

CURRENT No. 1364

Govt. of {1895} Madras.
PENSION.

19-12-94 No 4150.C
7-6-94 No 1406.W
20-9-93 No 2416.W
26-7-93 No 1937.W

25.C

Dec: 25-2-95

Rs 501 W d 2 March 1895

Recorded

CHAND
26/5/95

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 12th February 1895, No. 162.

FEBRUARY.

S. V. L. Arith

Encl. W. R.

4/5/95

RS

Shroff.

Reporting, for the orders of the Government of India, the question whether service as — on the Public Works establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior.

DESPATCHED
4-MAR-95

250 to 008

INDEXED
2.2
6/3

12TH FEBRUARY 1895, No. 162, PENSION.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension.

READ—again G.O., dated 31st May 1894, No. 669, Pension.

READ—also the following office-note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 14th December 1894, No. 4909-A.:—

In G.O., Pension Department, No. 669, dated 31st May 1894, copy of which has been communicated to you, Government, on the certificate and report of this office, sanctioned the grant to C. Subrahmanyam, late clerk, V class, 2nd grade (shroff), Irrigation establishment—

- (i) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 50 in consideration of his qualifying inferior service of 17 years and 10 days; and
- (ii) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 12 in consideration of his qualifying superior service of one year and eight months.

2. With reference to the above order, the Accountant-General, Madras, pointed out that no portion of Subrahmanyam's services should have been treated as inferior, as Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, prescribes that service of all shroffs in the Madras Presidency should be regarded as pensionable on the superior scale.

3. The ruling in Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, under which service as shroff in Madras should be regarded as superior irrespective of the pay attached to the post, has been based on G.O., Pension Department, No. 1034, dated 11th September 1889, in which this Government brought to the notice of the Government of India the position of shroffs in the Revenue Department in the following terms:—

“Shroffs in this Presidency are as a class most respectable and trustworthy and their work is very heavy. Their duty is not confined to the mere shroffing of coin as the designation of their appointment indicates, but is more responsible than that of ordinary gumstabs or clerks. They are in fact assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers. They have also by the existing rules to furnish large security and the loss of interest on this owing to its compulsory investment in Government securities swallows up a great part of their pay. The rules enforcing their responsibility for defective coins have of late become very stringent and practically result in an appreciable diminution of their salaries.”

4. Many of the above circumstances do not exist in the case of shroffs employed in the Public Works Department. It is doubtful therefore whether the ruling that service as shroffs is superior, applies to shroffs in this department, or whether the classification (superior or inferior) is to be determined, as has been done in this case, with reference to pay attached to the appointment.

5. I forward, for the information of Government, copy of Executive Engineer's (Buckingham Canal division) No. 1945 of 10th November 1894, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, giving information as to the nature, &c., of the duties performed by shroffs in the Public Works Department, and would request the favour of orders of Government as to how such service should be treated.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. S. RUSSELL, Esq., Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 10th November 1894, No. 1945.

(a) At Trevellian Basin Wharf—Mallayappa Mudaly on Rs. 10.
(b) At Elephant Gate Wharf—Ganapathy Mudaly on Rs. 8.

With reference to your endorsement, No. 278-B.C., dated 5th instant, I have the honour to state that there are only two shroffs employed in this division as noted in the margin.

2. As regards the several points on which information is required by the Examiner, I have to report—

(1) The nature of their duties consists of—

- (a) the collection of wharfage fees at the wharves at which they are stationed;
- (b) the compilation and submission of traffic registers.

(2) Their work is not very heavy, but one man is required at each of these wharves to collect dues and to register and regulate traffic.

(3) Their duties are probably more responsible than those of clerks. Although they collect comparatively small sums, the amount of trouble and confusion to traffic they would cause by negligence of orders would be very considerable.

(4) They collect small amounts, the actual cash collection during the whole of official year 1893-94 having been—

	RS.	A.	P.
(a) At Trevellian Basin	118	6	0
(b) At Elephant Gate	575	7	0

(5) They are of course responsible for the defective coins, if any, they may collect, but loss on this score has probably been insignificant. At any rate no complaints have been received on this matter.

(6) Securities are now not required from shroffs, such securities having been withdrawn under G.O., No. 2416 W., dated 20th September 1893, which lays down that security is not required from the subordinate revenue establishment. They furnished security formerly to the extent of Rs. 50 each. A revival of this system is recommended in the case of shroffs as a check on frauds and temptations to which these poorly-paid subordinates are liable to be exposed.

No. 296-B.C.

Forwarded to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with reference to his letter No. 4331-A. of the 31st October 1894.

20th November 1894.

(Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Major, R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

Endorsement No. 4150-C.

Transferred to the Pension Department for consideration.

2. At present no other shroffs are employed in the Public Works Department than the two in the Buckingham Canal division. There appears to be no reason why these two appointments should be excluded from the benefit of Article 435, Civil Service Regulations.

19th December 1894.

(Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 12th February 1895, No. 162, Pension.

The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, asks whether service as shroff on the Public Works Establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior. The Accountant-General points out that Article 435, Civil Service Regulations, extends the privilege of superior service to "all shroffs in Madras," and is accordingly of opinion

that shroffs in the Public Works Department are entitled to be so treated. The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, however, doubts whether this ruling applies to the shroffs of the Public Works Department, whose position differs in many respects from that of shroffs in the Revenue Department.

2. The correspondence which led to the extension of the superior service rules to all shroffs in the Madras Presidency shows that the concession was applied for on behalf of shroffs belonging to the Revenue Department, and it is clear that the men employed upon shroffing work in the Public Works Department are on a different footing. The Revenue Department shroffs are in fact "assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers;" they furnish large security, and their work is heavy. None of these conditions are present in the case of shroffs of the Public Works Department, who are merely toll-collectors, with little to do, who furnish no security, and who have hardly anything in common with the shroffs, properly so called, except the name conferred upon them by the Public Works Department. The Government accordingly considers that the Public Works Department shroffs cannot be treated in the matter of pension as on a par with the Revenue Department shroffs. On the other hand, the terms used in the Secretary of State's despatch, read in G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension (which terms have been reproduced in Article 435, Civil Service Regulations), do undoubtedly cover the case of Public Works Department shroffs, as well as of all other officers in a similar position, and the matter will therefore be reported to the Government of India for orders.

3. The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Under Secy. to Government.

To the Accountant-General.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" the Public Works Department.

Exd. A. Grubert.

50 Copies.

Gobt. of {1895} Madras.
PENSION.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 12th February 1895, No. 162.

FEBRUARY.

Shroff.

Reporting, for the orders of the Government of India, the question whether service as — on the Public Works establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension.

READ—again G.O., dated 31st May 1894, No. 669, Pension.

READ—also the following office-note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 14th December 1894, No. 4909-A.:—

In G.O., Pension Department, No. 669, dated 31st May 1894, copy of which has been communicated to you, Government, on the certificate and report of this office, sanctioned the grant to C. Subrahmanyam, late clerk, V class, 2nd grade (shroff), Irrigation establishment—

- (i) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 50 in consideration of his qualifying inferior service of 17 years and 10 days; and
- (ii) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 12 in consideration of his qualifying superior service of one year and eight months.

2. With reference to the above order, the Accountant-General, Madras, pointed out that no portion of Subrahmanyam's services should have been treated as inferior, as Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, prescribes that service of all shroffs in the Madras Presidency should be regarded as pensionable on the superior scale.

3. The ruling in Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, under which service as shroff in Madras should be regarded as superior irrespective of the pay attached to the post, has been based on G.O., Pension Department, No. 1034, dated 11th September 1889, in which this Government brought to the notice of the Government of India the position of shroffs in the Revenue Department in the following terms:—

"Shroffs in this Presidency are as a class most respectable and trustworthy and their work is very heavy. Their duty is not confined to the mere shroffing of coin as the designation of their appointment indicates, but is more responsible than that of ordinary gumastahs or clerks. They are in fact assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers. They have also by the existing rules to furnish large security and the loss of interest on this owing to its compulsory investment in Government securities swallows up a great part of their pay. The rules enforcing their responsibility for defective coins have of late become very stringent and practically result in an appreciable diminution of their salaries."

4. Many of the above circumstances do not exist in the case of shroffs employed in the Public Works Department. It is doubtful therefore whether the ruling that service as shroffs is superior, applies to shroffs in this department, or whether the classification (superior or inferior) is to be determined, as has been done in this case, with reference to pay attached to the appointment.

5. I forward, for the information of Government, copy of Executive Engineer's (Buckingham Canal division) No. 1945 of 10th November 1894, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, giving information as to the nature, &c., of the duties performed by shroffs in the Public Works Department, and would request the favour of orders of Government as to how such service should be treated.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. S. RUSSELL, Esq., Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 10th November 1894, No. 1945.

- (a) At Trevellyan Basin Wharf—Mallayappa Mudaly on Rs. 10.
(b) At Elephant Gate Wharf—Ganapathy Mudaly on Rs. 8.

With reference to your endorsement, No. 278-B.C., dated 5th instant, I have the honour to state that there are only two shroffs employed in this division as noted in the margin.

2. As regards the several points on which information is required by the Examiner, I have to report—

(1) The nature of their duties consists of—

- (a) the collection of wharfage fees at the wharves at which they are stationed ;
(b) the compilation and submission of traffic registers.

(2) Their work is not very heavy, but one man is required at each of these wharves to collect dues and to register and regulate traffic.

(3) Their duties are probably more responsible than those of clerks. Although they collect comparatively small sums, the amount of trouble and confusion to traffic they would cause by negligence of orders would be very considerable.

(4) They collect small amounts, the actual cash collection during the whole of official year 1893-94 having been—

	RS.	A.	P.
(a) At Trevellyan Basin	118	6	0
(b) At Elephant Gate	575	7	0

(5) They are of course responsible for the defective coins, if any, they may collect, but loss on this score has probably been insignificant. At any rate no complaints have been received on this matter.

(6) Securities are now not required from shroffs, such securities having been withdrawn under G.O., No. 2416 W., dated 20th September 1893, which lays down that security is not required from the subordinate revenue establishment. They furnished security formerly to the extent of Rs. 50 each. A revival of this system is recommended in the case of shroffs as a check on frauds and temptations to which these poorly-paid subordinates are liable to be exposed.

No. 296-B.C.

Forwarded to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with reference to his letter No. 4331-A. of the 31st October 1894.

20th November 1894. (Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Major, R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

Endorsement No. 4150-C.

Transferred to the Pension Department for consideration.

2. At present no other shroffs are employed in the Public Works Department than the two in the Buckingham Canal division. There appears to be no reason why these two appointments should be excluded from the benefit of Article 435, Civil Service Regulations.

19th December 1894. (Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 12th February 1895, No. 162, Pension.

The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, asks whether service as shroff on the Public Works Establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior. The Accountant-General points out that Article 435, Civil Service Regulations, extends the privilege of superior service to "all shroffs in Madras," and is accordingly of opinion

that shroffs in the Public Works Accounts, however, doubts whether this ruling applies to the shroffs of the Public Works Department, whose position differs in many respects from that of shroffs in the Revenue Department.

2. The correspondence which led to the extension of the superior service rules to all shroffs in the Madras Presidency shows that the concession was applied for on behalf of shroffs belonging to the Revenue Department, and it is clear that the men employed upon shroffing work in the Public Works Department are on a different footing. The Revenue Department shroffs are in fact "assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers;" they furnish large security, and their work is heavy. None of these conditions are present in the case of shroffs of the Public Works Department, who are merely toll-collectors, with little to do, who furnish no security, and who have hardly anything in common with the shroffs, properly so called, except the name conferred upon them by the Public Works Department. The Government accordingly considers that the Public Works Department shroffs cannot be treated in the matter of pension as on a par with the Revenue Department shroffs. On the other hand, the terms used in the Secretary of State's despatch, read in G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension (which terms have been reproduced in Article 435, Civil Service Regulations), do undoubtedly cover the case of Public Works Department shroffs, as well as of all other officers in a similar position, and the matter will therefore be reported to the Government of India for orders.

3. The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Under Secy. to Government.

To the Accountant-General.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" the Public Works Department.

Exd. A. Grubert.

50 Copies.

No 5016 d 2 March 1895

Recorded

*(Sd) CH B B
D A*

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 12th February 1895, No. 162.

FEBRUARY.

Shroff.

Reporting, for the orders of the Government of India, the question whether service as — on the Public Works establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior.

12TH FEBRUARY 1895, No. 162, PENSION.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension.

READ—again G.O., dated 31st May 1894, No. 669, Pension.

READ—also the following office-note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 14th December 1894, No. 4909-A.:—

In G.O., Pension Department, No. 669, dated 31st May 1894, copy of which has been communicated to you, Government, on the certificate and report of this office, sanctioned the grant to C. Subrahmanyam, late clerk, V class, 2nd grade (shroff), Irrigation establishment—

- (i) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 50 in consideration of his qualifying inferior service of 17 years and 10 days; and
- (ii) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 12 in consideration of his qualifying superior service of one year and eight months.

2. With reference to the above order, the Accountant-General, Madras, pointed out that no portion of Subrahmanyam's services should have been treated as inferior, as Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, prescribes that service of all shroffs in the Madras Presidency should be regarded as pensionable on the superior scale.

3. The ruling in Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, under which service as shroff in Madras should be regarded as superior irrespective of the pay attached to the post, has been based on G.O., Pension Department, No. 1034, dated 11th September 1889, in which this Government brought to the notice of the Government of India the position of shroffs in the Revenue Department in the following terms:—

"Shroffs in this Presidency are as a class most respectable and trustworthy and their work is very heavy. Their duty is not confined to the mere shroffing of coin as the designation of their appointment indicates, but is more responsible than that of ordinary gumastahs or clerks. They are in fact assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers. They have also by the existing rules to furnish large security and the loss of interest on this owing to its compulsory investment in Government securities swallows up a great part of their pay. The rules enforcing their responsibility for defective coins have of late become very stringent and practically result in an appreciable diminution of their salaries."

4. Many of the above circumstances do not exist in the case of shroffs employed in the Public Works Department. It is doubtful therefore whether the ruling that service as shroffs is superior, applies to shroffs in this department, or whether the classification (superior or inferior) is to be determined, as has been done in this case, with reference to pay attached to the appointment.

5. I forward, for the information of Government, copy of Executive Engineer's (Buckingham Canal division) No. 1945 of 10th November 1894, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, giving information as to the nature, &c., of the duties performed by shroffs in the Public Works Department, and would request the favour of orders of Government as to how such service should be treated.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. S. RUSSELL, Esq., Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 10th November 1894, No. 1945.

- (a) At Trevellyan Basin Wharf—Mallayappa Mudaly on Rs. 10.
(b) At Elephant Gate Wharf—Ganapathy Mudaly on Rs. 8.
- With reference to your endorsement, No. 278-B.C., dated 5th instant, I have the honour to state that there are only two shroffs employed in this division as noted in the margin.

2. As regards the several points on which information is required by the Examiner, I have to report—

(1) The nature of their duties consists of—

- (a) the collection of wharfage fees at the wharves at which they are stationed;
(b) the compilation and submission of traffic registers.

(2) Their work is not very heavy, but one man is required at each of these wharves to collect dues and to register and regulate traffic.

(3) Their duties are probably more responsible than those of clerks. Although they collect comparatively small sums, the amount of trouble and confusion to traffic they would cause by negligence of orders would be very considerable.

(4) They collect small amounts, the actual cash collection during the whole of official year 1893-94 having been—

	RS.	A.	P.
(a) At Trevellyan Basin	118	6	0
(b) At Elephant Gate	575	7	0

(5) They are of course responsible for the defective coins, if any, they may collect, but loss on this score has probably been insignificant. At any rate no complaints have been received on this matter.

(6) Securities are now not required from shroffs, such securities having been withdrawn under G.O., No. 2416 W., dated 20th September 1893, which lays down that security is not required from the subordinate revenue establishment. They furnished security formerly to the extent of Rs. 50 each. A revival of this system is recommended in the case of shroffs as a check on frauds and temptations to which these poorly-paid subordinates are liable to be exposed.

No. 296-B.C.

Forwarded to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with reference to his letter No. 4331-A. of the 31st October 1894.

20th November 1894.

(Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Major, R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

Endorsement No. 4150-C.

Transferred to the Pension Department for consideration.

2. At present no other shroffs are employed in the Public Works Department than the two in the Buckingham Canal division. There appears to be no reason why these two appointments should be excluded from the benefit of Article 435, Civil Service Regulations.

19th December 1894.

(Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 12th February 1895, No. 162, Pension.

The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, asks whether service as shroff on the Public Works Establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior. The Accountant-General points out that Article 435, Civil Service Regulations, extends the privilege of superior service to "all shroffs in Madras," and is accordingly of opinion

that shroffs in the Public Works Department are entitled to be so treated. The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, however, doubts whether this ruling applies to the shroffs of the Public Works Department, whose position differs in many respects from that of shroffs in the Revenue Department.

2. The correspondence which led to the extension of the superior service rules to all shroffs in the Madras Presidency shows that the concession was applied for on behalf of shroffs belonging to the Revenue Department, and it is clear that the men employed upon shroffing work in the Public Works Department are on a different footing. The Revenue Department shroffs are in fact "assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers;" they furnish large security, and their work is heavy. None of these conditions are present in the case of shroffs of the Public Works Department, who are merely toll-collectors, with little to do, who furnish no security, and who have hardly anything in common with the shroffs, properly so called, except the name conferred upon them by the Public Works Department. The Government accordingly considers that the Public Works Department shroffs cannot be treated in the matter of pension as on a par with the Revenue Department shroffs. On the other hand, the terms used in the Secretary of State's despatch, read in G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension (which terms have been reproduced in Article 435, Civil Service Regulations), do undoubtedly cover the case of Public Works Department shroffs, as well as of all other officers in a similar position, and the matter will therefore be reported to the Government of India for orders.

3. The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Under Secy. to Government.

To the Accountant-General.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" the Public Works Department.

End. A. Grubert.

50 Copies.

Gobt. of {1895} Madras.
PENSION.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 12th February 1895, No. 162.

FEBRUARY.

Shroff.

Reporting, for the orders of the Government of India, the question whether service as — on the Public Works establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior.

12TH FEBRUARY 1895, No. 162, PENSION.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension. *not read*

READ—again G.O., dated 31st May 1894, No. 669, Pension.

READ—also the following office-note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 14th December 1894, No. 4909-A.:—

In G.O., Pension Department, No. 669, dated 31st May 1894, copy of which has been communicated to you, Government, on the certificate and report of this office, sanctioned the grant to C. Subrahmanyam, late clerk, V class, 2nd grade (shroff), Irrigation establishment—

- (i) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 50 in consideration of his qualifying inferior service of 17 years and 10 days; and
- (ii) of a compensation gratuity of Rs. 12 in consideration of his qualifying superior service of one year and eight months.

2. With reference to the above order, the Accountant-General, Madras, pointed out that no portion of Subrahmanyam's services should have been treated as inferior, as Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, prescribes that service of all shroffs in the Madras Presidency should be regarded as pensionable on the superior scale.

3. The ruling in Civil Service Regulations, Article 435, under which service as shroff in Madras should be regarded as superior irrespective of the pay attached to the post, has been based on G.O., Pension Department, No. 1034, dated 11th September 1889, in which this Government brought to the notice of the Government of India the position of shroffs in the Revenue Department in the following terms:—

"Shroffs in this Presidency are as a class most respectable and trustworthy and their work is very heavy. Their duty is not confined to the mere shroffing of coin as the designation of their appointment indicates, but is more responsible than that of ordinary gumastahs or clerks. They are in fact assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers. They have also by the existing rules to furnish large security and the loss of interest on this owing to its compulsory investment in Government securities swallows up a great part of their pay. The rules enforcing their responsibility for defective coins have of late become very stringent and practically result in an appreciable diminution of their salaries."

4. Many of the above circumstances do not exist in the case of shroffs employed in the Public Works Department. It is doubtful therefore whether the ruling that service as shroffs is superior, applies to shroffs in this department, or whether the classification (superior or inferior) is to be determined, as has been done in this case, with reference to pay attached to the appointment.

5. I forward, for the information of Government, copy of Executive Engineer's (Buckingham Canal division) No. 1945 of 10th November 1894, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, giving information as to the nature, &c., of the duties performed by shroffs in the Public Works Department, and would request the favour of orders of Government as to how such service should be treated.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. S. RUSSELL, Esq., Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 10th November 1894, No. 1945.

With reference to your endorsement, No. 278-B.C., dated 5th instant, I have the honour to state that there are only two shroffs employed in this division as noted in the margin.

2. As regards the several points on which information is required by the Examiner, I have to report—

(1) The nature of their duties consists of—

- (a) the collection of wharfage fees at the wharves at which they are stationed ;
- (b) the compilation and submission of traffic registers.

(2) Their work is not very heavy, but one man is required at each of these wharves to collect dues and to register and regulate traffic.

(3) Their duties are probably more responsible than those of clerks. Although they collect comparatively small sums, the amount of trouble and confusion to traffic they would cause by negligence of orders would be very considerable.

(4) They collect small amounts, the actual cash collection during the whole of official year 1893-94 having been—

	RS.	A.	P.
(a) At Trevellian Basin	118	6	0
(b) At Elephant Gate	575	7	0

(5) They are of course responsible for the defective coins, if any, they may collect, but loss on this score has probably been insignificant. At any rate no complaints have been received on this matter.

(6) Securities are now not required from shroffs, such securities having been withdrawn under G.O., No. 2416 W., dated 20th September 1893, which lays down that security is not required from the subordinate revenue establishment. They furnished security formerly to the extent of Rs. 50 each. A revival of this system is recommended in the case of shroffs as a check on frauds and temptations to which these poorly-paid subordinates are liable to be exposed.

No. 296-B.C.

Forwarded to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with reference to his letter No. 4331-A. of the 31st October 1894.

20th November 1894.

(Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Major, R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

Endorsement No. 4150-C.

Transferred to the Pension Department for consideration.

2. At present no other shroffs are employed in the Public Works Department than the two in the Buckingham Canal division. There appears to be no reason why these two appointments should be excluded from the benefit of Article 435, Civil Service Regulations.

19th December 1894.

(Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 12th February 1895, No. 162, Pension.

The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, asks whether service as shroff on the Public Works Establishment on pay below Rs. 10 is inferior or superior. The Accountant-General points out that Article 435, Civil Service Regulations, extends the privilege of superior service to "all shroffs in Madras," and is accordingly of opinion

that shroffs in the Public Works Department are entitled to be so treated. The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, however, doubts whether this ruling applies to the shroffs of the Public Works Department, whose position differs in many respects from that of shroffs in the Revenue Department.

2. The correspondence which led to the extension of the superior service rules to all shroffs in the Madras Presidency shows that the concession was applied for on behalf of shroffs belonging to the Revenue Department, and it is clear that the men employed upon shroffing work in the Public Works Department are on a different footing. The Revenue Department shroffs are in fact "assistants to the treasurers and cashkeepers;" they furnish large security, and their work is heavy. None of these conditions are present in the case of shroffs of the Public Works Department, who are merely toll-collectors, with little to do, who furnish no security, and who have hardly anything in common with the shroffs, properly so called, except the name conferred upon them by the Public Works Department. The Government accordingly considers that the Public Works Department shroffs cannot be treated in the matter of pension as on a par with the Revenue Department shroffs. On the other hand, the terms used in the Secretary of State's despatch, read in G.O., dated 1st May 1890, No. 470, Pension (which terms have been reproduced in Article 435, Civil Service Regulations), do undoubtedly cover the case of Public Works Department shroffs, as well as of all other officers in a similar position, and the matter will therefore be reported to the Government of India for orders.

3. The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

Reel

Under Secy. to Government.

To the Accountant-General.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" the Public Works Department.

Exd. A. Grubert.

50 Copies.