to "the staff employed on the head works of the Periyár project." No mention is made about "above the ghât" or any locality, and "the staff employed on the head works of the Periyár project" is the staff of this division, wherever they may happen to be on duty on any particular day or month; and consequently the allowances appeared to be granted to the staff for the uninterrupted period while on duty in this division.

(2) The only other case of special allowances with which I am personally acquainted is that of the Wynaad. Here the Sub-divisional officer in charge of the Wynaad sub-division draws the Wynaad allowance for the whole year round wherever he may happen to be on duty. I also knew a case of a Police officer drawing Wynaad allowances during the whole time he was in Rumpa, his substantive appointment being in the Wynaad.

(3) Several requests have been made for special travelling allowances to cover the extraordinary expenses of locomotion. The answer has been in each case that no further allowances would be recommended by the Government. A further request for some concession was also asked to compensate for the enforced move twice a year. To this no answer at all has been received as far as I know, the reason being, I supposed, that the Periyár allowances would be sufficient compensation, and this could only possibly be by the allowances being drawn uninterruptedly.

3. Whether the allowances are meant to be drawn throughout the year may be open to doubt, but there can be no question about them for the period that the staff were on the bills.

4. The Examiner has disallowed the whole of the allowances pending information about the time of journey on the hills of each individual, information, I believe, already in his office, and setting aside altogether any claim for the whole period.

5. I request that this claim may be considered and that in the meanwhile I may be authorised to draw the allowances for the staff without pre-audit for the time only that they were on the hills, or that the Examiner may be requested to use some more expeditious method of audit in the present case. The claim for pay already in arrears for ten months was included in the salary bill for July, and after a month's delay in the

audit office was received after the despatch of the salary bill for August, so that according to the remark in the disallowance list it must be included in the salary bill for September, which would probably not be received audited until November.

6. In the hope that some less ponderous means of audit may be employed, or that these arrears obviously due may be drawn without audit, and an already harassing delay not aggravated, I append a separate statement of the amounts due to the staff for the periods actually occupied on the hills.

7. The objection raised about "consolidated rates of pay" regarding clerks has already received your attention and needs no comment of mine.

No. 680 P.R.

Submitted for the consideration and orders of Government.

2. Mr. Taylor's letter raises two distinct questions, both of which require decision; 1st, whether the special allowances granted by G.O., No. 2180 W., of 18th July 1888, are to be granted to the staff employed on the head works for the whole period of their employment, or only for such time as they may pass above the ghât; and, 2ndly, what individuals of the establishment are to be considered entitled to these allowances.

3. With regard to the first point, I must admit that I do not think Mr. Taylor's view is correct; I have always been under the impression that the allowances were to be given only for the periods passed above the ghât, and I have so claimed them in the pay bill of my own office, but there is undoubtedly some force in his contention that the Government of India say nothing about employment above or below the ghât, but simply use the expression "the staff employed on the head works of the Periyár project." It must also be borne in mind that the allowances originally recommended by the Madras Government for the period passed above the ghâts were in most cases (and especially in the case of the clerks who are, in my opinion, the men most to be considered) considerably greater than those actually granted, so that it would be only reasonable to suppose that they were intended to be drawn all the year round.

4. In the event of its being decided that the allowances are only to be drawn while above the ghâts, the further question will arise whether they should be forfeited during a temporary absence, such, for instance, as a subordinate being sent down to Uthampoliyam or Madura for a day or two to purchase materials or see to the sending up of machinery. In this case it might be well to fix a minimum limit within which allowances should not be forfeited.

5. The second question is one which affects my own office as well as that of the Executive Engineer. It has already been raised in my letter No 379 P R. of 27th July 1888, and will probably have been decided before this letter is received; in case it has not, it may be well to consider it here.

6. It will be seen that the Examiner has disallowed the claims of certain men on the ground that they are in receipt of what he calls "special" rates of pay; what principle has guided him in the selection it is impossible to say; Mr. Donovan (*p*) is no more in receipt of a "special" rate of pay than Sergeant Cherry (*d*), or Ramasawmy Iyengar (*q*) than Sergeant Murphy (*e*); these men and all the others (or nearly all) were appointed to certain grades and receive the pay of these grades and not "special" pay at all. As far as can be judged from perusal of the Examiner's remarks, his objections on this ground apply to all men on the temporary establishment; but even here he is not consistent in his objections, for he objects to the whole of my own office, two members of which belong to the permanent establishment, and does not object to Mohmed Abdul Aziz, who is in identically the same position.

7. It is further to be noted that the Examiner's objection is based on the ground of the men being on "special" rates of pay; the Government of India say nothing about "special rates;" the word used by them is "consolidated."

8. It is, however, probable that the two words really mean the same, namely, rates of pay specially fixed in consideration of the nature of the work, and the question may be considered on this supposition though it is to be regretted that the Examiner should have taken upon himself to alter the phraseology of the Government of India.

If this supposition be correct, it cannot be too distinctly stated that none of the men in question are on special rates of pay. The Executive Engineer's office is fixed at that of an ordinary second-class division and the men comprising it draw the same salaries as they would in any other division. The salaries of all these men were intentionally fixed at ordinary rates with the expectation that they would receive the special allowances in addition, and if it had been supposed that these special allowances would be withheld on the ground stated, Government would have been asked to fix their salaries at considerably higher rates than is actually the case.

9. With regard to my own office, the rates of pay are certainly in one sense "special," insomuch as the whole office is a special one. The work of the office is not so heavy as that of an ordinary circle and does not require so numerous or highly paid an establishment, but the grades of the men which it was proposed to employ were deliberately fixed on the supposition that they would receive the special allowances in addition.

10. So far as any principle at all can be traced in the Examiner's proceedings, it would seem that, had I obtained sanction to the employment of an ordinary Superintending Engineer's office with a head clerk on Rs. 160—200, no objection would have been raised to his receiving the extra allowances, but because he only receives Rs. 100 he cannot get them. Even this, however, does not account for his action in the case of the Executive Engineer's office, where he accepts the claim of the head clerk and objects to all the others.

11. I wish that I could end this reference here, but I regret to be obliged to ask Government to notice the manner in which the Examiner has dealt with the matter.

12. The bill was despatched from the Executive Engineer's office on the 1st August and was not returned by the Examiner till the 30th; this in itself calls for notice.

13. To the disallowance of the claims for men on "special" rates of pay no exception can be taken; I think they are entitled to it, but freely admit that the Examiner was right in delaying audit till the question had been settled by Government. The same cannot, however, be said as regards the men whose claim to the allowances is admitted, the only doubt being as to the period for which it should be passed.

14. Items (*a*) to (*s*) are disallowed "pending information" as to certain dates, every one of which is or ought to be on record in the Examiner's own office. His plain duty appears to have been to pass the charges for the periods about which there was no doubt, leaving the remaining periods to be audited when the doubt was settled. If in any particular case owing to incompleteness in the weekly returns, or for any other reason, the information was not available, the claim of the particular individual concerned could, of course, have been struck out; but it seems to me perfectly unjustifiable that a number of men should be kept out of money which is admittedly due to them, because the Examiner will not take the trouble to examine his own records.

15. What, I would ask, is the use of the weekly returns sent in from every office to the Examiner, except to supply the very information he now states himself to be in want of.

16. I am obliged to press this point as the case, as regards the subordinates at least, is really one of most cruel hardship; their expenses are at least three times that of ordinary stations, the long delay in the settlement of the question whether the allowances were to be given at all was very trying, and it would have been supposed that any officer concerned in the matter would have done his best to aid in the removal of the hardship as quickly as possible, rather than go out of his way to invent artificial objections.

17. I have not considered myself justified in ordering payment (though I have had considerable hesitation on the point) of the allowances for the periods about which there is no dispute (items 1 to 8 in the Executive Engineer's statement), but I request that this may be authorised by telegraph and that, as soon as the questions

raised in the first part of this letter are settled, orders may be given for immediate payment of any further sums that may be due under such decision, which sums it may be remarked will in some cases have been due for nearly a year. The Examiner's suggestion that they should be included in the bills for September and not paid till near the end of October will, I hope, not be supported by Government.

18. The question regarding travelling allowances, referred to in paragraph 2 (3) of Mr. Taylor's letter, is being separately dealt with in connection with G.O., No. 497 D., of 11th August 1888.

8th September 1888. (Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Colonel, R.E.,
Supg. Engr., Periyár Project Works.

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 27th September 1888, No. 2328.

Before attempting to reply to Colonel Pennycuick's remarks, I must state a circumstance of which I can find no mention in the letters of either the Superintending Engineer or the Executive Engineer—a circumstance of which the latter indeed was probably ignorant.

2. On receipt of G.O., No. 2180 W., of 25th July 1888, communicating the sanction of the Government of India to the allowances now in question, foreseeing the probability of misunderstandings, and being anxious to avoid as far as possible any delay in dealing with these claims when submitted, I asked the Superintending Engineer to let me have a statement showing, for each individual for whom allowances were to be claimed, dates and times of commencement and ending of their periods of duty at the head works. This statement the Superintending Engineer refused to furnish, justifying this refusal by arguments substantially the same as those advanced in para. 14 of his letter now under reference, namely, that it is the duty of the Examiner's office to make out the details of the claims. The Superintending Engineer's letter refusing to furnish this statement was received in my office on the 22nd August 1888. The questions raised in the Superintending Engineer's letter appear to be *six*, namely—

(*a*) The question whether the allowances are to be confined to periods spent on duty above the ghâts.
(*b*) The application of the above restriction in the case of temporary absences.
(*c*) The meaning of the expression "consolidated."
(*d*) My action in "taking upon myself to alter the phraseology of the Government of India."
(*e*) The delay in returning the salary bill.
(*f*) The alleged shirking of supposed duty of making out the claims correctly in detail.

3. The first point is not, I think, seriously disputed. The whole tenor of the correspondence from beginning to end, and the repeated use of such expressions as "the conditions of life at the head works of the Periyár," "the staff employed on the head works," and the reference to the allowances given in other "hill tracts," indicate this unmistakably I think; the Periyár allowances given in previous years were similarly restricted; moreover, the allowances are given as "local allowances," and it is clear from Code paras. 527 and 528 that such allowances are only to be drawn for such periods as the officers concerned "may be on authorised duty" within the defined limits—in this case the head work. It is not quite clear whether the Superintending Engineer does or does not dispute the correctness of this view: he says at the beginning of para. 3 that he thinks Mr. Taylor's view incorrect, but at the end of the same para. he says it is "only reasonable to suppose" the contrary.

4. With regard to the second point, the rule of Code para. 527 has, I believe, always been strictly interpreted, and periods of temporary absences have never, unless by oversight, or from want of correct information, been treated as periods passed within the defined limits.

5. If Government consider it desirable to fix any minimum period within which such temporary absences will not count, the sanction of the Government of India will be necessary. I doubt, however, whether it will be worth while to raise the question, as any such proposal would probably cut both ways, and short periods (within the minimum) spent in the defined limit would probably not count.

6. As regards the third point, I have already expressed my opinion in my office note No. 2149 of 28th August 1888, and I should probably only complicate matters by going into it in detail on this reference. If any further expression of opinion is desired from me, it will no doubt be asked for in connection with the office note just quoted. If the scale of pay proposed by the Superintending Engineer and sanctioned by Government was framed under a misapprehension, that is of course a reason for revising the scale, but that is not a fact which could have been within my knowledge, or which could have influenced me in dealing with the claims.

7. With regard to the fourth point (*d*), I am surprised that Colonel Pennycuick should have failed to see that alteration of phraseology, or substitution of one expression or set of expressions for another is nothing more than "interpretation" which is one of the most ordinary duties of an Examiner. Colonel Pennycuick had himself already taken exception to the use of the term "consolidated," and in the performance of my obvious duty of interpreting an order, I substituted the expression "special." My interpretation may have been wrong, or might even have been absurd, but the imperfect performance of an obvious duty would hardly warrant stricture for undertaking the duty at all. I note, however, that Colonel Pennycuick himself thinks that the two expressions do really mean the same; and that being the case his complaint seems to be somewhat unnecessary.

8. As for the fifth point (*e*), the charge as stated by the Superintending Engineer is, I admit, a serious one, but I submit that the fact stated in the opening of this note considerably alters the complexion of the case. As I had asked the Superintending Engineer to furnish a statement which I evidently considered necessary for the proper disposal of these claims, it might, I think, have occurred to the Superintending Engineer that I should wait for this statement. As the statement was not received until the 22nd August 1888, the delay is reduced to eight days.

9. I am very sorry that there should have been even this delay. By some accident the Superintending Engineer's letter (refusing to furnish the statement) was not seen by me when it arrived; had I seen it, I should have taken it up at once, but, as it was, it passed through the ordinary routine and I did not see it until the 29th. I regret even this comparatively trifling delay—a delay of eight days in connection with a matter that has been under correspondence for a year, if not more; but I venture to think that, under the circumstance, the Superintending Engineer might almost as reasonably have complained of delay in communicating to him the sanction of the Government of India; and I think that, if the history of the whole question were thoroughly examined, it would probably be found that there have been several other delays—possibly even some for which the Executive Engineer and the Superintending Engineer may be responsible—quite as great and quite as inexcusable as the one now in question, when the latter is reduced to its true dimensions.

10. Referring to what the Superintending Engineer calls my suggestion that the claims should be included in the bill for September "and not paid till near the end of October" (see the end of his para. 17), I beg to say that if a separate statement, such as I asked for, had been sent, at any time, it would have been examined at once and the Executive Engineer would, according to the invariable practice in such cases, have been asked to pay the claims found admissible, charging them to miscellaneous advances pending inclusion by this office in the next salary bill received; but as the Superintending Engineer had absolutely declined to furnish such a statement, it seemed useless to say anything more about it.

11. As I have mentioned the date (22nd August 1888) on which the Superintending Engineer's refusal of the statement was received, I must also mention that my letter asking for the statement was only despatched on the 10th August 1888, otherwise it might be erroneously supposed that there was some delay on the part of the Superintending Engineer in replying to my request. I am sorry it was not

asked for a few days earlier, as perhaps it might have been, but delays of a few days here and there cannot possibly be altogether avoided in a large office always pressed with work. It is evident at any rate that the matter was not put aside and neglected until the very last day of the month, as the Superintending Engineer's letter would probably lead any one to suppose.

12. As regards the last point (*f*), I submit that an officer is bound to put his claims in a reasonably correct form as to details, and that it is not the *duty* of the Examiner's office to make out the details of his claim for him. It is often done, when the trouble is not excessive, from a desire to expedite as much as possible the disbursements of acknowledged dues even though not claimed. The claims submitted by the Executive Engineer, Periyár division, did not appear to me to have been drawn up in such detail as is to be reasonably expected, before an audit office should be asked to check them, and the failure in this respect seemed to me the less excusable because Mr. Taylor was for a long time in the West Coast division (which include the Wynaad), and therefore, presumably—his letter, however, now seems to throw some doubt on the correctness of the presumption—well acquainted with the rules as to local allowances. In fact the case seemed to me, at the time—though wrongly perhaps—very much like that of an officer who should submit his journal with a travelling allowance bill for an outside lump sum, say Rs. 250, and expect the audit office to make out his bill correctly as to details and dock any excess claimed.

13. With regard to the Superintending Engineer's remarks about the use of the weekly returns, I submit that they are intended for use in connection with the audit of current claims, and that it is hardly reasonable to expect the audit office to construct out of some forty returns, covering a period of about eleven months, a detailed history of the movements of each individual—a thing which could only be done by delaying the disposal of the current claims of other divisions received in proper detail.

14. In the above remarks I have endeavoured to deal with all points that seem to require remark, but if I have overlooked any point, or if it should seem that there is any point as to which the explanation is insufficient, I trust that I may have an opportunity of completing it before the matter is finally disposed of.

15. In conclusion, I venture to protest against some of the expressions used in the Superintending Engineer's letter, as, for instance, "perfectly unjustifiable" keeping of a number of men "out of money which is *admittedly* due to them," and "going out of his way to invent artificial objections." As for this last remark, I find a difficulty in understanding what it means. After carefully reading and re-reading the Superintending Engineer's letter, it seems to me that if the remark has any particular meaning or reference—if it is anything more than a strong expression of general disapproval of my action—it must refer to the fact that, having, in the performance of a recognised duty, to construe a certain order, which the Superintending Engineer had previously characterized as unintelligible, or something to that effect, I adopted an interpretation which, on the Superintending Engineer's own showing (para. 8, first line), is probably correct, his only real objection being to my application, in certain individual cases, of the order thus interpreted.

From Colonel J. PENNYCUICK, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Periyá Project Works, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Periyár, 27th July 1888, No. 379 P.R.

With reference to G.O., No. 2180 W., of 18th instant, I have the honor to request explanation of the meaning of the expressions "engaged locally" and "not on consolidated salaries" with regard to clerks and sub-overseers.

2. The word "locally" presumably refers to the Periyár valley, and the fact of its insertion shows how little the Government of India realise the conditions unde which these works are being executed.

3. As far as I know clerks and sub-overseers are on consolidated salaries—certainly I never heard o ne who was not,—but the expression must be used in some more limited sense, for i not conceivable that the Government of India would, after keeping the men co ned in suspense for nine months, have granted even this concession with a conditi hich practically withholds it from the very men of all others to whom it is most essary.

4. Our office subord es are the very men who suffer most by residence here, they are all natives of a c ass to whom the climate and conditions of life are almost intolerable, and without extra pay it will be perfectly impossible to get decent men to remain here.

5. I do not wish to raise any question with regard to my own exclusion from the limited benefits now conferred on the other officers employed here, but it might be worth while to point out to the Government of India that, as the difference of pay between Superintending Engineer, 2nd class and 3rd class, is only Rs. 50 per month, it would be a positive benefit to me to be reduced to the 3rd class.

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 28th August 1888, No. 2149.

The Government of India no doubt mean that the local allowances sanctioned are only to be given in the case of officers, subordinates, clerks and accountants of the permanent establishment employed in the Periyár hill tracts on the pay of their substantive departmental ranks, or of such temporary or sub. *pro tem.* ranks as they may be holding in virtue of ordinary departmental promotion; and that the allowances are not to be given to men employed temporarily on scales of pay framed with special reference to local conditions of service, or to members of the permanent establishment who may be occupying posts for which such special scales of pay have been fixed, and who are drawing the pay of such posts instead of their proper departmental salaries.

2. Para. 5 of Colonel Pennycuick's letter is not understood; he draws as Superintending Engineer, 2nd class, pay and allowances at Rs. 1,752-4-0 per mensem, and as Superintending Engineer, 3rd class, he would draw only Rs. 1,593-8-0 per mensem.

Order—dated 8th October 1888, No. 3152 W., Public Works.

Ordered that the matters in dispute be referred to the Government of India for decision.

(Here enter No. 3153 W., dated 8th October 1888.)

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, Periyár Project Works.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Letter—to the Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 8th October 1888, No. 3153 W.

I am directed to forward, for the orders of the Government of India, the accompanying copies of correspondence which ~~have~~ arisen out of the sanction to special Periyár allowances communicated in your letter No. 118 I., dated 3rd July 1888. has/

2. The questions requiring the decision of the Government of India are—

(1) Whether the special allowances are to be drawn all the year round, or only for periods spent above ghâts; and

(2) Whether men on the temporary establishment are entitled to the allowances.

asked for a few days earlier, as perhaps it might have been, but delays of a few days here and there cannot possibly be altogether avoided in a large office always pressed with work. It is evident at any rate that the matter was not put aside and neglected until the very last day of the month, as the Superintending Engineer's letter would probably lead any one to suppose.

12. As regards the last point (*f*), I submit that an officer is bound to put his claims in a reasonably correct form as to details, and that it is not the *duty* of the Examiner's office to make out the details of his claim for him. It is often done, when the trouble is not excessive, from a desire to expedite as much as possible the disbursements of acknowledged dues even though not claimed. The claims submitted by the Executive Engineer, Periyár division, did not appear to me to have been drawn up in such detail as is to be reasonably expected, before an audit office should be asked to check them, and the failure in this respect seemed to me the less excusable because Mr. Taylor was for a long time in the West Coast division (which include the Wynaad), and therefore, presumably—his letter, however, now seems to throw some doubt on the correctness of the presumption—well acquainted with the rules as to local allowances. In fact the case seemed to me, at the time—though wrongly perhaps—very much like that of an officer who should submit his journal with a travelling allowance bill for an outside lump sum, say Rs. 250, and expect the audit office to make out his bill correctly as to details and dock any excess claimed.

13. With regard to the Superintending Engineer's remarks about the use of the weekly returns, I submit that they are intended for use in connection with the audit of current claims, and that it is hardly reasonable to expect the audit office to construct out of some *forty* returns, covering a period of about eleven months, a detailed history of the movements of each individual—a thing which could only be done by delaying the disposal of the current claims of other divisions received in proper detail.

14. In the above remarks I have endeavoured to deal with all points that seem to require remark, but if I have overlooked any point, or if it should seem that there is any point as to which the explanation is insufficient, I trust that I may have an opportunity of completing it before the matter is finally disposed of.

15. In conclusion, I venture to protest against some of the expressions used in the Superintending Engineer's letter, as, for instance, "perfectly unjustifiable" keeping of a number of men "out of money which is *admittedly* due to them," and "going out of his way to invent artificial objections." As for this last remark, I find a difficulty in understanding what it means. After carefully reading and re-reading the Superintending Engineer's letter, it seems to me that if the remark has any particular meaning or reference—if it is anything more than a strong expression of general disapproval of my action—it must refer to the *fact* that, having, in the performance of a recognised duty, to construe a certain order, which the Superintending Engineer had previously characterized as unintelligible, or something to that effect, I adopted an interpretation which, on the Superintending Engineer's own showing (para. 8, first line), is probably correct, his only real objection being to my application, in certain individual cases, of the order thus interpreted.

From Colonel J. PENNYCUICK, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Periyá Project Works, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Periyár, 27th July 1888, No. 379 P.R.

With reference to G.O., No. 2180 W., of 18th instant, I have the honor to request explanation of the meaning of the expressions "engaged locally" and "not on consolidated salaries" with regard to clerks and sub-overseers.

2. The word "locally" presumably refers to the Periyár valley, and the fact of its insertion shows how little the Government of India realise the conditions unde which these works are being executed.

3. As far as I know clerks and sub-overseers are on consolidated salaries—certainly I never heard o ne who was not,—but the expression must be used in some more limited sense, for i not conceivable that the Government of India would, after keeping the men co ned in suspense for nine months, have granted even this concession with a conditio which practically withholds it from the very men of all others to whom it is most essary.

4. Our office subord es are the very men who suffer most by residence here; they are all natives of a c ass to whom the climate and conditions of life are almost intolerable, and without extra pay it will be perfectly impossible to get decent men to remain here.

5. I do not wish to raise any question with regard to my own exclusion from the limited benefits now conferred on the other officers employed here, but it might be worth while to point out to the Government of India that, as the difference of pay between Superintending Engineer, 2nd class and 3rd class, is only Rs. 50 per month, it would be a positive benefit to me to be reduced to the 3rd class.

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 28th August 1888, No. 2149.

The Government of India no doubt mean that the local allowances sanctioned are only to be given in the case of officers, subordinates, clerks and accountants of the permanent establishment employed in the Periyár hill tracts on the pay of their substantive departmental ranks, or of such temporary or sub. *pro tem.* ranks as they may be holding in virtue of ordinary departmental promotion; and that the allowances are not to be given to men employed temporarily on scales of pay framed with special reference to local conditions of service, or to members of the permanent establishment who may be occupying posts for which such special scales of pay have been fixed, and who are drawing the pay of such posts instead of their proper departmental salaries.

2. Para. 5 of Colonel Pennycuick's letter is not understood; he draws as Superintending Engineer, 2nd class, pay and allowances at Rs. 1,752-4-0 per mensem, and as Superintending Engineer, 3rd class, he would draw only Rs. 1,593-8-0 per mensem.

ORDER—dated 8th October 1888, No. 3152 W., Public Works.

Ordered that the matters in dispute be referred to the Government of India for decision.

(Here enter No. 3153 W., dated 8th October 1888.)

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, Periyár Project Works.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

LETTER—to the Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 8th October 1888, No. 3153 W.

I am directed to forward, for the orders of the Government of India, the accompanying copies of correspondence which have arisen out of the sanction to special Periyár allowances communicated in your letter No. 118 I., dated 3rd July 1888.

2. The questions requiring the decision of the Government of India are—

(1) Whether the special allowances are to be drawn all the year round, or only for periods spent above ghâts; and

(2) Whether men on the temporary establishment are entitled to the allowances.

3. As regards (1) the Superintending Engineer points out that the scale of allowances originally recommended (especially in the case of clerks, who are most to be considered) was considerably greater than that actually granted by the Government of India, and that it is thus reasonable to suppose that the reduced scale of allowances was intended to be drawn throughout the year. There is, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council, some force in this contention, and it is commended to the consideration of the Government of India.

4. In respect to (2) the Superintending Engineer explains that the salaries of the temporary establishment were intentionally fixed at ordinary rates with the expectation that the men would receive the special allowances in addition; if they are now declared ineligible for the special allowances, it will, His Excellency the Governor in Council considers, be necessary to revise their salaries accordingly.

5. Having in view the hardship involved in the wholesale retrenchment made by the Examiner, the Superintending Engineer was, on the 15th September last, authorised, pending final orders, to disburse Periyár allowances to the whole establishment, permanent and temporary, for periods spent above ghâts. I am now to request confirmation of this proceeding.

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

Exd. J. Henriques.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of (1888) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated October, 8th.

Recd Excl

G.O., 8th Oct. 1888, Nos. 3152, 3153 W.

OCTOBER.

Periyar Allowances

Requesting orders on certain points in regard to the grant of —.

8644
9199

C.A.

(1)

Dir. has desired me to send this file through you with reference to his remarks relative to the disposal on Cur 8644 –

Dir. desires me to mention to you that C.E. Periyar will be certain to demur to the Govt. rule being communicated to him as an interpretation of the points ~~to~~ raised in his letter No 379 PR d/ 29-7-88 – & he (Dir) thinks it will be much better to give the interpretation in the shape of a Govt. order. The remarks in our office of C.E. P.W.D. letter No 118 d/ 31-8-88, para 4; about men engaged locally refers only to subordinates

---

Supg. Engr's office P. Project
Periyar 8th September 18
519
1P

H. S. Taylor Esqre,
gineer, No 1 Periyar Divn
intending Engineer, Periyar
d/ Periyar 6 September 88

the honor to forward herewith
ance list on the Salary
which included the
Periyar allowances from
of the work.
cluded in the bill the
ances for the whole
period from the date
vidual member joining
. I did this for the
sons
G.O. No 2180 W dated
8, says that the
are granted to "the
gaged on the head works
Project" No mention
"above the Ghaut
ity, and the staff
employed

& clerks, whereas the C.E. wants to apparently to make it applicable to all classes of temporary employes, officers, upper subordinates & all —

But there [illegible] me to suggest to you that a fresh disposal may be made on C.No 8644. the temp. upper subordinate has been [illegible] for Periyar on [illegible]

13/9/88

To W—

Submitted for orders as to whether the disposal already approved on C.No. 8644 is to be altered in the manner suggested.

It would simplify matters perhaps if C.E.'s interpretation is accepted in regard to men on the temporary Establishment. There is nothing to prevent the pay of these men being fixed with reference to local conditions, and it may be said that when they

13-9-88

3/

accept employment on the Periyar Works on a scale of pay to which they voluntarily agree, they are not entitled to anything more.

The other letter (C.No 9199) can it is thought be disposed of in the manner suggested by D.W. telegraphic intimation being sent to Colonel Pennycuick to distance allowances regarding which there is no question, subject to subsequent audit on final orders being passed.

15-IX-88

Seen with an [illegible] file

15/9/88

Supdg Engr's office P. Project
Periyar 8th September 188
D/9

1P

H. S. Taylor Esqre,
-gineer, No 1 Periyar Divn
-intending Engineer, Periyar
Dt Periyar 6 September 88

the honor to forward herewith
-vance list on the Salary
, which included the
Periyar allowances from
of the work.
-cluded in the bill the
-ances for the whole
period from the date
-vidual member joining
. I did this for the
reasons
G O No 2180 W dated
88, says that the
are granted to "the
-oyed on the head works
-ar Project" No mention
-nt "above the Ghaut"
-ity, and the staff
employed

No. 680 P.R. | Supg Engr's office P. Project
Periyar 8th September 1888
D/9

1P

Letter from H. S. Taylor Esqre,
Executive Engineer, No 1 Periyar Divn
to the Superintending Engineer, Periyar
Project Works dd Periyar 6 September 88
No 25 C

Enclo 2
1 Dis. list
1 statement

I have the honour to forward herewith the Disallowance List on the Salary bill for July which included the arrears of Periyar allowances from the beginning of the work.

2 I included in the bill the Periyar allowances for the whole uninterrupted period from the date of each individual member joining the Division. I did this for the following reasons

a The G.O. No 2180 W dated 18th July 1888, says that the allowances are granted to "the staff employed on the head works of the Periyar Project" No mention is made about "above the Ghauts" or any locality, and the staff employed on the head works of the Periyar Project" is the staff of the Division, wherever they may happen to be on duty on any particular day or month; and consequently the allowances appeared to be granted to the staff for the uninterrupted period while on duty in this Division

(2) The only other case of special allowances with which I am personally acquainted is that of the Wynaad. Here the Sub Divisional officer in charge of the Wynaad Sub Division draws the Wynaad allowance for the whole year round wherever he may happen to be on duty. I also knew a case of a Police officer drawing Wynaad allowances during the whole time he was in Rampa - his substantive appointment being in the Wynaad.

(3) Several requests have been made for special travelling allowances to cover the extraordinary expenses of locomotion. The answer

has

has been in each case that no further allowances would be recommended by the Government. A further reques for some concession was also asked to compensate for the enforced mo twice a year. To this no answer at all has been received as far as I kn the reason being I supposed that the Periyar allowances would be suffici compensation, and this could only t possibly be by the allowances being drawn uninterruptedly.

3 Whether the allowances are meant to be drawn throughout the year, may be open to doubt, but there can be no question about them for the period that the staff were on the hills

4. The Examiner has disallowe the whole of the allowances pending information about the time of journey on the hills of each individual, information I believe already in his office, and setting aside altogether any claim for the whole period.

5. I request that this claim may

be considered and that in the meanwhile I may be authorised to draw the allowances for the staff without pre audit for the time only that they were on the hills, or that the Examiner may be requested to use some more expeditious method of audit in the present case. The claim for pay already in arrears for 10 months was included in the Salary bill for July and after a month's delay in the audit office was received after the despatch of the salary bill for August, so that according to the remark in the Disallowance list it must be included in the Salary bill for September which would probably not be received audited until November.

6. In the hope that some less ponderous means of audit may be employed, so that these arrears obviously due may be drawn without audit, and an already harassing delay not aggravated, I append a separate statement of the

amounts

amounts due to the staff for the periods actually occupied on the hills.

7. The objection raised about "Consolidated rates of pay" regarding clerks has already received your attention and needs no comment of mine.

(Copy)

Enclos: 2.
1 Dis: List.
1 Statement.

Submitted for the consideration and orders of Government.

2 Mr Taylor's letter raises two distinct questions both of which require decision; 1st whether the special allowances granted by G. O. No 2180 W of 18th July 1888 are to be granted to the staff employed on the Head works for the whole period of their employment or only for such time as they may pass above the ghat, and 2nd what individuals of the establishment are to be considered entitled to these allowances.

3 With regard to the first point

I must admit that I do not think Mr Taylors view is correct; I have always been under the impression that the allowances were to be given only for the periods passed above the ghât and I have so claimed them in the pay bill of my own office, but there is undoubtedly some force in his contention that the Government of India say nothing about employment above or below the Ghat, but simply use the expression "the staff employed on the Head Works of the Periyar Project". It must also be borne in mind that the allowances originally recommended by the Madras Government for the period passed above the ghats were in most cases (and especially in the case of the clerks who are in my opinion the men mostly to be considered) considerably greater than those actually granted so that it would be only reasonable to

suppose

suppose that they were intended to be drawn all the year round.

4. In the event of its being decided that the allowances are only to be drawn while above the Ghâts, the further question will arise whether they should be forfeited during a temporary absence, such for instance as a subordinate being sent down to Uthampaliyam or Madura for a day or two to purchase materials or see to the sending up of machinery. In this case it might be well to fix a minimum limit within which allowances should not be forfeited.

5. The second question is one which affects my own office as well as that of the Executive Engineer. It has already been raised in my letter No 3797R of 27 July 1888, and will probably have been decided before this letter is received; in case it has not it may be well to consider it here.

6 It will be seen that the Exam

has

he disallowed the claims of certain men on the ground that they are in receipt of what he calls "special" rates of pay; what principle has guided him in the selection it is impossible to say; Mr Donovan (p) is no more in receipt of a "special" rate of pay than Sergeant Cherry (d), or Ramasamy Iyengar (g) than Sergeant Murphy (e); these men and all the others (or nearly all) were appointed to certain grades and receive the pay of these grades and not "special" pay at all. As far as can be judged from perusal of the Examiners remarks his objections on this ground apply to all men on the temporary establishment, but even here he is not consistent in his objections, for he objects to the whole of my own office, two members of which belong to the permanent establishment, and does not object to Mohmed Abdul Aziz who is in

in identically the same position.

7 It is further to be noted that the Examiners objection is based on the ground of the men being on "special" rates of pay; the Government of India say nothing about "special rates"; the word used by them is "consolidated".

8 It is however probable that the two words really mean the same, namely rates of pay specially fixed in consideration of the nature of the work, and the question may be considered on this supposition though it is to be regretted that the Examiner should have taken upon himself to alter the phraseology of the Government of India. If this supposition be correct it cannot be too distinctly stated that none of the men in question are on special rates of pay. The Executive Engineer's Office is fixed at that of an ordinary 2nd class Division and the men comprising it draw the same salaries as they would in any other Division. The salaries of all these men were intentionally fixed at ordinary rates with

disallowed the claims of certain men on the ground that they are in receipt of what he calls "special rates of pay; what principle has guided him in the selection it is impossible to say; Mr Donovan (p) is no more in receipt of a "special rate of pay than Sergeant Cherry (d), or Ramaswamy Iyengar (p) than Sergeant Murphy (d); these men and all the others (or nearly all) were appointed to certain grades and receive the pay of those grades and not "special pay at all. As far as can be judged from perusal of the Examiners remarks his objections on this ground apply to all men on the temporary establishment, but even here he is not consistent in his objections, for he objects to the whole of my own office, two members of which belong to the permanent establishment, and does not object to Mohmed Abdul Aziz who is

in

in identically the same position.

7 It is further to be noted that the Examiners objection is based on the ground of the men being on "special rates of pay; the Government of India say nothing about "special rates; the word used by them is consolidated.

8 It is however probable that the two words really mean the same, namely rates of pay specially fixed in consideration of the nature of the work, and the question may be considered on this supposition though it is to be regretted that the Examiner should have taken upon himself to alter the phraseology of the Government of India. If this supposition be correct it cannot be too distinctly stated that none of the men in question are on special rates of pay. The Executive Engineers office is fixed at that of an ordinary 2nd class Division and the men comprising it draw the same salaries as they would in any other Division. The salaries of all these men were intentionally fixed at ordinary rates

with the expectation that they would receive the special allowances in addition, and if it had been supposed that these special allowances would be withheld on the ground stated Government would have been asked to fix their salaries at considerably higher rates than as actually the case.

9. With regard to my own office the rates of pay are certainly in one sense "special" in so much as the whole office is a special one. The work of the office is not so heavy as that of an ordinary circle and does not require so numerous or highly paid an establishment, but the grades of the men which it was proposed to employ were deliberately fixed on the supposition that they would receive the special allowances in addition.

10. So far as any principle at all can be traced in the

Examiners

Examiners proceedings it would seem that had I obtained sanction to the employment of an ordinary Sup. Engineer's office with a head clerk on Rs 160-200, no objection would have been raised to his receiving the extra allowances, but because he only receives Rs 100 he cannot get them. Even this however does not account for his action in the case of the Executive Engineer's office, where he accepts the claim of the head clerk and objects to all the others.

11. I wish that I could end this reference here, but I regret to be obliged to ask Government to notice the manner in which the Examiner has dealt with the matter.

12. The bill was despatched from the Executive Engineer's office on the 1st August and was not returned by the Examiner till the 30; this in itself calls for notice.

13. To the disallowance of the claims

for men on "special" rates of pay no exception can be taken; I think they are entitled to it but freely admit that the Examiner was right in delaying audit till the question had been settled by Government. The same cannot however be said as regards the men whose claim to the allowances is admitted the only doubt being as to the "period" for which it should be passed

14 Items (a) to (i) are disallowed "pending information" as to certain dates, every one of which is or ought to be on record in the Examiners own office. His plain duty appears to have been to pass the charges for the periods about which there was no doubt leaving the remaining periods to be audited when the doubt was settled. If in any particular case owing to incompleteness in the

weekly

weekly returns, or for any other reason, the information was not available the claim of the particular individual concerned could of course have been struck out, but it seems to me perfectly unjustifiable that a number of men should be kept out of money which is admittedly due to them; because the Examiner will not take the trouble to examine his own records.

15 What, I would ask, is the use of the weekly re[illegible]s sent in from every office to the Examiner, except to supply the very information he now states himself to be in want of.

16. I am obliged to press this point as the case as regards the subordinate at least is really one of most cruel hardship; their expenses are at least three times that of ordinary stations, the long delay in the settlement of the question

whether the allowances were to be given at all was very trying, and it would have been supposed that any officer concerned in the matter would have done his best to aid in the removal of the hardship as quickly as possible, rather than go out of his way to invent artificial objections.

17. I have not considered myself justified in ordering payment (though I have had considerable hesitation on the point) of the allowances for the periods about which there is no dispute (items 1 to 8 in the Executive Engineer's statement) but I request that this may be authorised by telegraph and that as soon as the questions raised in the first part of this letter are settled orders may be given for immediate payment of any further sums that may be due under such decision, which sums it may be remarked will

in

some cases have been due for nearly a year. The Examiner's suggestion that they should be included in the bills for September and not paid till near the end of October will I hope not be supported by Government.

18. The question regarding travelling allowances referred to in para 2(b) of Mr Taylor's letter is being separately dealt with in connection with G. O. No 4978 of 11th August 1888.

Jno Pennycuick
Col R.E.,
Superintending Engineer,
Periyar Project Works

G. 6. 2180 W. 18. 7. 88
No 4932. 11. 8. 88

1572
20 SEP 88

P. W. C. No 2779

(1) E.I / A. 7758/88

From,
The Supg. Engineer
Periyar Project

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 680. P. R.
Dated 8th September/88

Enclos: 2

R/ 13. 9. 88

Submits for consideration and orders letter from the Executive Engineer No. I Periyar Division regarding Periyar allowances disallowed by the Examiner of P. Works accounts—

G. 13. 9. 88 of 2779

P. W. Dept

No. 673 D. d/15–9–88

44 A

Urgent telegram to the Supdg Engineer Periyar Project d/15th Septr 1888.

Your endorsement 680 P.R. dated 8th September. Pending final orders you are authorised to disburse Periyar allowances for periods spent above Ghat

(Sd) J. O. H.

W

of [illegible] to these special allowan

EXAMINED
1572
SEP 1888
ENCLOSURES 3
P.W. ACCOUNTS

D/4

1572

No. 674 D

15

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Ootacamund, 17 September 1888.

15

OFFICE NOTE.

Vide 6738 D - 15-9-88 sent in the file Committee formed 10-8-84 / 88

From

W.

To

C. W. A.

From the Superintending Engineer of Periyar Project, No 652 P.R. dated 8th September 1888.

For favor of early remarks

Pending final decision of the questions raised, the Superintending Engineer has, in view of the hardship to the men employed on the Periyar Works by withholding their allowances, been authorised to "disburse Periyar allowances for periods spent above Ghat." Whether or not the sanction of the Government of India to these special allowances

15-9-88

is intended to be restricted to men on the permanent establishment, it is evident that the Superintending Engineer has, in fixing the rates of pay for temporary establishments, put them at lower figures than he would have recommended had he supposed them unentitled to the allowances. Should it hereafter be decided that these men cannot draw the allowances, revision of their salaries will be necessary.

17/9/88 W

9P

R. 2523,927-9-

---

of which I can find no mention in the letters of either the Supg. Engineer or the Executive Engineer — a circumstance of which the latter indeed was probably ignorant.

2. On receipt of G.O. No. 2180 W. of 25th. July 1888 communicating the sanction of the Government of India to the allowances now in question, foreseeing the probability of misunderstandings, and being anxious to avoid as far as possible any delay in dealing with these claims when submitted, I asked the Supg. Engineer to let me have a statement showing, for each individual for whom allowances were to be claimed, dates and times of commencement and ending of their periods of duty at the head works. This statement the Supg. Engineer refused to furnish, justifying this refusal by arguments substantially the same as those advanced in para 14 of his letter now under reference, namely that it is the duty of the Examiner's office to make out the details of the claims. The Supg. Engineer's letter refusing to furnish this

statement was received in my office on the 22nd August 1888. The questions raised in the Supg. Engineers letter, appear to be six, namely;

(a) the question "whether the allowances are to be confined to periods spent on duty above the ghats;

(b) the application of the above restriction in the case of temporary absences;

(c) the meaning of the expression "consolidated";

(d) my action in taking upon myself to alter the phraseology of the Government of India";

(e) the delay in returning the salary bill.

(f) the alleged shirking of supposed duty of making out the claims correctly in detail.

3. The first point is not I think seriously disputed. The whole tenor of the correspondence from beginning to end, and the repeated use of such expressions as "the conditions of life at the head works ~~"the staff employed on the head works"~~ of the Periyar", and the reference to the allowances given in other "hill tracts", indicate this unmistakeably I think: the Periyar allowances ~~previously~~ given in

previous years were similarly restricted: moreover the allowances are given as "local allowances", and it is clear from Code paras 527 and 528 that such allowances are only to be drawn for such periods as the officers concerned "may be on authorized duty" within the defined limits, in this case the head work. It is not quite clear whether the Supg. Engineer does or does not dispute the correctness of this view: he says at the beginning of para 3 that he thinks Mr. Taylor's view incorrect, but at the end of the same para he says it is "only reasonable to suppose" the contrary.

4. With regard to the second point, the rule of Code para 527 has I believe always been strictly interpreted, and periods of temporary absences have never, unless by oversight, or from want of correct information, been treated as periods passed within the defined limits.

5. If Government consider it desirable to fix any minimum period within which such temporary absences will not count, the sanction

statement was received in my office on the 22nd August 1888. The questions raised in the Supg. Engineers letter, appear to be six, namely;

(a) the question "whether the allowances are to be confined to periods spent on duty above the ghats;

(b) the application of the above restriction in the case of temporary absences;

(c) the meaning of the expression "consolidated";

(d) my action in taking upon myself to alter the phraseology of the Government of India";

(e) the delay in returning the salary bill.

(f) the alleged shirking of supposed duty of making out the claims correctly in detail.

3. The first point is not I think seriously disputed. The whole tenor of the correspondence from beginning to end, and the repeated use of such expressions as "the conditions of life at the head works "the staff employed on the head works" of the Periyar", and the reference to the allowances given in other "hill tracts", indicate this unmistakeably I think: the Periyar allowances ~~previously~~ given in

previous years were similarly restricted: moreover the allowances are given as "local allowances" and it is clear from Code paras 527 and 528 that such allowances are only to be drawn for such periods as the officers concerned " may be on authorized duty" within the defined limits, in this case the head work. It is not quite clear whether the Supg. Engineer does or does not dispute the correctness of this view: he says at the beginning of para 3 that he thinks Mr. Taylor's view, incorrect, but at the end of the same para he says it is "only reasonable to suppose" the contrary.

4. With regard to the second point, the rule of Code para 527 has I believe always been strictly interpreted, and periods of temporary absences have never, unless by oversight, or from want of correct information, been treated as periods passed within the defined limits.

5. If Government consider it desirable to fix any minimum period within which such temporary absences will not count, the s[illegible]on ear

of the Government of India will be necessary, I doubt however whether it will be worth while to raise the question, as any such proposal would probably cut both ways, and short periods (within the minimum) spent in the defined limit would probably not count.

6. As regards the third point, I have already expressed my opinion in my office note No. 2146 of 28th. August 1888, and I should probably only complicate matters by going into it in detail on this reference. If any further expression of opinion is desired from me, it will no doubt be asked for in connection with the office note just quoted. If the scale of pay proposed by the Supg. Engineer and sanctioned by Government, was framed under a misapprehension, that is of course a reason for revising the scale, but that is not a fact which could have been within my knowledge, or which could have influenced me in dealing with the claims.

7. With regard to the fourth point (d), I am surprised that Colonel Pennycuick should have failed to see that alteration of

phraseology, or substitution of one expression, or set of expressions, for another, is nothing more than "interpretation" which is one of the most ordinary duties of an Examiner. Colonel Pennycuick had himself already taken exception to the use of the term "consolidated", and in the performance of my obvious duty of interpreting an order, I substituted the expression "special". My interpretation may have been wrong, or might even have been absurd, but the imperfect performance of an obvious duty would hardly warrant strictness for undertaking the duty at all. I note however that Colonel Pennycuick himself thinks that the two expressions do really mean the same; and that being the case his complaint seems to me somewhat unnecessary.

8. As for the fifth point (e), the charge as stated by the Supg. Engineer is I admit a serious one, but I submit that the fact stated in the opening of this note considerably alters the complexion of the case. As I had asked the Supg. Engineer

to furnish a statement which I evidently considered necessary for the proper disposal of these claims, it might I think have occurred to the Supg. Engineer that I should wait for this statement. As the statement was not received until the 22nd. August 1888, the delay is reduced to eight days.

9. I am very sorry that there should have been even this delay. By some accident the Supg. Engineer's letter (refusing to furnish the statement) was not seen by me when it arrived; had I seen it, I should have taken it up at once, but as it was, it passed through the ordinary routine and I did not see it until the 30th. I regret even this comparatively trifling delay — a delay of eight days in connection with a matter that has been under correspondence for a year if not more, but I venture to think that, under the circumstances, the Supg. Engineer might almost as reasonably have complained of delay in communicating to him the sanction of the Government of India; and I think that, if the history of the whole question were thoroughly

examined, it would probably be found that there have been several other delays — possibly even some for which the Executive Engineer and the Supg Engineer may be responsible — quite as great and quite as inexcusable as the one now in question, when the latter is reduced to its true dimensions.

10. Referring to what the Supg. Engineer calls my suggestion "that the claims should be included in the bill for September " and not paid till near the end of October" (see the end of his para 17), I beg to say that if a separate statement, such as I asked for, had been sent, at any time, it would have been examined at once, and the Executive Engineer would according to the invariable practice in such cases, have been asked to pay the claims found admissible, charging them to miscellaneous advances pending inclusion by this office in the next salary bill received, and as the Supg. Engineer had absolutely declined to furnish such a statement, it seemed useless to say anything more about it.

11. As I have mentioned the date (22nd. August 1888) on which the Supg. Engineer's refusal of the statement was received, I may also mention that my letter asking for the statement was only despatched on the 10th. August 1888. Otherwise it might be erroneously supposed that there was some delay on the part of the Supg. Engineer in replying to my request. I am sorry it was not asked for a few days earlier, as perhaps it might have been, but delays of a few days here and there cannot possibly be altogether avoided in a large office always pressed with work. It is evident at any rate that the matter was not put aside and neglected until the very last day of the month, as the Supg. Engineer's letter would probably lead any one to suppose.

12. As regards the last point (f), I submit that an officer is bound to put his claims in a reasonably correct form as to details, and that it is not the duty of the Examiner's office to make out the details of his claim for him. It is often done, when the trouble is not excessive, from a desire to expedite as much as possible the disbursements of acknowledged dues even though not claimed. The claims submitted by the Executive Engineer Periyar Division did not appear to me to have been drawn up in such detail as is to be reasonably expected, before an audit office should be asked to check them; and the failure in this respect seemed to me the less excusable because Mr. Taylor was for a long time in the West Coast Division (which include the Wynaad), and therefore presumably — his letter however now seems to throw some doubt on the correctness of the presumption — well acquainted with the rules as to local allowances. In fact the case seemed to me, at the time, — though wrongly perhaps, — very much like that of an officer who should submit his journal with a travelling allowance bill for an outside lump sum — say Rs. 250 — and expect the audit office to make out his bill correctly as to details and dock any excess claimed.

13. With regard to the Supg. Engineer's remarks about the use

of the weekly returns, I submit that they are intended for use in connection with the audit of current claims, and that it is hardly reasonable to expect the audit office to construct out of some forty returns, covering a period of about eleven months, a detailed history of the movements of each individual; a thing which could only be done by delaying the disposal of the current claims of other divisions received in proper detail.

14. In the above remarks I have endeavoured to deal with all points that seem to require remark, but if I have overlooked any point, or if it should seem that there is any point as to which the explanation is insufficient, I trust that I may have an opportunity of completing it before the matter is finally disposed of.

15. In conclusion I venture to protest against some of the expressions used in the Supg. Engineer's letter, as for instance "perfectly unjustifiable" keeping of a number of men "out of money which is admittedly due to them", and "going out of his way to invent artificial

objections". As far this last remark, I find a difficulty in understanding what it means. After carefully reading and re-reading the Supg. Engineer's letter it seems to me that if the remark has any particular meaning or reference -- if it is anything more than a strong expression of general disapproval of my action, it must refer to the fact that, having, in the performance of a recognized duty, to construe a certain order, which the Supg. Engineer had previously characterized as unintelligible, or something to that effect, I adopted an interpretation which, on the Supg. Engineers own showing (para 8 first line), is probably correct, his only real objection being to my application, in certain individual cases, of the order thus interpreted.

C.

27/9

G. 6. 2180 W. 18. 7. 88

P.W.C. No 9786

(5)

En. 3

R/28. 9. 88

0

28.9.8

No 379 P.R

Office of the Supg Engineer,
Periyar Project Works.
Periyar 27th July 1888.

B/292 1/P

From
Col. J. Pennycuick R.E.,
Superintending Engineer,
Periyar Project Works.

To
The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

With reference to G. O. No 2180 W of 18th instant, I have the honor to request explanation of the meaning of the expressions "engaged locally" and "not on consolidated salaries" with regard to clerks and sub overseers.

2. The word "locally" presumably refers to the Periyar valley, and the fact of its insertion shows how little the Government of India realise the condition under which these works are being executed.

3. As far as I know all clerks and sub overseers are on consolidated salaries, certainly I never heard of one who was not, but the expression must be used in some more limited

sense, for it is not conceivable that the Government of India would after keeping the men concerned in suspense for nine months have granted even this concession with a condition which practically withholds it from the very men of all others to whom it is most necessary.

4. Our office subordinates are the very men who suffer most by residence here, they are all natives of a class to whom the climate and conditions of life are almost intolerable, and without extra pay it will be perfectly impossible to get decent men to remain here.

5 I do not wish to raise any question with regard to my own exclusion from the limited benefits now conferred on the other officers employed here, but it might be worth while to point out to the Government of India that as the difference of pay between Superintending Engineer 2nd class and 3rd class is only Rs 50 per month, it would be a positive benefit to me to be reduced to the 3rd class.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obdt servt,
Col. R.E.,
Supdg Engineer Punjab Imperial Works.

G. O. No 2180 W. d/ 18. 7. 88.

EXAMINER
No. 1655
13 AUG 1888
P. W. ACCOUNTS

8649

P. W. C. No 7055

P. W. Department
Ootacamund 11th augt 1888

No 1493 D

(1)

From,

The Supg Engineer
Periyar Project

To, The Chief Engineer
P. W. D

No 379. P.R.

Dated 27th July 1888

Recd 1 - 8. 88

To/
C

For remarks.

Jcc
10/8/88

17P

To V. No 2149 d/ 28. 8. 88

The Government of India no doubt mean that the local allowances sanctioned are only to be given in the case of officers, subordinates, clerks and accountants of the permanent establishment employed in the Periyar hill tracts on the pay of their substantive departmental ranks, or of such temporary or pro tem ranks as they may be holding in virtue of ordinary departmental promotion; and that the allowances are not to be given to men employed temporarily on scales of pay framed with special reference to local conditions of service, or to members of the permanent establishment who may be occupying posts for which such special scales of pay have been fixed, and who are drawing the pay of such posts instead of their proper departmental salaries.

2. Para 5 of Colonel Pennycuick's letter is not understood; he draws as Supg. Engineer 2nd Class pay and allowances at Rs. 1,752-4-0 per mensem, and as Supg. Engineer 3rd Class he would draw only Rs. 1,593-8-0 per mensem.

C.

Requests explanation of the meaning of the expressions "engaged locally" and "not on consolidated salaries" with regard to clerks and Sub overseers, mentioned in G O No 2180 W dated 18th July 1888 sanctioning the grant of certain allowances to the P. works Dept staff employed on the head works of the Periyar Project —

[illegible] 31. 8

P.W.C. No. 8644

~~G.O. 2180 W. 18. 7. 88~~
~~In 493 D. 11. 8. 88~~

P.W. Cons. [illegible] of 1888
673 D. 17. 9. 88
493 D. 11. 8. 88
2568 W. 20. 8. 88 25 [illegible] 13. 9. 88
497 D. 11. 8. 88
2180 W. 18. 7. 88
1861 W. 22. 6. 88
411. 12 W. 6. 2. 88
3389 W. 12. 12. 87
293 D. 8. 6. 88
1187 W. 20. 4. 88
856 W. 15. 3. 88
507. 8 W. 13. 2. 88
2834 W. 22. 10. 87
2314 W. 29. 8. 87
356 G. 7. 4. 83
1762 W. 1. 7. 74
2835 3. 12. 72

R/29-8-88

~~The Examiner's office note is communicated to the Supdg. Engineer Periyar Project with reference to his letter No. 379 P.W. of 27 July 1888~~

5/9/88

S. E. Periyar Project

[illegible] 13. 9. 88
[illegible] 30. 8. 88

---

24 [illegible]

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 3152 W.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 8th October/88 -

READ the following

Letter from the Executive Engineer No. 1 Periyar Dn. to the Supdg. Engineer Periyar Project. } P.W. No. 25. C of 6th Septr. 1888

From the Supdg. Engr. Periyar Project Works } " " 650. P.W. of 8th Septr. 1888

Office Note from the Examiner P.W. Accts " " 2323 of 27th Septr. 1888

Letter from the Supdg. Engr. Periyar Project Works } " " 379 P.W. of 27 July 1888

Office Note from the Exam. P.W. Accts " " 2149 of 28th Augt. 1888

19 P

Ordered that the matters in dispute be referred to the Government of India for decision.

To The S.E. Periyar Project
" Exam. P.W. Accts.
Desp. 24/10

4 Oct

P.W. No. 3153 of 8th October/

To

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

Sir,

I am directed to forward

for the orders of the Government of India, the accompanying copies of correspondence which have arisen out of the sanction to special Fever allowances communicated in your letter No. 118 I. d/ 3rd July 1888.

2 The questions requiring the decision of the Government of India are

(1) Whether the special allowances are to be drawn all the year round, or only for periods spent above ghats, &c.

(2) whether men on the temporary establishment are entitled to the allowance.

3 As regards (1) the Supdg. Engineer points out that the scale of allowances originally recommended (especially in the case of clerks, who are most to be considered,) was considerably greater than that actually granted

by

by the Government of India, and that it is thus reasonable to suppose that the reduced scale of allowances was intended to be drawn throughout the year. There is, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor-in-Council, some force in this contention, and it is commended to the consideration of the Government of India.

4 In respect to (2) the Supdg. Engineer explains that the salaries of the temporary establishment were intentionally fixed at ordinary rates with the expectation that the men would receive the special allowances in addition; If they are now declared ineligible for the special allowances, it will, His Excellency the Govr.-in-Council

considers, be necessary to revise their salaries accordingly.

5 - Having in view the hardship involved in the wholesale retrenchment made by the Examiner, the C.E. was, on the 15th September last, authorised, pending final orders, to disburse Periyar allowances to the whole establishment, permanent and temporary for periods spent above Ghâts. I am now to request confirmation of the proceeding.

2/10/05

20/10

R.S.

173 : 8
129 : 9
9
3/10

26

17-1-11

Go of (1888) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

9/10

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G.O. 5 Oct 1888, No. 3152/3153

Senior allowances

Ordered that the G. of India be addressed on the subject of the –

Senior allowances

Requesting orders on certain points ~~of the G.~~ in regard to the grant of —

E/S 9/2

collection copies

9/10 9/10