

in the sense of the  
clause, which was  
clearly introduced in  
order to impose no  
disability on persons  
who, prior to 1<sup>st</sup> January  
1879, had already entered  
Government Service. The  
Resolution, indeed, guarded  
against the transfer of  
such persons to entirely  
different departments,  
which would be obviously  
equivalent to a fresh  
appointment. But had  
the intention of the clause  
been that imputed to  
it by the Accountant  
General, it would hope-  
lessly bar the advance-  
ment, which they have  
a legitimate right to

how is one of his clerks  
qualified to become the  
Chief Secy's right hand  
man -

It may very well be that the  
Chief Secy is able to show  
that he has made the happiest  
selection possible; that Mr.  
Parrish, during his short term  
of service, has displayed  
qualities which cannot be  
found in any one of the  
thousands of old & experienced  
"natives of India" available  
for the position. This evi-  
dence, however, should be laid  
before the S. of S. without whose  
previous sanction an appli-  
cation of this highly exceptional,  
overriding character, ~~unapparent~~  
the letter and certainly of  
the spirit of his recent Reso-  
lution, cannot, in my  
opinion, be allowed.

David G. James Esq.  
Secy of P.

I am inclined to  
think Mr. C. will  
expect

45  
Council but have respects of persons like the  
subject of the present  
reference, for no fault of their  
own save being Europeans.  
The Accountant General  
appears from his letter to  
be in some doubt, and the  
may possibly accept without  
demur a ruling in the  
sense of the foregoing re-  
marks. Submitted, therefore,  
than an order be issued  
stating that the case is  
considered to fall within  
exception (c), the Secretariat  
Office establishments being  
really but one department.  
If further objections are  
raised by the Accountant  
General, I consider that the appl. General, the Chief Secretary  
in question is ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~whenever~~ <sup>whenever</sup> submit for approval  
of the the spirit of the  
letter of the ruling in  
question, while on General (a) 4th of the Resolution.  
4/12/80

considerations I am most  
strongly of opinion that the  
Chief Clerk should not be in  
a position of his own  
immediately confidential  
relation in the Govt. containing

Somebody, considered with  
me, to the Government & an one  
indivisible. Some opinion  
that any other view will very probably  
lead to disastrous results from  
some collision of department or  
maintaining some kind of a  
to the understand of the Government  
division.

The nature of the work  
of the Chief Clerk is  
in the Govt. is employed, is  
in character just the same  
as the work of the Chief Clerk  
in another Dept. This is not  
technical - The technical  
materials are supplied by the  
outside Dept. of the Govt. himself  
to work of the Chief Clerk. I place  
them in form. in the complete  
handwritten form. I am that  
all necessary confid. arrangements  
are examined. I believe  
our discipline in  
Dept. My impression is

that Mr. Single would be in the technical branch of the Govt. which in both branches  
him in the Government. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own  
functions that the Government. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own  
the Govt. I feel found in the public nature of the Govt. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own  
many of the Govt. Government is the Govt. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own  
containing. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own  
as in the Govt. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own  
or the Govt. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own  
in the Govt. I am of opinion that the Chief Clerk should not be in a position of his own

5/5  
I agree in the opinion expressed  
by the whole of the Committee.  
It seems to me that the usual  
Departments of the Secretariat  
are quite distinct, though  
working under the same  
controlling authority.  
If a general similarity of duties  
is accepted, as guiding the  
decision, then it would seem  
true that all departmental  
separation must cease to  
exist, for the duties of the  
clerical  
needs of offices must have  
a

a great similarity.

W. 15/12

The order was the words  
hand of a Dept.

having seen the  
reply to my  
queries. I consider

Mr. Amichants

view would be

that Mr. P. appointing

is inadvisable whether

in view of the situation

6/13  
J. S. J. man  
application for which  
I am returned of  
my suspicious  
suspends 10/12

The question therefore is settled:-  
the Honble Mr. being alone in  
the minority.

Mr. Pingle, I am glad to understand  
will not lose pecuniarily - as he  
draws 600 in the S. P. W. branch  
of the Penitentiary - to which he is entitled.

His certificates are good; but  
hundreds of young English people  
- men could produce similar  
ones - and it is to protect the  
Natives of India from an influx

£. 350 only  
and the fee of  
the appointment is  
now only 500.

all necessary and  
was submitted  
The Dispute  
ed 12. 12. 12  
The

such competitors for  
Office, that the Rules quoted  
in the correspondence were  
enforced, as I suppose.

I don't see, finally, why these  
papers are sent about under  
double cover, as if confidential.

The whole correspondence, numbers  
and misquoting to be kept regularly  
in the Progs - in full print.

22-10-12/6.

I have this morning seen Mr. May Lee  
on this subject - He informs me that Mr.  
Dewar has been tried as an acting man -  
failed to show the necessary qualities -  
that he does not think there is any one  
in the Secretariat a R. of S. competent  
- therefore there may be grounds which  
had not been brought before me for application  
of R. of S. - I make this note in duplicate  
to Mr. Munro on the 20/12

1. I have already mentioned  
on this subject that I have  
little to add to my  
previous remarks, but  
in the light of my  
view that the Govt  
Secretariat is a  
single office I now  
state that during my  
own experience in the  
R. of S. Dept. was  
prevalent in the  
lands of the Govt. Sec.  
as an allied branch  
of Secretariat work  
that the judicial  
branch has been  
less than once

These papers relate  
to the appointment of first  
Assistant to the Chief  
Secretary, a ministerial ap-  
pointment carrying Rs 600  
a month and in the personal  
gift of the Chief Secretary.

2. The post fell vacant  
at the beginning of November  
consequent on the promotion  
of Mr. G. Hammett to the  
Inspector Generalship of  
Registration carrying Rs 600  
a month.

3. In the exercise of  
my patronage I appointed  
Mr. A. J. Spigle a European  
who had received his

education in England and  
had been for five years  
employed as second and  
acting First Assistant  
to Colonel Sankley the  
Secretary in the S. W. Branch  
of the Govt. Secretariat who  
very strongly recommended  
him for the post. As soon  
as I was aware that it  
was to be pro-  
moted I made enquiries  
regarding a suitable suc-  
cessor. From what I  
had seen of Chief Secretary  
work I was distinctly of  
opinion it was not desirable  
that a Native, even if  
otherwise qualified for the  
post, should be made the  
Repository of all the con-  
fidential information and  
state secrets which would  
pass through his hands. I  
was equally well satisfied

that from the Ch. Sec.  
to the Sec. of the  
Branch. That of the  
Dept. Sec. still later  
all of them have worked  
together in the same  
building, & the constant  
interchange of views  
in the office makes  
it essentially necessary  
that the same oblig-  
ing confidential employ-  
ee should take the  
superior position, as  
regards the records of  
each and the Dept.  
I have no personal  
interest in Mr. Springle. but I  
think the principles of  
B. I. continue to be  
of special importance

in the present situation  
of the Govt. Sec. of the  
Branch. That of the  
Dept. Sec. still later  
all of them have worked  
together in the same  
building, & the constant  
interchange of views  
in the office makes  
it essentially necessary  
that the same oblig-  
ing confidential employ-  
ee should take the  
superior position, as  
regards the records of  
each and the Dept.  
I have no personal  
interest in Mr. Springle. but I  
think the principles of  
B. I. continue to be  
of special importance

8/15  
that not one of the clerks  
in the Department was  
thoroughly competent to  
control so large an establishment  
and discharge in a credit-  
able manner the multi-  
farious duties of the office.  
4. I therefore cast about  
elsewhere for a successor  
to Mr. Hannett, and I  
was much impressed with  
the favorable reports I received  
of Mr. Springle, who was  
a perfect stranger to me  
at that time and unknown  
even by sight. After very  
carefully considering the  
matter I came to the con-  
clusion that I could not  
do better than appoint him  
to the vacancy.  
5. Mr. Springle took  
charge on the 9th of Nov.  
1880. The beginning of the  
following month the

Accountant General raised the question as to whether the appointment was not considered contrary to the instructions contained in the Despatch from the Secretary of State No 9 dated 10<sup>th</sup> July 1879 which had been issued more than three years after Mr. Spangle had entered Govt. service.

6. The Despatch in question covered a circular issued by the Govt. of India to the Govts. and Administrations of the Bengal Presidency containing instructions on the subject "of appointing Natives of India to an increasing majority of higher offices in the Unconquered Service" and of reserving these offices "to which it is not desirable

I do not wish to raise any question. but I feel called on to protest & not being after the tendency of the manifest of this Englishman some English in India under Govt. unless in the Unconquered or former Govts. The theory is that the authority absolutely unimpaired but most unfair to the Natives of India Britain shown for our own purposes be brought to this Council. I often turn aside now in view of the true friendship. I have no doubt that

9/5  
to appoint Natives as far as it is practicable for "Unconquered Civil Officers". The general tenor of these instructions point to offices which are in the gift of the Governor General of India or of the local Governor or in other words to Gazetted appointments which are made exclusively by the Governor in Council. 8. As already stated the first Assistantship is a Ministerial and not a Gazetted appointment, but the officiating Accountant General reads the instructions as covering it as well. the salary, Rs 600, exceeding the money limit of Rs 200 fixed with

to appoint Natives as far as it is practicable for "Unconquered Civil Officers". The general tenor of these instructions point to offices which are in the gift of the Governor General of India or of the local Governor or in other words to Gazetted appointments which are made exclusively by the Governor in Council. 8. As already stated the first Assistantship is a Ministerial and not a Gazetted appointment, but the officiating Accountant General reads the instructions as covering it as well. the salary, Rs 600, exceeding the money limit of Rs 200 fixed with

I do not quite understand why these papers are re-circulated as the question appears to have been in a manner decided by a majority of the Council in Dec last. I am unwilling to disturb a decision already arrived at, even if that decision be not very precise but if it

reference to the salary was  
allowed to Native Probationers  
admitted to India to  
the Civil Service.

9. This view has been  
contended in my note of  
the 6th Decr and the  
Honble Members of Govt  
and His Grace the Duke  
of Buckingham have re-  
corded their views on  
the subject. It will be  
seen from their notes and  
minutes that the Honble

Mr. Middleton differed from  
the Honble D. J. Carmichael  
and His Excellency the Com-  
mander in Chief (who has  
however recorded his opinion  
only on one point. The unity  
of the Govt Secretariat) while  
His Grace the Duke of Bucking-  
ham has in his final note re-  
qualified the opinions

and opinion I may say that  
fully accepting as I do the policy  
enunciated in the despatch of July  
1879 I cannot think that this  
is a case that ought to be governed  
by its provisions.

In the first place I look upon the  
Secretariat as a unity - It  
is under a chief Secretary, a  
fact which implies that the  
branches not immediately  
dealt with by him are still  
to some extent under him,  
and he may I presume under  
instructions from Govt alter  
and redistribute the work of  
the branches as thought  
advisable. If this be so then  
the appointment now under  
consideration is a transfer &  
would not come within the  
purview of the despatch.

I am however further contented  
that even if the Secretariat be  
so distinct in its branches as to  
form separate services, still  
this appointment is not barred  
by the despatch. This distinctly

personal, it is in the actual  
gift of the Chief Secretary, and  
is not even gazetted. It is of the  
nature of not under the name  
of a private secretarship,  
and I do not think that  
the Secretary of State ever  
contemplated interfering with  
individual freedom of  
choice in such cases.

I do not say anything  
as to the hands with which the  
person appointed if he  
were to be removed now  
delegated to his former  
position, and the consequent  
displacement of others who  
have been appointed in  
succession to him, I say  
merely to record my opinion  
as to the bearing of the  
despatch on this case

WPA Jan 28 1881  
W. D. A. M.

10/55  
expressed in his previous  
notes.

10. The effect of an adverse  
decision will be to deprive  
me of the man whom I  
have selected as most  
suitable for the appoint-  
ment and to require me  
either to accept the nomi-  
nation by Govt of a junior  
and inexperienced civilian,  
or to appoint a native.

11. As regards the former,  
no civilian can with pro-  
priety accept the post -  
it being a subordinate  
ministerial appointment  
or clerkship - and as  
regards the latter I have  
already stated that such  
a nomination would be  
objectionable on grounds  
of public policy. The con-  
sequences to Mr. Spingle

formally, would also be  
of so grave a nature that  
they are. I would submit  
deserving of special con-  
sideration.

12. He entered the P.W.  
Secretariat in 1875 at the  
age of 23, under the full  
expectation of being eligible  
like his predecessors in  
line to appointments in the  
other Govt. Offices, there being  
then no bar to transfer  
from one to another of these.  
He has had five years  
experience of Secretariat  
work, the duties of the  
Assistant in the P.W.  
Office being (as the Honble  
Member in charge of the  
P.W. Dept. has remarked  
in his minute) precisely  
the same in kind as those  
of Assistants in the other  
Secretariat Offices. If it be

<sup>11/55</sup>  
decided that the resolution  
is applicable to his case,  
and that there are no  
grounds for specially ex-  
empting him from its  
operation, he is either cast  
adrift, or he is relegated  
to the Second Assistantship  
in the P.W. Secretariat.  
an appointment now carry-  
ing Rs 300 less than the one  
he at present occupies. It  
may be remarked that  
the second alternative will  
involve the cancellation of  
the appointments made  
in the interim, Col. Sankar  
having filled up Mr.  
Springle's late post.

13. I would submit  
that it is an established  
principle of administration  
that no servant, of whatever  
nationality, actually in

Govt service should be  
denied the prospect of  
advancement. The Resolution  
in question expressly contem-  
plates such advancement  
in clause (C) which provides  
that advancement is open  
to those (not being Covenanted  
Civilians or Natives) who  
entered the branch of the  
dept. in which they are to  
be promoted prior to January  
1879.

14. The whole tenor of  
the Resolution would seem  
to show that it was in-  
formed with special re-  
ference to appointments  
in the higher branches  
of the Govt Service and  
not to those on Ministerial  
Establishments which are  
only filled by clerks in  
subordinate grades. In res-  
pect of this however it

<sup>2/5</sup>  
is quite certain that it  
was never intended to  
bar the promotion of a  
clerk in the same office.  
The Madras Govt Secretariat  
is one, and although it may  
be divided and subdivided  
for convenience in the dis-  
posal of business, its unity  
is not thereby affected.  
There is nothing to prevent  
the Govt. transferring a  
particular branch of the  
business from one portion  
of the Secretariat to another  
e.g. the "Telegraph" to the  
P. W. Secretary, the "Savings"  
to the Revenue Secretary,  
or even the "Public Works"  
to the Chief Secretary,  
if on grounds of public  
policy this course be con-  
sidered desirable. Such  
changes have been made,  
and may be made again

Similarly Clerks may with  
equal propriety be inter-  
changed - and the transfers  
would unquestionably be  
held to be within the  
Secretariat. It is thus  
clear that the promotion  
of Mr. Springle is within  
the same office - viz: the  
Madras Govt. Secretariat,  
and as such is not barred  
by the Resolution under  
notice.

15. If notwithstanding  
these arguments, it be decided  
to refer this particular  
question for the orders of  
the <sup>Home</sup> Govt. — then  
I would submit that it  
should be distinctly stated  
that the appointment which  
has given rise to the dis-  
cussion is of a special  
and confidential character  
requiring in the person

135  
who fills it, high qualities  
of trust and fidelity, of  
which the Chief Secretary  
must be fully assured  
before he can venture con-  
fidently to nominate to  
the post.

16. There are therefore  
the strongest possible  
grounds for making an  
exception in regard to this  
post - at all events in  
the case of the present  
incumbent, who has been  
selected as specially fitted  
for the appointment, which  
he has already held for  
three months, and which,  
by the time the final  
decision of the Home Govt.  
is received, will have  
extended probably to the  
best part of half a year.

a year.

15/11

P.S.

Since writing the above  
a further communication  
on the subject of restricting  
appointments to Natives  
has been received through  
the Govt of India. The  
wording of which appears  
to confirm the contention  
that the rules of 1879  
were introduced with reference  
solely to appointments made  
by the Governor in Council,

14/155

while in paragraph 5 of  
the extract it is expressly  
~~again~~ admitted that there  
may be special consideration  
for at times waiving the  
strictness of the rule.

R.S.

State for  
information of his Ex<sup>ty</sup> the Gov.

With reference to  
the first part of his  
Ex<sup>ty</sup> Henry's remarks, the  
Chief Secretary spoke  
of the late session  
on the morning of  
his departure, in  
regard to these papers,  
and his grace, on  
hearing that there  
were further considerations  
to be brought forward,  
made his second  
note with the  
express purpose, as  
the

27<sup>th</sup> Dec<sup>r</sup> 1800.

Secretary under  
order of settling the  
matter & to be referred.

to be referred in  
accordance with the  
Minister is referred in  
the Secretary's note  
to be submitted.

1881

Public Dept.  
16/155

Charge of the Madras  
Bank.

Letter from the  
Accountant General A.D. No. 4501 dated 2 Dec<sup>r</sup>/80.

Minute for the Hon.  
D. J. Carmichael. A.D. dated 7 Dec<sup>r</sup>/80

Minute for the Hon.  
H. D. D. D. A.D. dated 8 Dec<sup>r</sup>/80

Minute for the  
Hon. H. D. D. A.D. dated 26 Jan<sup>r</sup>/81.

Order No. 7<sup>th</sup> Feby 1881  
No 155.

The appointment in  
question is of a kind  
that, in the opinion  
of the H. C. Hon. the  
Governor in Council  
cannot

MR 12  
Admitted by H. C. Hon. the Govt

objection to the appointment of the present first assistant.

must be governed by the provisions of the Secretary of State's despatch of July 1879.

This is a personal, suggested appointment in the gift of the Chief Secretary, being of the nature of a private secretary's ship and the

~~Secretary of State~~  
~~Secretary of State~~  
~~Secretary of State~~

to observe to whom the Secretary of State contemplates inter-consultation with the Secretary of State in the exercise of the freedom of choice in such case.

The Accountant General is therefore authorized to withdraw his objection.

The Accountant General } despatch 7/2/81

Council  
 Mr. [unclear] [unclear]  
 on account of [unclear]  
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]  
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]  
 [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]

18  
 155

for Council.

1. His Ex. H.
4. Hon. W. Hall
3. Hon. J. J.
2. His Ex. H.

& as the treatment of  
 this minute, the treatment  
 of the whole case must  
 of course depend

to ask the Hon. Mr.  
 Sedgwick whether he  
 wishes the second  
 minute written on the  
 enclosed case to  
 be treated in an  
 ordinary way, or  
 confidentially.  
 The question is asked  
 with reference to  
 the latter part of  
 the minute, which  
 deals with a general  
 matter of policy -  
 the exclusion of  
 European powers

office under Govt.,  
and they are honestly  
disinterested officers.  
There may be objections  
to having conflicting  
views open to perusal  
in the halls of Congress.

19  
155

Public Dept.

80/1  
155

This copy.

The appointment in question  
is of a kind that, in  
the opinion of the R. C.  
the President is bound  
ought not to be made  
in the President of  
the Secretary of State.  
Report of July 1879.  
It is a personal, not  
a public appointment  
in the gift of the  
Chief Secretary, being  
of the nature of a  
private Secretaryship  
rather than a public  
appointment.

Gent. Order  
No. 155,  
d/7 February  
1881

Attd. Ad.

7/2/87

| FORM NO. 10 (Rev. 1-55)               |                                          |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE    |                                          |
| ATTENTION: PERSONNEL DIVISION         |                                          |
| 1. NAME (Last, first, middle initial) | 2. GRADE OR POSITION                     |
| 3. ORGANIZATION                       | 4. ADDRESS (Street, city, state, zip)    |
| 5. PHONE NUMBER                       | 6. MAILING ADDRESS (If different from 4) |
| 7. DATE OF BIRTH                      | 8. DATE OF ENTRY INTO SERVICE            |
| 9. DATE OF EXPIRATION OF SERVICE      | 10. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 11. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 12. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 13. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 14. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 15. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 16. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 17. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 18. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 19. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 20. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 21. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 22. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 23. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 24. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 25. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 26. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 27. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 28. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 29. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 30. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 31. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 32. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 33. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 34. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 35. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 36. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 37. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 38. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 39. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 40. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 41. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 42. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 43. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 44. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 45. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 46. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 47. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 48. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 49. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 50. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 51. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 52. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 53. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 54. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 55. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 56. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 57. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 58. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 59. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 60. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 61. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 62. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 63. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 64. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 65. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 66. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 67. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 68. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 69. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 70. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 71. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 72. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 73. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 74. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 75. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 76. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 77. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 78. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 79. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 80. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 81. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 82. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 83. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 84. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 85. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 86. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 87. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 88. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 89. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 90. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 91. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 92. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 93. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 94. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 95. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 96. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                  |
| 97. DATE OF LAST ASSIGNMENT           | 98. DATE OF LAST PROMOTION               |
| 99. DATE OF LAST EVALUATION           | 100. DATE OF LAST REVIEW                 |

ORDINARY, MS.

(21)

|                   |              |
|-------------------|--------------|
| Public DEPARTMENT |              |
| G.O., DATED       | 7 - 2 - 1881 |
| No.               | 155          |

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Authorizes the  
Inspector to  
show his object  
to the applicant  
for a T. P.  
as Ins. of the  
Chap. Secretariat

(1) Number of pages 42  
(2) Date of repair 10-10-86  
(3) Initials of the Referencer lms

# TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Public DEPARTMENT

|          |          |        |
|----------|----------|--------|
| G.O. No. | 155      | Press. |
| B.P. No. |          | Misr.  |
| Dated    | 7-2-1881 | 197.   |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Ob. 155  
21

*Treas. Audit* DEPARTMENT.

No. 4501

Fort Saint George,  
Accountant General's Office,  
2 December 1878

FROM THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To The

*Secretary to Government,  
Public Department,  
Fort Saint George.*

SIR,

With reference to the appointment of Mr. Pringle to be First Assistant in the Chief Secretariat, I have the honor respectfully to invite attention to G. O. No. 1258 Public, dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 1879, communicating for information and guidance Secretary of State's Despatch No. 12 dated 10<sup>th</sup> July 1879 with its enclosure Government of India Home Department Circular No. 21 dated 18<sup>th</sup> April 1879, and to enquire, whether His Grace the Governor in Council does not consider that Mr. Pringle's appointment is one which, under para 2 of the Secretary of State's Despatch, requires the previous sanction of the Secretary of State, as Mr. Pringle is not a native of India, and his previous appointment was not in the branch of the Department in which he is now promoted as required by

para 3

para 3. C of the Government of India Circular referred to above:-

In the above circumstance, I have been obliged, pending the receipt of special orders from His Grace the Governor in Council, to disallow the pay claimed on account of Mr. Pringle in the Establishment Pay bill of the Chief Secretariat for November 1880.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your obedient servant

H. Donald

Offg. Account General

2/5

Ad

No. 2791.

3/155

From

The Accountant General,  
Madras, 8<sup>th</sup> December  
1880, N<sup>o</sup> 4501.

I expect the a/c's  
& scripless are just.  
The rule is strictly laid  
down, but an exception  
is made in favor of any  
person who "entered the  
branch of the dept. in which  
is now the provided,  
"before Jan'y/79". Now,  
surely, the Secretariat has  
several branches, and the  
work of the Public works  
branch is quite distinct  
from the work in the  
bureaus which are provided  
over the Chief Secy - Mr.  
Colonel Sankar, ex. pr.,  
our able Secretary for  
works, is ~~not~~ <sup>a good</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup>  
Chief Secy? ~~and~~ <sup>if not</sup>,  
m

General  
FOR ORDERS.

Submitted that  
Mr. Pringle's case falls  
under exception (c) to  
paragraph 3 of Govt.  
of India Resolution  
N<sup>o</sup> 21-746-53. of the  
18<sup>th</sup> April 1879. The  
Government Secretariat,  
though composed of  
different offices, forms  
but one department  
m

Public 1880  
N<sup>o</sup> 4501  
3 DEC 1880

DEPARTMENT.  
ACCT. GENL'S OFFICE, MADRAS.

No.

FROM  
THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, MADRAS.

To  
The Secretary to Government  
Public Department

Dated 2<sup>nd</sup> December 1880  
Recd. 3<sup>rd</sup> No. of answer.  
And  
Subject. No. 2791.

The opportunity of  
attention to para 2 of the  
of the 'Departmental Committee'.  
dated 20<sup>th</sup> 8.0 dated 9 August  
1879. Public. No. 2228 and  
that funding special order  
he has disallowed the pay  
of Mr. Pringle as the  
to the Public Works Dept. of  
the Chief Secy. for  
Revenue No. 1880