

Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 2573 W

DATED 10 October 98

Censure

[Despatch Abstract.]

Withdrawing the ~~C~~ passed on
the manner of Rev. Accounts for rendering
information in regard to the Grant of Charge allowed
to Mr. W. M. Barker as an Engineer & fixing
the responsibility ^{fulfilling} in similar cases on the Secy.
himself.

E

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

B
Hom orders

Again G.O., dated	189	,	No.
Again G.O., dated	189	,	No.
Current No. 5554	of 1898, dated 4 th July	O.N.	from the Examined, P.W. Accounts.
" "	" 189	,	" "
" "	" 189	,	" "

No: 2593 W/8/10.10.98

The Examiner, P. H. Accounts.

C. No. 5554 of 1898.

SUBJECT.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.
~~THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.O.I.E.~~
~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

Withdrawal of the censure
 on
 passed ~~by~~ the Examiner,
 P.W. Accounts.

18.25.93 14/10/10.28

FOR ORDERS.

In his note read above the Examiner P.W. Accounts appeals against the censure implied in para 3 of G.O. No. 1395 W dated 3rd June 1898. He enters at considerable length -- into the circumstances on which his inaccurate report to Government was based. These are somewhat technical and complicated, and on reconsideration the undersigned is disposed to accept the explanation and to recommend that the para in question of the G.O. be withdrawn.

2. In working out these establishment matters, the Examiner acts as the Secretary's Financial Assistant and not as the independent adviser of Government. He should not, therefore, it is thought, come under the special cognizance of Government.

The matter is fully explained in the note appended B, of which I beg to send ^W extracts

23.5.98

*Very well.
 J. G. H.*

The view of this, it is to be presumed that the Sec. will himself accept the responsibility in future.

*J. G. H.
 1.10.98*

C. A. W.

As you desired that I
should let you see my
note on the subject of
the initiative in the matter
of recording changes in
the personnel of the Engineer
& upper subordinate staff,
I forward this ^{file} ~~note~~ through
you for submission to D.W.
& W., with any remarks
you may desire to offer.

I must premise
by stating that this matter
has been delayed a
considerable time by the
endeavour to trace the G.O.
under which the present
system was brought into
force. When at last
we hit upon G.O. no 15084
of 29.5.83 in the index,
it was found that the
G.O. had been removed
from its proper place

in the bundle, & there was
nothing to show for what
purpose it had been taken.

My patient search
through files relating to estates
questions of later date, we
came upon the copy of
the G.O. which is now in
the present file. It was
found that search had
been made for the original
G.O. some years ago, that
it was not then forthcoming,
& that this copy was then
made from the Examiner's
office copy.

From particularly
anxious to obtain the right
G.O., as I remember that
the order was framed
after a considerable amount
of noting between this
office & C_i, as to the best
method of securing accuracy
in draft notifications -
the G.O. however sets forth
clearly the procedure in force
before May 1883, & the
for ~~leaving~~ adopting

the present plan of leaving the
initiative to C_i.

Formerly, draft no-
tifications were sent to C_i
for check & publication,
after they had been passed
by Govt. & the Chief Secy,
& inaccuracies were then
frequently discovered, neces-
sitating sometimes a re-
vision of the notification
to Govt. If we are to
initiate changes, it will
be necessary to draw up
the draft notification, & to
send them to C_i for check,
before submission to Govt.
or the Chief Secy for
final approval. In the
case of a long string of
events, it is very probable
that several office notes will
pass between this office
& C_i before a correct scale
is agreed to. Then again,
when a large number of
promotions & reversions
have to be made on the
upper subordinate estate,
at one time, I think we

You are aware how much
noting & consideration is
devoted to the selection of
men for the various steps.
If we take the initiative,
it is quite possible that
after all the before men-
tioned labour has been gone
through, C may discover
an error which may
upset all the succeeding
strings of events, &
necessitate a recasting of
the draft notification.

Now as first for
suggesting that we should
~~drop~~ drop C's help in
this matter, as I thought
we had sufficient material
in our own office to
initiate changes, but
after carefully considering
the matter, & consulting
the Establishment Clerk,
I think it would be
most advisable to maintain
the present procedure.

C's office has, from
Salary Lists, Journals &c.,
more accurate information

than we have, of dates of
arrival & departure, as-
sumption of charge &c.,
& from his fortnightly report
of changes, we can with
confidence draw up
draft notifications
for submission to W & Genl.
or to Genl. The present
system has on the whole
worked very smoothly
since 1885, & draft
notifications once passed
have very rarely
had to be modified
or recast. Another
important point is that
C keeps the time scale
for the Regt. established in
statements which he period-
ically sends to us enabling
us to regulate pro-
motion on the Regt. establishment.
To take the initiative our-
selves, would be to go
back to the state of
affairs which existed
before May 1885.

the Govt says that
in other provinces, the
Secretaries take the
initiative themselves, but
I submit that our
procedure was an im-
provement on that in other
places, as it was an
endeavour to minimise
inter-communication on
detail changes.

I should have
mentioned before, that
shortly after the issue
of G.O. no. 150 SW of 29.5.83,
it was arranged with
~~Chief Secy~~ C that his reports
should be in the form
of a fortnightly return
of changes. This practice
has continued since.

In going through
the papers on the subject
in the Secy's office, I
was shown an old note
by Mr D.C. Gordon,
who was Secy in 1953,
relating to the following

effect: - "We shall do this for
in office, but as our
reports are sometimes based
on incomplete information,
maybe they will not round
on us if our information
is at any time not quite
accurate."

As we accept C's
help in this matter, perhaps
it was not quite proper
to have made use
of the observation in
that final place in
para 3 of G.O. no. 139 SW
of 3.6.88, that this
ground perhaps the
para might be with-
drawn.

C
10.9.88
DW
W

Submitted

I quite agree with
SAs, and would add
that our Establishment
Section consists of one
clerk, who is greatly
worked as it is. All the
I have been able to do

to 27.
6-9-97.
P. W.
DEPT.

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5554

From E. A. Denny Esquire
Esq. P. W. Accounts,
Madras T Coorg

Order

No. 808 $\frac{A}{Z}$

Dated 2 July 1898

Received }
Registered } 4-7-98

Enclosures
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Charge Allowance to Mr Parker
Assistant Engineer. Explains a
circumstances under which
was reported to be inadmissible,
with remarks.

o L S 230 o L S 372

Nizams

him is to give him the temporary
help of a clerk from time to time
to clear off arrears. C's office
on the other hand is organized
on a most liberal scale. He can
have no difficulty in finding clerks
for any amount, almost, of extra
work.

As regards want of information.
I do not know what is referred to.
C has all the information that we
have, and a great deal more.

It will give infinitely more trouble
if these questions of changes in Estab-
lishment are initiated in the Secretariat.
I have a vivid recollection of the time &
trouble consumed before the arrangements
of 1883 was decided on. The rules are
much more complicated now.

C's help should be given unofficially,
in his capacity of Financial Asst to the
Secretary. He would thus never come under the
notice of the Govt. as in the Govt. complained of. It seems
reasonable that, under this view, the censor
should be withdrawn.

R.S.
13 Sep 98

W the views of C.A.W & S.A.W that the present
system should be maintained, as being the best possible
one, can be accepted. Yes.

2. As per order, when Esq. P.W.A. made
the special stipulation, as now brought to notice by S.A.W,
that the information supplied, did not be taken as proof
from the possibility of error, the censor merely passed
as C might be withdrawn. Such information be re-
fused in future as not unofficially.
Yes note in order accordingly. 15-9-98.

h
h
to
on
on
h
T
h
f

... route he was ...

W
s
ed
e-

dated

189 .

{ P. W.
DEPT.

1897.

Madras, 2nd July 1898

OFFICE NOTE No. 208 $\frac{A}{3}$

To

W.

On the strength of the remarks passed in para 3 of G.O.No.1395 W dated 3rd June 1898 I think it ~~is~~ necessary to explain at some length the circumstances under which the charge allowance to Mr Parker, Assistant Engineer, which was originally stated to be admissible, had subsequently to be reported as inadmissible.

2. In his letter No.3552 dated 26th November 1897 printed with G.O.No.3580 W dated 22nd December 1897, Mr Allen signified his willingness to accept the offer of the Nizams' Government under certain conditions one of which was that he was to be on probation for a period of three months, and that, if at its close, His Highness the Nizams' Government and Mr Allen agreed that he should be confirmed, the engagement was to last for a period of 5 years on both sides.

3. Until, therefore, Mr Allen was actually confirmed in his new post under the Nizams

Nizams Government, it was not possible to remove his name from the effective list as "seconded" on deputation to Foreign service for over 6 months vide P.W. Code I.I. 59 clause (4).

4. The probationary period of three months stipulated upon having expired on the 31st March 1898, it was a natural presumption that the engagement was to last for 5 years vide my O.N. No. 417 A E dated 31st March 1898. On this presumption, Mr Allens name was removed from the list as "seconded", with the result that such removal reduced the limit of the No. of Executive Engineers up to which temporary promotions could be made from 36 to 35. The deputation of Mr Allen while it thus reduced the No. of Executive Engineers by one, also reduced the No. of Executive Engineers permanent and temporary allowable by one, thus rendering the charge allowance which was stated to be admissible ^{against a vacancy, inadmissible} under the supposed altered conditions of his engagement.

5. From the telegram from the Government of India dated 18th June 1898, it now appears that the question of Mr Allens confirmation is still under consideration, and if this is held to be tantamount to an extension of the three months probation allowed him, it will be a matter for consideration whether Mr. Allen should not still be retained on the list, in which case the charge allowance to Mr. Parker will, after all, be admissible; but on this point a further report will be sent on receipt of final

orders of the Government of India.

6. You will thus see that the original report as to the admissibility of charge allowance was based on the aspects of the case as they stood at the time, and that the subsequent report as to its inadmissibility was justified by the fact of no intimation of Mr Allen's probation not having ceased having been received in my office.

7. Considering that, unlike the practice in most other Provinces, changes in the personnel of the Engineers and Upper Subordinate Establishments are initiated by the Examiners office, and not unfrequently on incomplete and, occasionally, incorrect information, it must I think be admitted the reports by the Examiner cannot but be liable at times to modification in the light of information subsequently received. The information ^{originally} furnished in the present case can scarcely therefore, I submit, be termed as "inaccurate", and I would accordingly ask that Government may be moved to cancel or modify the remark in para 3 of the G.O. quoted.

W 27.98
c.

27/98

DW

Submitted with
reference to W's
note.

a note on the
point referred to
by W will be
submitted

Noted
AK

18-7-98.

cc
19/7/98

Shy

PWD

Cms 55521

W

DW

For order.

The said note
seems to be a piece
of special pleading -
Mr Allen went to
Hyderabad on three
months trial. There
was a strong pre-
sumption that he
would be confirmed,
while he was still
on probation. The Govt
should not have re-
sented his absence
as causing a vacancy.

When the Govt
reported on 12 June
1898. that there was
a vacancy, admitting

the grant of
of a charge allow-
of Rs 85 per m. to
Mr Parker, it must
have been known
perfectly well in his
office that if Mr
Allen was confirmed
at Hyderabad, the
vacancy would be
non-existent. But
the question was decided
one way or the other,
he should not have
advised the grant of
an allowance which,
there was every pro-
bability, would
have to be retrenched
later on.

He does now
compliment the matter
by stating that if
Mr Allen's probationary
period is extended,

the charge allowance to
Mr Parker may after
all be admissible.
This means that if
Mr Allen is allowed
a further trial of say
3 months, his name
will be kept on the
motion list, & the
allowance may be re-
granted to Mr Parker.
But then if Mr Allen
is confirmed at the
end of the extended
probation (his con-
firmation will of course
date from the time
he first joined) his
name will be removed
from the motion
list, & it will again
be necessary to cancel
the allowance to Mr
Parker.

This question of
charge allow- should

not be considered at
all until it is finally
decided whether
my Allen is to be
confirmed at Hyderabad.

My dear's argu-
ments that his first
report was not
inaccurate, is not
at all convincing.

W
13-7-98

I don't think I have made
out a case why para 3 of B.O.
1395 W of 7.6.98 should be
cancelled or modified. It is
obvious that ~~it~~ allowances
should not be granted until it
is clear that they stand no
chance of being cancelled.
Yet I now propose to
~~repeat the~~ ~~commit the same error~~
which para 3 of the B.O.
took exception to.

A.H.
14-7-98.

Saw

While the position of Mr.
Allen's permanent transfer
to foreign service has
settled C should not
have brought forward the
position of a vacancy
occurring in his stead.
As a matter of fact, I
believe Mr. Allen is
chief instructor to the D.O.
who is expected to report
the first part of
para 7 of C's note. It
might be better to alter the
practice of instituting changes
of personnel in this office
15-7-98.