

1852 w 7 21/6/50



No. 3622 w 21/5-1002

The Examiner Public

Works Accounts is authorised to admit the pay of Mr. Ellis, draughtsman, at the lower rate proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. There is no objection to men being appointed on lower rate of pay than those provided in the sanctioned scale, but each case should be separately submitted for the sanction of Government who alone have power to alter sanctioned rates of pay.

10.11.50
10/11/00

It is as the sanction to the pay of Mr. Ellis, draughtsman, at the lower rate proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, in para 2 of the Chief Engineer's letter are extraordinary.

C.E. for J.
Ex: J.W. Aceto
Ciel 10.11.50
12/11/00

1888

From Chief Engineer for Irrigation
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF WORKS,
Restoration
Tank Maintenance Scheme,

To THE Chief Engineer
J.W. Depette

No. 2800 T
Dated 7th November 1888
Despatched
Received

ENCLOSURES.

No. 3622 w 21/5-1002

Subject.

Requests sanction of Government to the pay of Mr. J.C. Ellis Draughtsman in no III Party. Tank Restoration Scheme, disallowed by the Examiner of P.W. accounts under P.W. Code para 172 note and also a general ruling to govern all similar cases in future.

With order

be glad of a general ruling to
govern all similar cases in future.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

S. D. Pease
for Chief Eng^r for design
H.S.

4.7.11. D. 11

No. 2800T

Chief Engineer,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
TANK MAINTENANCE SCHEME,

Chepak, 7 November 1888.

From

G. J. Walch Esq.
As Chief Engineer Coordination
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
TANK MAINTENANCE SCHEME,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department

Enclosures.

SIR,

I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to obtain the sanction of Government to the employment of W. J. C. Ellis, 3rd Class draughtsman, as second draughtsman No 3 Party, Tank Restoration Scheme.

2. The draughtsman was appointed to No 3 Party on Rs 30 (i.e. Rs 20 + Rs 10 local allowance), in August last. In applying for renewed sanction of Tank Restoration Scheme Establishment,

See

(see statement printed with S.O.,
No 1852 W, dated 21st June 1888),
the estimated pay of the 2nd
draughtsman was put down at
Rs 50, but this figure was put
down—as in many other instances
included in the same statement—
merely as a maximum to be drawn
by the holder of the post, since
had a lower rate—say Rs 30—been
allowed, it might in the first
place have been impossible to induce
a suitable man to take the post
in Hurmool on that pay, in the
second place it would have been
impossible to promote him—even if
qualified by his examinations—and
in the 3rd place it would have
been impossible to exchange him,
on necessity, with a man drawing
higher pay in another Party—with-
out in each case obtaining the

special sanction of Government to
the excess over the Rs 30 allowed.

3. The Examiner of S.M. Accounts
disallows Mr Ellis's pay under S.M.
Code para 172, note, on the ground
that the sanctioned rate of pay is
being lowered to suit Mr Ellis's
qualifications; and though it has
been pointed out to the Examiner
that the rates allowed in the
sanctioned statement are maxima
and that therefore not merely should
it be allowed to employ men on
lower rates of pay, but that the
employment of men on lower salaries
should on the other hand rather
be insisted on, provided that
they are considered fit to do the
work required of them, he declines
to allow Mr Ellis's pay without
the sanction of Government, for
which I now ask, and I shall
be

be glad of a general ruling to
govern all similar cases in future.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

S. D. Pease
for atg Chief Eng or for Dr Wright
M.S.

4.7.11. D. 12

3615, 3616, 3618, 3619, 3620
3621 9-3622
15-11-1888
counting

Let I see H. H. H.
Munich
MML
12/11/88

John G.
12/11/88

28