

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 20
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 11/89
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 6/3

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P. a. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	2123 2124	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	6. 8. 1890	198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

Shining

GOVT.
MADRAS.

1890

P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 30 June 1890.

OFFICE NOTE No. 3809

To

W.

If by the term "sanctioned cadre" as used in the concluding portion of the letter from the Government of India No. 1312 G. dated 21st. May 1890 communicated with G.O. No. 1534 W. dated 3rd. June 1890, the Government of India refer to the cadre as sanctioned by them in their letter No. 3042 G. dated 29th. November 1888 communicated with G.O. No. 3884 W. of 10th. December 1888, then on the dates (3rd. November 1889 to 7th. December 1889) from and to which Mr. Joyce held charge of the Madura Division in addition to his own duties, there were 30 charges against 29 sanctioned posts. It seems therefore that no charge allowance is admissible to Mr. Joyce.

2. The claim will be passed provisionally if desired, pending any reference that may be considered necessary to make to the Government of India, but early orders of Government are solicited as to whether this is to be done or

whether the claim should be disallowed
when preferred by Mr. Joyce.

4/6
C.

2/23
17
No 394 Day 10 July 1900

To C.

Your office note No 3809 of
30.6.90.

The 30 charges calculated by
you apparently include the
Subdivisions and Cuddalore (Indra)
divisions which were not
included in the 29 charges
sanctioned by the Govt of India
in its letter No 3042 of 29.11.88.
More 29 charges referred to
are all permanent divisions
in which category it was
stipulated in the previous
correspondence that the Runkhela
and Darya Divisions should be
placed - Hence the inclusion
of these divisions in the Govt
letter of 29.11.88.

Letter from the Govt No 1312 of
24.1.90 says distinctly
that the additional charge
allowance of Rs 100/- may be
hanced, provided the total
number of permanent and
temporary charges included in
the Madras sanctioned cadre
is not exceeded. As this
Govt. has power to create
temporary divisions, these
sanctioned cadre may be held
to

Pr. Ar. 1534W of 3.6.90 ✓
B. 1200-12W of 23.4.90 ✓
... 631 W of 20.5.90 ✓
... 3601 W of 18.12.89 ✓
Memo No 5360C of 16.11.89 ✓
Pr. Ar. 3884W of 10.12.88 ✓
... 3267W of 13.10.88 ✓

No 6212 of 15.2.90

39. VII

2/7

KEEP WITH

CURRENT No.

dated

189

to the 29 permanent charges
authorized by the Govt. Also
such temporary charges as may
be constituted by the Govt. -
Apparently therefore there is no
objection to the admission of
charge allowance to Mr. Joyce
for the period in question.

If you do not concur in
this view, the allowance may be
passed to Mr. Joyce provisionally
pending a reference to the Govt.
of India, which will be made
if you still consider it necessary.

Yours

RRR DB

W.

supd 10/7/90.

12 JUL 1890

No. 394 D.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Ootacamund, 10th July 1890.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W.

To

C

Your office note No.
3809 d/30.6.1890.

The 30 charges cal-
culated by you apparently
include the Quibrada
and Cuddalore bridge
divisions, which were
not included in the 29
charges sanctioned by
the Govt. of India in
its letter No. 3042 of
29.11.88. Those 29 charges
referred to are all permanent
divisions in which category
it was stipulated in the
previous correspondence
that

9 pages
that the Ruslikulga divisions
should be placed. Hence
the mention of those divisions
in the Govt. of India letter
of 29 Nov. 1898.

Letter from the Govt.
of India No. 1312 & 7212
May 1899 says distinctly
that the additional charge
allowance of Rs. 100 may
be passed, provided the
total number of permanent
and temporary charges
included in the cadres
functioned cadre is not
exceeded. As this Govt.
has power to create tem-
porary divisions, the
functioned cadre may
be held to be the 29
permanent charges an-
nounced by the Govt. of
India, plus such temporary
charges as may be con-
stituted by this Govt.
Apparently therefore there
is no objection to the
admission of charge

21/12/99
allowance to the force for
the period in question.

If you do not con-
cur in this view, the al-
lowance may be passed
to the force provisionally
pending a reference to the
Govt. of India, which
will be made if you
still consider it necessary.

Queeny

10.7.99

Cu

(C. No. 1201
S)

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1890.

P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

-WITH

CURRENT No.

Madras, 2/ July 1890.

189

OFFICE NOTE No. 4373.

To

Enc 1

W.

Your office note No. 394 D. dated 10th.
July 1890.

The Cuddalore Bridge Works was not included in the 30 charges referred to in my office note No. 3809 dated 30th June 1890 as it is treated as a sub-division of the South Arcot Division.

2. I understand the "permanent and temporary charges included in the Madras Sanctioned Cadre" referred to in the letter from the Government of India communicated with G.O. No. 1534 W. dated 3rd. June 1890 to mean the 29 Divisional Engineers (permanent) and 3 special Tank Engineers (temporary) included in the list printed with G.O. No. 3884 W. dated 10th. December 1888. I do not think that Government is at liberty to increase the Cadre (whether permanent or temporary) by creating as it certainly can, temporary divisions. On the contrary, I understand that such temporary divisions can only be created on the condition that they can be officered without

exceeding the sanctioned Cadre.

3. If Government is not disposed to accept this view, I would ask that the matter may be referred for the orders of the Government of India. In the mean- while, the allowances claimed ^{by} Mr. Joyce will be passed provisionally unless Government now directs that the claim shall remain in abeyance pending final settlement of the question as to the admissibility of the allowances.

Inf.
for C.

M. J.
D. 21/7
(Encl.)

No. 2123⁴ W. of 6 Aug. 1890

Mr. A. 1534 W. of 36.70
" " 3884 W. of 10.12.88
" " 3267 W. of 13.10.88
Reg. C. no. 62089 90

P.W. C. no. 69075

Ad. 22-7-90

Enc. 1

Under 176 C.S. Regs.
Mr. Joyce would at the discretion of Govt be allowed a charge allowance for holding the Murderer Division in addition to the Tank parties.
It is open to question whether according to the spirit of the rules, the charge of a Tank party should not be considered equivalent to the charge of a division, but as most of the Executive Engineers in the T.R.S. are in charge of two Tank parties, they would in this case claim charge allowance under 175(h).
If however the rule be that every officer ^{of the highest} in charge of one or more Tank parties is for the purpose of the rule in Art 176(h) considered as one Tank party in charge.

of his division, the
difficulty is not

work

S.M. 5.3.90

To be over and the
proceedings to be

F.I. 1.1.1901

proceedings to be

proceedings to be

work

Note for the order
of the Hon., drafted
by J. submitted
for perusal.

Cr.

7.3.20

Sum

work

7.3.90

work

7.3.20

40

Papers to

to be

9/3

S.I. 1.1.1901

work

21/3

work

If a tank party
is to be declared
division for the purpose
of Art. 178 (h) C.S.R.,
the following cases will
have to be considered.

(1) An S.M. in charge
of two parties will
be able to claim the
addl Rs. 100 per m.
under article
178 (h) (i) -

(2) An upper subordinate
in charge of party will
be able to claim the
Rs. 50 allowed by Art.
178 (h) (ii) -

(3) An S.M. of an
ordinary division having
a tank party within his
division under his
orders, will be able
to claim Rs. 100 p.m.

under art. 178 (b) (1)
 proposed by
 Cu
 10-3-90

under art. 178 (b) (1)
 proposed by
 Cu
 10-3-90

under art. 178 (b) (1)
 proposed by
 Cu
 10-3-90

2/10/90

I see no reason why
 the charge of one or more
 Tenth feathers, should
 not be considered equivalent
 to the charge of a deer's skin.
 As the rules now stand
 the decision against the
 claim of Mr. Joyce is
 correct, & apparently
 it will be necessary to
 group the lot of Indian
 furs with the other
 cases under art. 178

11-3-90

The cases under art.
 178 (b) (1) are
 undoubtedly have the
 best of Tenth feathers
 are considered equivalent
 to deer's, and I do not
 think the furs should
 sanction the extra all
 entering there. - make all
 for the. embodying them under
 present results. Rules
 11-3-90

20 W

2183
8

S.J. has marked
this paper to go through
through you.

Please initial
if ~~not~~ remarks are
considered necessary.

It may be pointed
out that it would
be advisable, before
orders are passed
in the case of S.J.'s
suggestions, to ask
C's opinion whether
an order of the Local
Govt. declaring such
parties to be divisions
will be accepted
by him.

Apparently the
sanction of the Govt.
of India will be
required.

Cs

15-3-20

Ans
15.3

12/04/90
625/25 ✓

No 2113 W of 6 Aug 1890 Public Works Department.
21/2
2183/8

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following

Office note from the Exam^r. P.W. Accts. H^r. N^o 3809 of 30. VII-90
Do - do - " - " N^o 4373 of 21. VII-90.

Ordered that the Govt. of India be addressed, and pending receipt of a reply Mr. Joyce's claim will remain in abeyance.

Exam^r. P.W. Accts
Sup^r. Sup^r IV file ✓
11/8

H. E. N^o 2124 W. of 6 Aug 1890.
2. The Secy. Genl Govt of India,
P. W. D.

Sir,

With reference to your letter N^o 13129 of 21st May 1890, sanctioning the grant of the additional charge allowance of Rs 100/- per mensem under article 178 (h), C. S. Regulations, to an Executive Engineer in charge of a Tank Restoration Party working under the direct orders of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, when placed in temporary charge of an ordinary executive division
Yours faithfully
L. E. G.
30/7/90

without prejudice to his own duties, I am directed to request an explanation of the proviso "that the total number of permanent & temporary charges included in the Madras sanctioned cadre is not exceeded".

2. In your letter N° 3042 G dated 29th November 1888, twenty-nine permanent divisional charges and three special tank charges were sanctioned, but at the time the circumstance described in para 2 of my letter N° 1201 W of 23rd April 1890 took place there were in existence, in addition to three tank parties in charge of Executive Engineers, and twenty-nine permanent divisions, one temporary (the Gudivada) division, the formation of which had been duly sanctioned by this Government, and all of which were financed within the Budget Grant for Establishment. The Examiner, P.W. Accounts however holds that the "sanctioned cadre" includes only the

23/7

21/83/10

Twenty-nine permanent charges and the three special tank parties referred to in your letter of 29th November 1888 above quoted, and that as an extra temporary division was in existence when the claim arose, the additional charge allowance is not admissible to the officer in question.

3. If the Examiner's view be correct, it is needless to say that an Executive Engineer will very seldom be in a position to claim the allowance of Rs 100/- under article 178 (h) C.S. Regulations, when placed in temporary charge of two divisions, as there are nearly always one or more temporary divisions in existence, specially formed for the execution of projects. In the opinion of this Government "the total number of permanent and temporary charges" referred to in your letter of 21st May 1890 should be taken to mean the 29 permanent charges

sanctioned by the Government
of India plus such temporary
divisions as may be constituted
by this Government, provided
the total number of such
charges can be officered
within the establishment.

If an officer in charge of
one such division is
temporarily absent, and the

Executive Engineer of a
neighbouring division is
placed in charge of the two
divisions for a short period,

the latter officer would certainly
appear entitled to the extra
allowance of Rs 100/- In no
case would the formation

of a temporary division be
sanctioned with the express
object of placing it under
the dual charge of an Executive
Engineer already in charge
of a permanent division.

2. Copies of two notes on the subject
from the Secy. P.W. Dept. No 3309
of 30th June 1890 and 4373 of
13th July 1890, are herewith
forwarded.

1/8 July 90

113-111
Hw 28 VII



No. 2123-4 Wd 61 Aug 1890