

Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 1756 E

DATED

11 July '98

28540
1898

[Despatch Abstract.]

W. C. B. Bullion. Letter from the Govt of India
declining to modify the decision already
arrived at in regard to the date of commencement
of local allowance to — a Under Secy, but
stating that separate orders will issue in
regard to his prayer to be allowed the house
rent of his rank, irrespective of the maximum
limit of Rs 1050 on account of pay & allowances,
Commnd: to Mr Bullion, thro' the S. E. Secy.

[illegible]

SUBJECT.
Mr C. H. B. Barlton Sec: Engineer

Declining to modify the decision already
communicated re: the date from which
the local allowance as Under Secretary
was to be drawn by —, and
stating that separate orders will
issue with regard to his request
to be allowed the house rent of
his rank irrespective of the
maximum limit of Rs 1050
on account of pay & allowance

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
1054-55W	26-4-98
5285C	6-12-97
3309W	26-11-97
234W	20-1-96
2545W	16-10-95
2450W	5-10-95
2331W	19-9-95
2199W	5-9-95
2266W	19-8-95
425W	19-2-95
491C	8-2-95
91W	15-1-95
3104W	4-12-94
2950W	16-11-94
1602W	27-1-94

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
-----	-------

All communications
should be addressed
to the Secretary.

No. 1560 G.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Simla, the 4th June 1898.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1055 W., dated 26th April 1898, forwarding for orders, a letter from Mr. C.H.B. Burlton, Executive Engineer, and Under Secretary to the Government of Madras, in which he prays (1) that the sanction to the grant of his local allowance as Under Secretary may commence from the date of his appointment to that office viz., 2nd April 1894, instead of from 12th August 1895, the date on which the Secretary of State's sanction to grant of the allowance was received; and (2) that he may be allowed the house rent of his rank irrespective of the maximum limit of Rs. 1,050 on account of pay and allowances.

These requests are supported by the Government of Madras for the reasons explained in your letter under reply.

2. In regard to the first request, I am directed to state that the Government of India have again considered the matter and regret they are unable to modify the decision already communicated in Public Works Department letter No. 43 G., dated 6th January 1896, which is accordingly upheld.

3. I am, however, to observe that Mr. Burlton is in error

in

in stating that retrospective effect was given in the case of the allowances to the Under Secretaries to the Governments of Bengal, the North Western Provinces and Oudh, the Punjab and Burma. ^{These} allowances were applied for and sanctioned in 1890, and the sanction took effect from the date of receipt of the Secretary of State's orders. The same rule which is the ordinary rule was followed in the case of the Under Secretary to the Government of Madras.

4. In regard to the second request, I am directed to state that separate orders will be issued later.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

Su laistre

Offg. Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Documents accompanying:-

Nil.

+ The allowances were ^{from Madras} applied for in 1890, & sanctioned in May 1890 (May I). The same application took 14 months to dispose of. *W. B. S. 11.6.98*

M.I.

His Excellency the Governor

Cms 5175

This note in the subject is forwarded with reference to His Excellency's instructions in C. No 5175. The inf.

upon it seems from the letter which is to point out that while it took, at most, 4 1/2 months to sanction the allowance to Bengal, Madras & Burma, it took 14 months to sanction a similar provision to Madras. I certainly think this inequality of treatment deserves a strong protest.

Perhaps this might be asked to refer the matter to the Secy of State

Done the draft order on C. No. 5175 (S. B. S.)
W. B. S. 11.6.98
24.6.98
Refused B-

On the whole, I do not think any good result will follow further correspondence on this subject.

A. S. H. 3.7.98

H. E. 24.6.98 5.7.98

unexpended relative to the local allowance of Rs. 100 of under sanctioning p. co. 5.

The case in support of Mr. Bartlett's claim to be granted the allowance with retrospective effect from 2nd April 1894, is contained in letter to India No. 1055-W of 26.4.98.

In reply, the S. & S. states that it has again considered the matter, regrets it is unable to modify the decision already communicated in its letter No. 43 of date 6.1.96, which is accordingly upheld.

His Secy. inquires whether a strong case can be made out

for a rejoinder, & the papers
have been sent to me
with refer to this case's
note.

Sanction to the
allow was first commu-
nicated in letter from the
G. F. J. No 2428 dated
29.8.95. It was then
stated that the sanction
would have effect from
12.8.95, the date of receipt
of the Secy of State's
despatch on the subject.

Very soon after
(in letter from this office
No 2450 W of 5.10.95)
the G. F. J. was asked
whether the sanction
might be brought
into effect from the
27. June 1894, the date
on which it was applied
for, & attention was
drawn to the delay
in disposing of the

+ Flag 6 -

+ W.

+ letter No 43 of 6.1.96
flagged B -

i.e. that Sanctions must
have effect from the date
of receipt of
of the Secy of State's despatch
conveying the same -

+ A

Flag 6

matter which had occurred
in the G. F. J. Secretary

In reply, the G. F. J.
said that after giving
careful consideration to
the argument advanced
by the Govt. in favour
of giving earlier effect
to the sanction, it was
unable to recommend
a departure from the
usual rule, as it did
not consider that any
special hardship was
involved to the officers
concerned.

The question was
again argued as strongly
as possible in this office
in letter No 1055 W of 26.4.98,
but the result is again
a refusal to reconsider
the matter. This last
refusal is couched
in rather positive

terms, it seems ~~very~~
doubtful whether the
H. of S. will listen with
equanimity to any further
representation on the
subject.

His Excy. however
seems willing to support
a rejoinder, if one can
be made out, & the
papers are therefore
submitted for consideration
as to whether anything
fresh can be urged
in favour of giving
a retrospective effect
to the sanction.

The H. of S. points
out that Mr. Burlton
is in error in stating
that retrospective effect
was given in the case
of the Alley to the under
Secretary in Bengal &c.,
& that there allowance

were applied for and
sanctioned in 1880, & that
the sanction took effect
from the date of receipt
of the Secy of State's order.

Mr. Burlton made
use of the term "retro-
spective effect" in his
letter of 21.2.88. This
was no doubt a
mistake, for the
sanction to the grant
of the Alley to the under
Secy. in Bengal &c.
was conveyed in a
letter dated 15.7.80,
& it was then stated
that the sanction would
have effect from ~~the~~
14.5.80, which no
doubt was the
date of the ~~last of the~~
receipt of the Secy of
State's despatch on
the subject. This
point however

+ T

⊕ P.

appears to require no
rejoinder -

Mr. S. J. S. still
with regard to
further that Mr. Burtin
cannot request, viz:
that Pres. have not
should be granted
investigation of the
limit of \$1050, -
separate order will
be issued later. His
point will probably
be conceded, & need
not again be taken
up in the present
connection -

for orders.

On

20-6-98

W I do not see the material
for reprints beyond printing
out that the Meadows Under
leg was kept out of the al-
low given to R. W. Under legs
elsewhere, because the Govt
took so long a time to dispose
of a foregone conclusion. This

is hardly ^{likely} to make that
but. recollect the help
& it seems clear that they
have made up its mind
to make no ~~unsuccessful~~
further departure from a
rigid interpretation of,
what is termed, "the or-
dinary rule."

Atk

20-6-98.