

(1) Number of pages 26
(2) Date of repair 21-1-87 ✓
(3) Initials of the Referencer lax

81

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Public DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1257	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	16 - 9 - 1881	<i>[Signature]</i>

Co. 5

Not to be folded or roughly handled

13

1257
1

To
HIS GRACE THE MOST NOBLE
THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS,
Governor of Fort St. George in Council.
The memorial of H. LEFANU, Esq., B.A., Ex. Sch.
F.C.D., Barrister-at-Law and of the Madras
Civil Service.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHewETH,—That your memorialist is a member of the Madras Civil Service appointed in the year 1865, is Head Assistant to the Collector and Magistrate of Tinnevely, and is now Acting Sub-Collector and Joint Magistrate of Salem. That your memorialist respectfully prays your Grace's Government to take into consideration the hopeless position in which he, and other junior Members of the Madras Civil Service, are placed, through no fault of their own, as regards pay, promotion, furlough and furlough allowances.

That your memorialist was induced to compete for the Civil Service in 1864 in consequence of the inducements held out to him in certain papers, "relating to the Civil Service of India" which were sent to him by the Civil Service Commissioners. These papers are No. 6,817 printed in 1863 by Her Majesty's printers Eyre and Spottiswoode, and your memorialist respectfully maintains that the Secretary of State and the Government of India are in equity, if not legally, bound to fulfil, to some reasonable extent, the hopes held out in these papers to candidates for the service. In forwarding these papers the Civil Service Commissioners observe as follows. "The statements may be in some respects deficient or incorrect; but, for the purpose of giving a more definite conception than is generally prevalent as to the nature and pecuniary rewards of a civilian's career in India, they will probably be found sufficiently accurate and complete." In these papers the Civil Service Commissioners give certain tables "condensed from one supplied to the Commissioners by the Secretary of State for India" to one of which your memorialist respectfully requests the attention of your Grace's Government.

PERIODS OF SERVICE.	MADRAS.	
	No. of Recipients.	Average Salary.
		£
Under 4 years	8	570
4 Years & less than 8 years.	23	1,218
8 " " 12 "	10	1,680
12 " " 20 "	23	2,149
20 " " 35 "	42	3,235
Upwards of 35 years	2	5,650
Total	108*	2,277

* Absentees omitted in the calculation.

Your memorialist's whole pay at 1s. 8d. per rupee is now, after upwards of 14 years service, only £1,022, and for at least 5 years to come your memorialist can expect no increase of salary under the present conditions of the service. On the contrary, owing to the license tax now contemplated, your memorialist's income will actually be diminished in future years instead of being increased. Your memorialist is therefore receiving, at 14 years service, and is likely to receive up to 19 years service £200 a year less than he was led to expect at 4 years service, £664 a year less than he was led to expect at 8 years service, and £1,127 a year less than he was led to expect from 12 to 20 years service. When your memorialist entered the service a Sovereign was only worth Rs. 10-4. A rupee is now only worth 1s. 8d. The medium in which he is paid has depreciated 14 per cent. in 14 years.

That your memorialist was led to choose the Madras Civil Service in consequence of the higher relative pay which he was led to expect in the earlier years of his service, which expectations have, as shown, been so far from being fulfilled. Your memorialist had his choice of all the Presidencies, and was solely led to prefer Madras in consequence of the higher pecuniary emoluments offered at the outset, resigning thereby the brilliant prospects open in the later years of their service to Bengal Civilians.

That your memorialist desires to call the attention of your Grace's Government to the disadvantages under which University men labour in the service, a disadvantage the more striking as the Secretary of State has now made college residence compulsory. As to the contrast between the career of a university man and that of a non-university man in the service, Nos. 39 (Mr. Daniel) and 94 (your memorialist) on the list supply a test case, exemplifying the inequalities of the service. Mr. Daniel and your memorialist were born in January and April 1849 respectively. In a year when 80 appointments were thrown open for competition, Mr. Daniel passed for the service as a school boy, and came out to India at 19. At least 5

Which he was to make his own use of
X. But if they had not been so, he would have been in the middle

years service he was a pukka Head Assistant and Acting Sub-Collector, and at 5 years service Acting Small Cause Court Judge at Madara; Acting Civil and Session Judge at 8 years service, pukka Sub-Collector at 9 years service, and pukka Collector at 14 years service. Your memorialist entered College at 18, beating for exhibition and honors men who are now his seniors in the Bengal Civil Service, was first of the first in his year in classical honors, Erasmus Smith's exhibitioner, and classical scholar a year before the usual time; took his degree, and, in the open competition for the Indian Civil Service, when there were only 40 vacancies and 219 candidates, was first of all the candidates in the subjects in which he was examined. He was also called to the bar. Your memorialist had to wait upwards of 12 years to obtain a pukka Head Assistantship, and nearly 13 for an Acting Sub-Collectorate, in which post he must rest content up to 19 years service, when he may obtain a pukka Sub-Collectorate. Your memorialist will be entitled to his pension by the time he arrives at a Collectorate. This is no exceptional case. Both the other men of your memorialist's year are university men and in the same position. The same applies to many other members of the years 1863 to 1867. In fact, by a strange anomaly, the prizes of the service are practically reserved for those who entered it under the easiest conditions; while those who qualified by severer tests are permanently excluded from promotion to the higher appointments. It is well known that members of the Civil Service, who should have come to India in the year 1862, failed at the further examination, and only entered the service, in 1863, through having, by a special grace, been permitted to appear at the further examination in that year. This concession was not repeated and the result exemplifies what your memorialist has above stated. Thus Mr. Trevor Lloyd, now a planter in Bengal, was one of those who passed for the Madras Civil Service at the open competition of 1862, when there were 80 vacancies. Failing at the further examination in 1863, he was still young enough to compete with your memorialist at the open competition in 1864, when he failed to obtain one of 40 vacancies. The same results may be deduced from the standard examinations which Civilians have to pass in this country before they can be promoted. In these your memorialist passed before 17 of those who were his seniors by one, two and three years service; and these 17 only passed after the tests had been diluted so as to admit of being passed by instalments and not all at once, as was the rule when your memorialist passed. Of these 17, one is now a pukka District Judge; three are Acting District Judges and two are Acting Collectors. In fact through his whole service your memorialist must be subordinate to men of the same age as himself and of inferior ability.

That your memorialist submits that he might fairly expect to obtain the promotion current in the service when he entered it, and prays the attention of your Grace's Government to the state of things then and now existing. After upwards of 14 years service your memorialist has become No. 94 on the Civil List. When he entered the service, in October 1865, No. 94 (Mr. Whiteside) had less than 10 years service. As No. 94 your memorialist is only a recently confirmed Head Assistant and 4 or 5 years from a confirmed Sub-Collectorate. Mr. Whiteside as No. 94 had been a confirmed Sub-Collector for 3½ years, having reached that rank on 5 years service. He had also already acted as Civil and Session Judge for nearly two years. His promotion was nothing extraordinary; for No. 96 (Mr. Barlow,) was also a confirmed Sub-Collector at that date; so also was No. 101. When your memorialist entered the service the officers of 14 years service were those appointed in the year 1851. Of these gentlemen, Mr. Carmichael, now member of Council, was then a pukka Collector of more than two years standing; Mr. Puckle, of the same year, obtained his pukka Collectorate on 14 years service. At 14 years service your memorialist is only a recently confirmed Head Assistant.

That your memorialist would respectfully call the attention of your Grace's Government to the injurious effect which the new rules have had on the junior members of the service as regards pay. When first proposed in 1867, your memorialist protested against them as wholly in favour of his seniors. The chief result of these rules has been to stop promotion, as no one now vacates his appointment without proceeding on furlough. The increased acting allowances do not at all affect the lower grades and, though they somewhat affect the higher, still the difference is nothing in comparison with the sum lost by promotion being stopped. In the same way the new rules do nothing for the junior members of the service in regard to furlough allowances. The furlough allowance of the old rules was £500 a year. Your memorialist's allowances, if he went on furlough to-morrow, would, after 14 years service, at ½ of the pay of the 3 previous years, not amount to £300 a year, and would only be brought up to that sum by the rules as to the minimum. After 14 and up to 19 years service your memorialist's furlough pay, supposing exchange not to follow, is, 8d. would only be £211 a year, and your memorialist will be entitled to his pension before his furlough allowances will amount to £1,000 a year. The glaring inequality is illustrated by the case above quoted. Mr. Daniel, of the same age as your memorialist, is now on leave on £1,000 a year. Your memorialist's pay for serving in India is, and will be, only £1,022 per annum. In fact your memorialist is practically debarred from taking furlough as the rules now operate. What they amount to is simply this: to one man they say "you entered the service, on the easiest terms, as a school boy; you have been exceptionally fortunate in promotion; you have had ample opportunities for saving, and therefore do not stand so much in need of money, therefore you shall have £1,000 a year on furlough." To another they say "you entered the service under difficult circumstances as to competition, in which you highly distinguished yourself—you came out to the country comparatively poor in life, bringing to the service the culture of a costly university education, and the rank belonging to one of the learned professions; you have

had no promotion worth mentioning; you cannot possibly have saved money; you cannot possibly maintain a wife and six children and educate the latter on £500 a year; but, because of all this you shall have £500 a year on furlough and no more." Your memorialist would call attention to the fact that the old rules regarding furlough were actually more favourable to persons in his position than those of 1868. Half pay up to £1,000 a year, without reference to the average of the preceding 3 years, was allowed on sick leave, and half pay without any limit on special leave. As regards pay on sick or special leave, at no period can your memorialist profit during his service by the rules of 1868. Your memorialist respectfully prays that, in addition to the other concessions alluded to below, your Grace's Government will be pleased to obtain for him and others similarly situated some concession in the matter of leave allowance. Your memorialist is continually suffering from fever and rheumatic gout, brought on by exposure on famine duty, to which nothing but a residence at a German watering place can give relief; but your memorialist cannot leave the country for want of funds. It must be plain to your Grace's Government that the whole furlough allowance of £500 a year would barely maintain and educate six children, to say nothing of your memorialist and the cost of transit from India to England and back again.

That your memorialist further wishes to draw attention to the loss which he and the juniors of the service generally have sustained by the denudation which the service has undergone in the matter of appointments since he entered it. On that date the following appointments, now lost to the service, were held by Madras Civilians. Inspector-General of Jails Rs. 2,750; Accountant-General, Madras Rs. 3,000, Accountant-General, Bombay Rs. 3,000; Judge (3rd Civilian) of High Court Rs. 3,750; President, Sanitary Commission Rs. 3,000; Inam Commissioner Rs. 3,000; Director of Revenue Settlement Rs. 2,800; Small Cause Court Judge, Combaconum Rs. 1,400; Small Cause Court Judge, Vellore Rs. 1,400; Small Cause Court Judge, Madara Rs. 1,400; Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement Rs. 1,287; Superintendent of Coorg Rs. 1,000; added to which three of your memorialist's seniors were employed in Bombay, and subsequently returned to stop promotion. Besides this in the appointment of Registrar to the High Court and Tamil Translator your memorialist, who as a barrister and passed in Honors in Tamil possessed special qualifications for these appointments, has been superseded by Mr. Weir, two years his junior, to 24 of whose seniors this appointment even now, 5 years after it was conferred on him, would still give promotion. On public grounds your memorialist would further pray attention to the results of the abolition of the Small Cause Courts in this Presidency. With the exception of Mr. C. J. Knox, there is not a single Junior Civilian of those now expectant of promotion in the Judicial line who has had the smallest Judicial experience. Some 4 or 5 years hence when, at the close of their service, 50 per cent. of the men of 1864 and 1865 must enter the Judicial branch, there will not be one of them who has ever seen the inside of a Civil Court. The Judicial branch of the service is not one for which a man can qualify *per saltum* by the enchanter's wand of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, and, in the interests of the State and of good administration, it is undesirable that a Civilian who has spent 20 years of his service exclusively in the Revenue line should be pitch-forked into the Judicial line for which he has had no training whatever. On the other hand it would be most unfair were such promotion to be refused them because they had not qualified for a post for which they never had the opportunity of qualifying. No one, with the slightest knowledge of what a Revenue Officer's multifarious work and duties are, can pretend for a moment that, side by side with these, an officer can find time to study the Acts and Rulings which govern the Civil Courts, and which have nothing in common with his current work. Your memorialist would draw attention to the policy in former years of securing a training, to an extent far beyond that of the Small Cause Courts, for Junior Civilians in the Judicial branch, of which every trace has now been swept away.

That your memorialist begs respectfully to submit herewith the accompanying "Examination of the position as regards past and future promotion of the more junior section of the Madras Civil Service, together with a discussion of the remedies appropriate to the case," from which your Grace's Government will see how much his present emoluments and future prospects fall short of what (judging from the experience of his predecessors in the service as far back as 1812) your memorialist had reasonably expected to obtain, in the hope that your Grace's Government will see fit to take such steps as may be necessary to give your memorialist those prospects of promotion to which he considers he is equitably entitled.

That relief has been granted to similar grievances in every province in India except Madras, though the state of the Madras Civil Service is worse than that of any other province except the North-West, and is as bad as that of the North-West Provinces was. That but for a misunderstanding of the position a remedy would have been applied in Madras also in 1876. That this is the more felt by Madras Civilians like your memorialist, who have not only received no reward or recognition whatever for their services during the famine of 1877-78, but also were deprived of the promotion they would ordinarily have received, owing to leave having been stopped during the famine. Your memorialist's loss on this head alone amounts to more than Rs. 5,000. On the other hand Civilians from other Presidencies were allowed the promotion and pay which they would have received if not on famine duty; and this in addition to their famine allowances. Thus Mr. Oldham, a.c.s., who joined the service like your memorialist in 1865, and who passed below your memorialist both in the open competition and at the further examination, drew from Rs. 1,266 to Rs. 1,733 per mensem while on famine duty;

1257
3

during 16 months of famine duty your memorialist received only Rs. 725 per mensem, for 2 months Rs. 733 and for 7 months Rs. 1,021. Mr. Oldham had only famine duty, got Rs. 6 per diem travelling allowance and had the use of Government tents; your memorialist had administrative charge of a division; got only Rs. 4 extra tentage during 18 months of his famine duty, and used his own tents. Your memorialist and many others appointed from the years 1863 to 1869 have had their permanent promotion enormously delayed, and have had, and will have, to act much more and longer in lower appointments than the men who went before them. That this is not only a loss in the past but also a continuing loss, as your memorialist and all in his position must, through all their service, suffer serious loss in the emoluments which they have a right to expect both in acting appointments and on furlough. That even a Collectorate can scarcely be obtained by your memorialist and others similarly affected within the time when they will qualify for pension, and they can never obtain any of the higher offices of the service which fall within the sphere of a legitimate ambition. Had your memorialist known what his prospects were he would never have entered the service. Your memorialist is longer in the country than any member of the Madras bar in good practice, his brother-in-law the Advocate-General alone excepted, and is junior to him by a year only. The same talents which gained him distinction in college, in the open competition and in the Vernaculars would, it is no unfair assumption, have given him a handsome income and an accumulated fortune at the bar. Your memorialist was not dependent solely on the Civil Service when he entered it, as his exhibition, scholarship and right to free chambers in college did not expire until 4 years after he came to the country. When your memorialist respectfully states that the present state of things is inconsistent with efficient administration he is but borrowing the language used in a similar case by Sir J. STRACHY who said, "If nothing be done, the time will come when our Collectors and Magistrates will be men of fifty years old, and our Subordinate District Officers five and forty. The bare statement of such facts will be enough to satisfy any one who knows anything of Indian administration how urgent is the necessity of the case."

That your memorialist trusts that he will be excused for praying the consideration of Government to the facts set out in the accompanying paper and the remedies therein discussed. In doing so your memorialist would draw attention to a condition with which the grant of minimum allowances (para 49) was saddled in other provinces, viz., that the period in excess of one year spent on sick leave before 8 years service was rendered should be deducted. The ground on which this was done was that "such leave sets back an officer's ordinary promotion." This in Madras at least is not the case. Supposing, however, that it was, it would be most unfair that, because an officer has been unfortunate, he should, in consequence of this, have another misfortune tacked on. Your memorialist respectfully submits that two wrongs do not make a right: no officer takes sick leave if he can avoid it, certainly least of all in the earlier period of his service, when his allowances are so small. When one year's leave for four year's residence is allowed, it makes practically no difference to Government when this leave is taken; or rather it is of positive advantage to Government that it should be taken in the earlier years of service, when the leave allowances are smaller and the officer's service is less valuable from want of experience. Your memorialist was obliged before 8 years service to take 2 years and 5 months leave in consequence of sunstroke incurred on duty. Your memorialist has now worked off all the leave taken and has leave to his credit. Had he taken 3 years leave after 8 years service none would count against him under this rule; but, because the leave was taken under 8 years service, 17 months of this leave would count against him. Your memorialist therefore prays that, if minimum allowances are granted, such leave only as has not been earned or worked off should count against service for such allowances.

That your memorialist further respectfully represents that the minimum allowances granted in other provinces bear no tangible proportion to the loss as sustained in the past and to be sustained in the future by him and others similarly situated in the Madras Civil Service, and prays that your Grace's Government will be pleased to recommend a higher scale in view of the great depreciation which his prospects have undergone, and also that such allowances should be retrospective from the date on which similar concessions were granted in the North West Provinces. Your memorialist submits that it would not be fair that he and others should suffer, in comparison with Civilians in other provinces, owing to their moderation and reluctance to bring their grievances to the notice of your Grace's Government.

That, in consideration, your memorialist desires to express that his case is a representative one, and will doubtless be looked on as such by the other members of the service interested in the matter. Your memorialist begs respectfully therefore that your Grace in Council will be pleased to forward to the Government of India, and the Secretary of State, if necessary, with the support of your Grace's Government, this his representation of the hopeless position as regards promotion in which your memorialist now finds himself, with a view to such steps as may seem right to your Grace in Council being taken to afford him redress.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, EVER PRAY.

H. LEFANU,
Madras Civil Service.

OSUR,

17th January 1880.

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR OF
FORT ST. GEORGE IN COUNCIL.

The Memorial of H. LEFANU, ESQ., B.A.,
Esq. Sch. T.C.D., Barrister-at-Law and
of the Madras Civil Service.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That your Memorialist presented a Memorial to your Excellency's Government on the 17th January 1880, and to this he has received no reply, although upwards of nineteen months have elapsed since it was presented. That no steps have been taken to put the Civilians of this Presidency on an equal footing with those of the rest of India, to whom relief was granted in 1876. That the grievances referred to in his Memorial of 17th January are increasing, and the longer your Memorialist serves the more promotion recedes from him. The following will illustrate this—your Memorialist is now, at sixteen years' service, No. 88 on the Civil List. When he competed for the C. S. in 1864, No. 88, had only ten years' service, had been a pukka Sub-Collector for two years, and had nine pukka Sub-Collectors junior to him. When your Memorialist came to India in 1865, No. 88, had ten years' service, had been a pukka Sub-Collector for ten months and had seven pukka Sub-Collectors junior to him.

In 1866 No. 88 had 10 years' service had been a pukka Sub-Collector for 8 months and had 9 pukka Sub-Collectors junior to him.

" 1867 "	" 88 "	" 10 "	" "	" "	" 15 "	" 10 "	" "	" "
" 1868 "	" 88 "	" 10 "	" "	" "	" 7 "	" "	" "	" "
" 1869 "	" 88 "	" 7 "	" "	" "	" 2 "	" "	" "	" "
" 1870 "	" 88 "	" 8 "	" "	" "	" 3 "	" 1 "	" "	" "
" 1871 "	" 88 "	" 9 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1872 "	" 88 "	" 10 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1873 "	" 88 "	" 9 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1874 "	" 88 "	" 10 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1875 "	" 88 "	" 11 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1876 "	" 88 "	" 13 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1877 "	" 88 "	" 13 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1878 "	" 88 "	" 14 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1879 "	" 88 "	" 15 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1880 "	" 88 "	" 16 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
" 1881 "	" 88 "	" 16 "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "

The case of No. 86 on the list is worse as that gentleman has seventeen years' service.

In his former Memorial your Memorialist drew attention to the fact that he is practically debarred from taking furlough, though in ill-health. When your Memorialist joined the service he received from the Secretary to the Board of Examiners a printed paper pointing out the impropriety of incurring debt. The salary which your Memorialist was led to expect at from twelve to twenty years' service was £2,149 per annum. His pay for the last year was Rs. 9,506 = £815-3-8, or £1,333-16-4 less, at sixteen, than what he was led to expect at twelve years' service. Your Memorialist was obliged to send his family home last year, his eldest child being now 14 years of age. His remittances on this account for the last year come to Rs. 11,148-13 = £917-10-9, or £102-7-1 more than his whole pay for the same period. Your Memorialist is prepared to prove this statement if required, and it must be plain that for a

1257
4

lady and seven children to go from Madras to England, set up house, and to clothe, feed, and educate the children, the sum mentioned is not excessive. Your Memorialist, however, respectfully submits that if Government solemnly warn their officers against incurring debt, they are under a corresponding obligation to remunerate them so as to enable them to avoid indebtedness. How your Memorialist, with a family of eight persons to provide for, could pay his passage home and out, and live for a year at home on £500 is a problem which would have to be solved before he can take the furlough at his credit. Your Memorialist has had no furlough for 9½ years, and for at least three years to come can expect no increment to his furlough allowances, and then only a trifling one.

Your Memorialist respectfully requests that, if it is the intention of Government to do nothing for him and those in his position, Government will be pleased to say so and spare them further suspense. The remedies applicable to the situation have been so fully brought to notice in former Memorials that it would be only a waste of time to recapitulate them. If deferred much longer they will be of no effect even if granted.

To date your Memorialist's pay falls short by £11,958 of what he was led to expect in the first sixteen years of his service.* The average pay which he was led to expect was (£22,468 ÷ 16 =) £1,404: the average received was (£10,510 ÷ 16 =) £657 per annum, or about the pay of a First Class Deputy Collector.

* Total pay received in 16 years Rs. 1,21,570 at 1/84 = £10,510. Pay which he was led to expect (vide first Memorial, para. 3) was (£570 × 4) + (£1,218 × 1) + (£1,680 × 4) + (£2,149 × 4) = £22,468 which minus £10,510 the pay received, gives £11,958.

Your Memorialist begs to append a copy of his Memorial presented nineteen months ago as it is possible, the original still remaining unnoticed, that it has not been received. Its receipt has never been acknowledged.

And your Memorialist will as in duty bound EVER PRAY.

H. LEFANU.

HOSUR,
1st September 1881.

C.R.D. *Trincom*
12 SEP 81

*case to be
Gover - with file of
papers relating to the
subject*

*Ld. Hartington lately
told H. of C. that
he was waiting for his
reply to some
queries -*

by 11/9/11

*Letter to G.S. No. 529.
29 April 1880.*

1251/3

*The file of papers in re
Civil Service Grievances
is at this moment
with His Excellency the
Governor, together with
the "Revenue Board v.
Commissioners" file.*

*In April 1880, 19
memorials presented
by members of the Madras
Civil Service were for-
warded to the Govt.
of India, but they
deferred dealing with
the subject till the
larger questions of
the constitution of
new districts of provinces*

Collectors, and of abolishing the Revenue Board were settled.

In the spring of this year, a letter to the Govt. of India was drafted, urging that this particular question should be considered independently of the larger questions, but the present Governor objected to this, and very recently (in a note which was sent to the Hon. Mr. Jannichael for perusal) he remarked that nothing could be done till the Govt. of India had been addressed in the matter

1257/6
matter of the other questions. His Excellency has also remarked that he doubts the existence of a real grievance in the case of some at least of the memorialists. —

Am 21

9. 13/9

Council
 Sec. 100
 M. L. Jones
 President
 1890

In CURRENT No. 1905
1257
7

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR OF
FORT ST. GEORGE IN COUNCIL.

*The Memorial of H. LEFANU, ESQ., B.A.,
Ex. Sch. T.C.D., Barrister-at-Law and
of the Madras Civil Service.*

That your Memorialist presented a Memorial to your Excellency's Government on the 17th January 1880, and to this he has received no reply, although upwards of nineteen months have elapsed since it was presented. That no steps have been taken to put the Civilians of this Presidency on an equal footing with those of the rest of India, to whom relief was granted in 1876. That the grievances referred to in his Memorial of 17th January are increasing, and the longer your Memorialist serves the more promotion recedes from him. The following will illustrate this—your Memorialist is now, at sixteen years' service, No. 88 on the Civil List. When he competed for the C. S. in 1864, No. 88, had only ten years' service, had been a pukka Sub-Collector for two years, and had nine pukka Sub-Collectors junior to him. When your Memorialist came to India in 1865, No. 88, had ten years' service, had been a pukka Sub-Collector for ten months and had seven pukka Sub-Collectors junior to him. When a pukka Sub-Collector for 8 months and had 9 pukka Sub-Collectors junior to him.

Year	Age	Service	Remarks
1867	88	10	Registrar High Court 3 years & 8 mths.
1868	88	10	a pukka Sub-Collr. for 2
1869	88	7	" 3
1870	89	8	and wanted one step to be a pukka Sub-Collector.
1871	88	9	a pukka Sub-Collr. for 10 months and had 3 pukka
1872	88	10	Under-Secretary to Government for 4 years and was Acting Sub-
1873	88	9	Secretary Board of Revenue and had 1 pukka Sub-Collector
			junior to him.
			a pukka Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement for 4 years but 8
1874	88	10	of his seniors were not pukka Sub-Collectors.
			and wanted 11 steps to be a pukka Sub-Collector.
1875	89	11	" 13
1876	88	13	" 16
1877	88	13	" 12
1878	88	14	" 14
1879	88	15	" 12
1880	89	16	" 12
1881	88	16	"

The list is worse as that gentleman has seventeen years' service
 attention to the fact that he is pr

" 1878	" 88	" 14	"	"	"
" 1879	" 88	" 15	"	" 12	"
" 1880	" 88	" 16	"	" 12	"
" 1881	" 88	" 16	"	"	"

The case of No. 86 on the list is worse as that gentleman has seventeen years' service. In his former Memorial your Memorialist drew attention to the fact that he is practically debarred from taking furlough, though in ill-health. When your Memorialist joined the service he received from the Secretary to the Board of Examiners a printed paper pointing out the impropriety of incurring debt. The salary which your Memorialist was led to expect at from twelve to twenty years' service was £2,149 per annum. His pay for the last year was Rs. 9,906 = £815-3-8, or £1,333-16-4 less, at sixteen, than what he was led to expect at twelve years' service. Your Memorialist was obliged to send his family home last year, his eldest child being now 14 years of age. His remittances on this account for the last year come to Rs. 11,148-13 = £917-10-9, or £102-7-1 more than his whole pay for the same period. Your Memorialist is prepared to prove this statement if required, and it must be plain that for a

lady and seven children to go from Madras to England, set up house, and to clothe, feed, and educate the children, the sum mentioned is not excessive. Your Memorialist, however, respectfully submits that if Government solemnly warn their officers against incurring debt, they are under a corresponding obligation to remunerate them so as to enable them to avoid indebtedness. How your Memorialist, with a family of eight persons to provide for, could pay his passage home and out, and live for a year at home on £500 is a problem which would have to be solved before he can take the furlough at his credit. Your Memorialist has had no furlough for 9½ years, and for at least three years to come can expect no increment to his furlough allowances, and then only a trifling one.

Your Memorialist respectfully requests that, if it is the intention of Government to do nothing for him and those in his position, Government will be pleased to say so and spare them further suspense. The remedies applicable to the situation have been so fully brought to notice in former Memorials that it would be only a waste of time to recapitulate them. If deferred much longer they will be of no effect even if granted.

To date your Memorialist's pay falls short by £11,958 of what he was led to expect in the first sixteen years of his service.* The average pay which he was led to expect was (£22,468 ÷ 16 =) £1,404: the average received was (£10,510 ÷ 16 =) £657 per annum, or about the pay of a First Class Deputy Collector.

Your Memorialist begs to append a copy of his Memorial presented nineteen months ago as it is possible, the original still remaining unnoticed, that it has not been received. Its receipt has never been acknowledged.

And your Memorialist will as in duty bound EVER PRAY.

H. LEFANU.

HOSUR,
1st September 1881.

* Total pay received in 16 years Rs. 1,21,570 at 1/8½ = £10,510. Pay which he was led to expect (vide first Memorial, para. 3) was (£570 × 4) + (£1,218 × 4) + (£1,690 × 4) + (£2,149 × 4) = £22,468 which minus £10,510 the pay received, gives £11,958.

To

HIS GRACE THE MOST NOBLE
THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS,

Governor of Fort St. George in Council.
The memorial of H. LEFANU, Esq., B.A., Ex. Sch.
T.C.D., Barrister-at-Law and of the Madras
Civil Service.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,—That your memorialist is a member of the Madras Civil Service appointed in the year 1865, is Head Assistant to the Collector and Magistrate of Salem, Tinnevely, and is now Acting Sub-Collector and Joint Magistrate of Salem.

That your memorialist respectfully prays your Grace's Government to take into consideration the hopeless position in which he, and other junior Members of the Madras Civil Service, are placed, through no fault of their own, as regards pay, promotion, furlough and furlough allowances.

That your memorialist was induced to compete for the Civil Service in 1864 in consequence of the inducements held out to him in certain papers, "relating to the Civil Service of India" which were sent to him by the Civil Service Commissioners. These papers are No. 6,817 printed in 1863 by Her Majesty's printers Eyre and Spottiswoode, and your memorialist respectfully maintains that the Secretary of State and the Government of India are in equity, if not legally, bound to fulfil, to some reasonable extent, the hopes held out in these papers to candidates for the service. In forwarding these papers the Civil Service Commissioners observe as follows. "The statements may be in some respects deficient or incorrect; but, for the purpose of giving a more definite conception than is generally prevalent as to the nature and pecuniary rewards of a civilian's career in India, they will probably be found sufficiently accurate and complete." In these papers the Civil Service Commissioners give certain tables "condensed from one supplied to the Commissioners by the Secretary of State for India" to one of which your memorialist respectfully requests the attention of your Grace's Government.

PERIODS OF SERVICE.	MADRAS.	
	No. of Recipients.	Average Salary.
		£
Under 4 years	8	570
4 Years & less than 8 years.	23	1,218
8 " " 12 " "	10	1,680
12 " " 20 " "	23	2,149
20 " " 35 " "	42	3,235
Upwards of 35 years	2	5,650
Total...	108*	2,277

* Absentees omitted in the calculation.

Your memorialist's whole pay at 1s. 8d. per rupee is now, after upwards of 14 years service, only £1,022, and for at least 5 years to come your memorialist can expect no increase of salary under the present conditions of the service. On the contrary, owing to the license tax now contemplated, your memorialist's income will actually be diminished in future years instead of being increased. Your memorialist is therefore receiving, at 14 years service, and is likely to receive up to 19 years service £200 a year less than he was led to expect at 4 years service, £260 a year less than he was led to expect at 8 years service, and £1,127 a year less than he was led to expect from 12 to 20 years service. When your memorialist entered the service Sovereign was only worth Rs. 10-4. A rupee is now only worth 1s. 8d. The medium in which he is paid has depreciated 17 per cent. in 14 years.

That your memorialist was led to choose the Madras Civil Service in consequence of the higher relative pay which he was led to expect in the earlier years of his service, which expectations have, as shewn, been so far from being fulfilled. Your memorialist had his choice of all the Presidencies, and was solely led to prefer Madras in consequence of the higher pecuniary emoluments offered at the outset, resigning thereby the brilliant prospects open in the later years of their service to Bengal Civilians.

That your memorialist desires to call the attention of your Grace's Government to the disadvantages under which University men labour in the service, a disadvantage all the more striking as the Secretary of State has now made college residence compulsory. As to the contrast between the career of a university man and that of a non-university man in the service, Nos. 39 (Mr. Daniel) and 94 (your memorialist) on the list supply a test case, exemplifying the inequalities of the service. Mr. Daniel and your memorialist were born in January and April 1848 respectively. In a year when 80 appointments were thrown open for competition, Mr. Daniel passed for the service as a school boy, and came out to India at 19. At less than 5

Ch. H. Lefanu

years service he was a pukka Head Assistant and Acting Sub-Collector, and at 5 years service Acting Small Cause Court Judge at Madura; Acting Civil and Session Judge at 8 years service, pukka Sub-Collector at 9 years service, and pukka Collector at 14 years service. Your memorialist entered College at 18, beating for exhibition and honors men who are now his seniors in the Bengal Civil Service, was first of the first in his year in classical honors, Erasmus Smith's exhibitioner, and classical scholar a year before the usual time; took his degree, and, in the the open competition for the Indian Civil Service, when there were only 40 vacancies and 219 candidates, was first of all the candidates in the subjects in which he was examined. He was also called to the bar. Your memorialist had to wait upwards of 12 years to obtain a pukka Head Assistantship, and nearly 13 for an Acting Sub-Collectorate, in which post he must rest content up to 19 years service, when he may obtain a pukka Sub-Collectorate. Your memorialist will be entitled to his pension by the time he arrives at a Collectorate. This is no exceptional case. Both the other men of your memorialist's year are university men and in the same position. The same applies to many other members of the years 1863 to 1867. In fact, by a strange anomaly, the prizes of the service are practically reserved for those who entered it under the easiest conditions; while those who qualified by severer tests are permanently excluded from promotion to the higher appointments. It is well known that members of the Civil Service, who should have come to India in the year 1862, failed at the further examination, and only entered the service, in 1863, through having, by a special grace, been permitted to appear at the further examination in that year. This concession was not repeated and the result exemplifies what your memorialist has above stated. Thus Mr. Trevor Lloyd, now a planter in Bengal, was one of those who passed for the Madras Civil Service at the open competition of 1862, when there were 80 vacancies. Failing at the further examination in 1864, when he failed to obtain one of 40 vacancies. The same results may be deduced from the standard examinations which Civilians have to pass in this country before they can be promoted. In these your memorialist passed before 17 of those who were his seniors by one, two and three years service; and these 17 only passed after the tests had been diluted so as to admit of being passed by instalments and not all at once, as was the rule when your memorialist passed. Of these 17, one is now a pukka District Judge; three are Acting District Judges and two are Acting Collectors. In fact through his whole service your memorialist must be subordinate to men of the same age as himself and of inferior ability.

That your memorialist submits that he might fairly expect to obtain the promotion current in the service when he entered it, and prays the attention of your Grace's Government to the state of things then and now existing. After upwards of 14 years service your memorialist has become No. 94 on the Civil List. When he entered the service, in October 1865, No. 94 (Mr. Whiteside) had less than 10 years service. As No. 94 your memorialist is only a recently confirmed Head Assistant and 4 or 5 years from a confirmed Sub-Collectorate. Mr. Whiteside as No. 94 had been a confirmed Sub-Collector for 3½ years, having reached that rank on 5 years service. He had also already acted as Civil and Session Judge for nearly two years. His promotion was nothing extraordinary; for No. 95 (Mr. Barlow), was also a confirmed Sub-Collector at that date; so also was No. 101. When your memorialist entered the service the officers of 14 years service were those appointed in the year 1851. Of these gentlemen, Mr. Carmichael, now member of Council, was then a pukka Collector of more than two years standing: Mr. Puckle, of the same year, obtained his pukka Collectorate on 14 years service. At 14 years service your memorialist is only a recently confirmed Head Assistant.

That your memorialist would respectfully call the attention of your Grace's Government to the injurious effect which the new leave rules have had on the junior members of the service as regards pay. When first proposed in 1867, your memorialist protested against them as wholly in favour of his seniors. The chief result of these rules has been to stop promotion, as no one now vacates his appointment when proceeding on furlough. The increased acting allowances do not at all affect the lower ranks and, though they somewhat affect the higher, still the difference is nothing in comparison with the sum lost by promotion being stopped. In the same way the new rules do nothing for the junior members of the service in regard to furlough allowances. The furlough pay under the old rules was £500 a year. Your memorialist's allowances, if he went on furlough to-morrow, would, after 14 years service, at ½ of the sum by the rule as to the minimum. After 16 and up to 19 years service your memorialist's furlough pay, supposing exchange not to fall below 1s. 8d. would only be £511 a year, and your memorialist will be entitled to his pension before his furlough allowances will amount to £1,000 a year. The glaring inequality is well illustrated by the case above quoted. Mr. Daniel, of the same age as your memorialist, is now on leave on £1,000 a year. Your memorialist's pay for serving in India is, and will for years be, only £1,022 per annum. In fact your memorialist is practically debarred from taking furlough as the rules now operate. What terms, as a school boy; you have been exceptionally fortunate in promotion; you have had ample opportunities for saving, and therefore do not stand so much in need of money, therefore you shall have £1,000 a year on furlough." To another they say "you entered the service under difficult circumstances as to competition, in which you highly distinguished yourself—you came out to the country comparatively late in life, bringing to the service the culture of a costly university education, and the rank belonging to one of the learned professions; you have

had no promotion worth mentioning; you cannot possibly have saved money; you cannot possibly maintain a wife and six children and educate the latter on £500 a year; but, because of all this you shall have £500 a year on furlough and no more." Your memorialist would call attention to the fact that the old rules regarding furlough were actually more favourable to persons in his position than those of 1868. Half pay up to £1,000 a year, without reference to the average of the preceding 3 years, was allowed on sick leave, and half pay without any limit on special leave. As regards pay on sick or special leave, at no period can your memorialist profit during his service by the rules of 1868. Your Grace's Government will be pleased in addition to the other concessions alluded to below, your memorialist respectfully prays that, to obtain for him and others similarly situated some concession in the matter of leave allowances. Your memorialist is continually suffering from fever and rheumatic gout, brought on by exposure on famine duty, to which nothing but a residence at a German watering place can give relief; but your memorialist cannot leave the country for want of funds. It must be plain to your Grace's Government that the whole furlough allowance of £500 a year would barely maintain and educate six children, to say nothing of your memorialist and the cost of transit from India to England and back again.

That your memorialist further wishes to draw attention to the loss which he and the juniors of the service generally have sustained by the denudation which the service has undergone in the matter of appointments since he entered it. On that date the following appointments, now lost to the service, were held by Madras Civilians. Inspector-General of Jails Rs. 2,750; Accountant-General, Madras Rs. 3,000; Accountant-General, Bombay Rs. 3,000; Member of the Viceroy's Council Rs. 6,666; Judge (3rd Civilian) of High Court Rs. 3,750; President, Sanitary Commission Rs. 3,000; Inam Commissioner Rs. 3,000; Director of Revenue Settlement Rs. 2,800; Small Cause Court Judge, Combaconum Rs. 1,400; Small Cause Court Judge, Vellore Rs. 1,400; Superintendent of Judge, Cuddalore Rs. 1,400; Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement Rs. 1,287; Superintendent of Coorg Rs. 1,000; added to which three of your memorialist's seniors were employed in Bombay, and subsequently returned to stop promotion. Besides this in the appointment of Registrar to the High Court and Tamil Translator your memorialist, who as a barrister and passed in Honors in Tamil possessed special qualifications for these appointments, has been superseded by Mr. Weir, two years his junior, to 24 of whose seniors this appointment even now, 5 years after it was conferred on him, would still give promotion. On public grounds your memorialist would further pray attention to the results of the abolition of the smallest Judicial experience. Some 4 or 5 years hence when, at the close of their service, a single Junior Civilian of those now expectant of promotion in the Judicial line who has had 50 per cent. of the men of 1864 and 1865 must enter the Judicial branch of the service one of them who has ever seen the inside of a Civil Court. The Judicial branch of the service is not one for which a man can qualify *per saltum* by the enchanter's wand of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, and, in the interests of the State and of good administration, it is undesirable that a Civilian who has spent 20 years of his service exclusively in the Revenue line should be pitch-forked into the Judicial line for which he has had no training whatever. On the other hand it would be most unfair were such promotion to be refused them because they had not qualified for a post for which they never had the opportunity of qualifying. No one, with the slightest knowledge of what a Revenue Officer's multifarious work and duties are, can pretend for a moment that, side by side with these, an officer can find time to study the Acts and Rulings which govern the Civil Courts, and which have nothing in common with his current work. Your memorialist would draw attention to the policy in former years of securing a training, to an extent far beyond that of the Small Cause Courts, for Junior Civilians in the Judicial branch, of which every trace has now been swept away.

That your memorialist begs respectfully to submit herewith the accompanying "Examination of the position as regards past and future promotion of the more junior section of the Madras Civil Service, together with a discussion of the remedies appropriate to the case," from which your Grace's Government will see how much his predecessors in the service as far back as 1812) your memorialist had reasonably expected to obtain, in the hope that your Grace's Government will see fit to take such steps as may be necessary to give your memorialist those prospects of promotion to which he considers he is equitably entitled.

That relief has been granted to similar grievances in every province in India except Madras, though the state of the Madras Civil Service is worse than that of any other province except the North-West, and is as bad as that of the North-West Provinces was. That but for a misunderstanding of the position a remedy would have been applied in Madras also in 1876. That this is the more felt by Madras Civilians like your memorialist, who have not only received no reward or recognition whatever they would ordinarily have received, owing to leave having been stopped during the famine. Your memorialist's loss on this head alone amounts to more than Rs. 5,000. On the other hand Civilians from other Presidencies were allowed the promotion and pay which they would have received if not on famine duty; and this in addition to their famine allowances. Thus Mr. Oldham, B.C.S., who joined the service like your memorialist in 1865, and who passed below your memorialist both in the open competition and at the further examination, drew from Rs. 1,266 to Rs. 1,733 per mensem while on famine duty;

4

during 16 months of famine duty your memorialist received only Rs. 725 per mensem, for 2 months Rs. 733 and for 7 months Rs. 1,021. Mr. Oldham had only famine duty, got Rs. 6 per diem travelling allowance and had the use of Government tents; your memorialist had administrative charge of a division; got only Rs. 4 extra tentage during 18 months of his famine duty, and used his own tents. Your memorialist and many others appointed from the years 1863 to 1869 have had their permanent promotion enormously delayed, and have had, and will have, to act much more and longer in lower appointments than the men who went before them. That this is not only a loss in the past but also a continuing loss, as your memorialist and all in his position must, through all their service, suffer serious loss in the emoluments which they have a right to expect both in acting appointments and on furlough. That even a Collectorate can scarcely be obtained by your memorialist and others similarly affected within the time when they will qualify for pension, and they can never obtain any of the higher offices of the service which fall within the sphere of a legitimate ambition. Had your memorialist known what his prospects were he would never have entered the service. Your memorialist is longer in the country than any member of the Madras bar in good practice, his brother-in-law the Advocate-General alone excepted, and is junior to him by a year only. The same talents which gained him distinction in college, in the open competition and in the Vernaculars would, it is no unfair assumption, have given him a handsome income and an accumulated fortune at the bar. Your memorialist was not dependent solely on the Civil Service when he entered it, as his exhibition, scholarship and right to free chambers in college did not expire until 4 years after he came to the country. When your memorialist respectfully states that the present state of things is inconsistent with efficient administration he is but borrowing the language used in a similar case by Sir J. STRACHEY who said, "If nothing be done, the time will come when our Collectors and Magistrates will be men of fifty years old, and our Subordinate District Officers five and forty. The bare statement of such facts will be enough to satisfy any one who knows anything of Indian administration how urgent is the necessity of the case."

That your memorialist trusts that he will be excused for praying the consideration of Government to the facts set out in the accompanying paper and the remedies therein discussed. In doing so your memorialist would draw attention to a condition with which the grant of minimum allowances (para 49) was saddled in other provinces, viz., that the period in excess of one year spent on sick leave before 8 years service was rendered should be deducted. The ground on which this was done was that "such leave sets back an officer's ordinary promotion." This in Madras at least is not the case. Supposing, however, that it was, it would be most unfair that, because an officer has been unfortunate, he should, in consequence of this, have another misfortune tacked on. Your memorialist respectfully submits that two wrongs do not make a right: no officer takes sick leave if he can avoid it, certainly least of all in the earlier period of his service, when his allowances are so small. When one year's leave for four years' residence is allowed, it makes practically no difference to Government when this leave is taken; or rather it is of positive advantage to Government that it should be taken in the earlier years of service, when the leave allowances are smaller and the officer's service is less valuable from want of experience. Your memorialist was obliged before 8 years service to take 2 years and 5 months leave in consequence of sunstroke incurred on duty. Your memorialist has now worked off all the leave taken and has leave to his credit. Had he taken 3 years leave after 8 years service none would count against him under this rule; but, because the leave was taken under 8 years service, 17 months of this leave would count against him. Your memorialist therefore prays that, if minimum allowances are granted, such leave only as has not been earned or worked off should count against service for such allowances.

That your memorialist further respectfully represents that the minimum allowances granted in other provinces bear no tangible proportion to the loss as sustained in the past and to be sustained in the future by him and others similarly situated in the Madras Civil Service, and prays that your Grace's Government will be pleased to recommend a higher scale in view of the great depreciation which his prospects have undergone, and also that such allowances should be retrospective from the date on which similar concessions were granted in the North West Provinces. Your memorialist submits that it would not be fair that he and others should suffer, in comparison with Civilian officers in other provinces, owing to their moderation and reluctance to bring their grievances to the notice of your Grace's Government.

That, in conclusion, your memorialist desires to express that his case is a representative one, and will doubtless be looked on as such by the other members of the service interested in the matter. Your memorialist begs respectfully therefore that your Grace in Council will be pleased to forward to the Government of India, and the Secretary of State, if necessary, with the support of your Grace's Government, his representation of the hopeless position as regards promotion in which your memorialist now finds himself, with a view to such steps as may seem right to your Grace in Council to be taken to afford him redress.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, EVER PRAY.

H. LEFANU,
Madras Civil Service.

Osua,
17th January 1880.

Public 1905/81

CURRENT No. 1905 Osua.
9-9-81.

1257
10

To
H. E. F. F. F.
Ct.

To
The Chief Secretary to Govt
By telegram

By
The Hon. Secy to Govt
Enclosed herewith a
memorial in writing to the Governor in Council
and a printed copy of the same, as also a
copy of a memorial presented to Government
5th Jan in January 1880.

By the Hon. Secy
To
The Hon. Secy to Govt
By telegram

1257

To
The Honourable Mr. Secretary of the Government of India,
Bombay.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the Memorial of H. Le Gallé Esq^r. B.A.
Esq^r. J.C.D., Barrister-at-Law and of
the Madras Civil Service.

Most Respectfully I enclose,

That your Memorialist presented a Memorial to
your Excellency's Government on the 17th January 1890, and
to this he has received no reply, although upwards of nine-
teen months have elapsed since it was presented. That no
steps have been taken to put the conditions of his Pension
on an equal footing with those of the rest of India, to
whom relief was granted in 1876. That the grievances
mentioned in his Memorial of 17th January are increasing, and
that a protracted war of resistance is being carried on by him.
The following will illustrate his position:
Memorialist is now at sixteen years' service, as 88 on the
Civil List. When he competed for the C.S. in 1864, as 88, he
only got 1st prize, but from a Sub-Collector for
two years, after which he had passed Sub-Collector Junior
him. When your Memorialist came to India in 1864,
he had been a Sub-Collector for 10 years, and had been a Sub-Collector Junior for 2 years.

average received was
or about the pay of a First class Dep. by law.

Your Memorialist begs to append a copy of his Memo-
rial, presented nineteen months ago as it is possible, the
original still remaining unnoticed, that it has not been
received. Its receipt has never been acknowledged.

And your Memorialist will as in duty bound ever pray.

He Lane.

Howe

Sept 21st 1886

1257
B.

Public 1905/81

1887 DEPARTMENT.

From *Y. S. O. No. 125*

Mr. Le Fanu,
Medias Mail
R.D. *Service*

2 SEP 81 No.

Dated *7*
Recd. *12* } *Sept. 81.*

CURRENT No. *1905*

SUBJECT.

Commit. Tell him Am
with consideration

757

Sub Table
1. 1st. 2nd.

with order

Mr. Le Fanu is represented by
the memorial to which the
present is attached
in connection with the