

Care
ORDINARY, MS.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED *19-1-92*
No. *41*

INDEXED.

Care
~~When given for copying~~

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Regarding despatch
for Ministry of State
containing proposals for
reducing the work
of the Chief Secretary*

*Recd
8 I 2/11*

1-10

*13-11-11
18/9/03*

17-3-13 ✓

Financial

No. 219.

Public C.N.P. 371

India Office

London, 5th November 1891.

I

His Excellency the Most Honourable
The Governor General of India in Council

My Lord Marquis,

as Secretariat: as
the appt. of an addl.
Under Secretary.

I have considered in Council your
Excellency's letter, dated the 25th of August No. 238 in which
you support a proposal made by the Government of Madras for
relieving the Chief Secretary's branch of their Secretariat by
the appointment of an additional Under Secretary on a
salary of Rupees 1200/- a month.

2. I am most reluctant to sanction any additional
appointment in the Secretariat, if it can be avoided; and I
cannot but think that it may be possible to reduce the work
of the Chief Secretary at Madras by following the course
adopted in Bombay of transferring to the Military Department
the Marine and the Ecclesiastical business. At Madras
also the Financial work might be performed by the
Revenue Secretary.

3. If, after such transfers of work as the Local
Government may be able to effect, it will be still necessary
to give additional assistance to the Chief Secretary, I am
of opinion that this should take the form of the appointment
of an additional Unconvenanted Assistant, for which post

I

I doubt not that it would be practicable to find a native of India fully qualified..

It. I take this opportunity of impressing upon your Government the importance of checking the growth of work, both in your own offices and in those of the local Governments, by dispensing with all unnecessary reports and returns, and by delegating greater authority to the subordinate Boards and officers. In connection with this subject, I desire to draw your attention to my Despatch dated the 2nd of July last, No. 128, in this Department, and to that of the 26th of March No. 35 (Revenue).

I have, &c.,
(Signed) Cross

No. 4789
Government of India.
Finance and Commerce Department.
Calcutta, the 28th November 1891.

Read. -

Despatch from Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, No. 219 Financial, dated the 5th November 1891, received on the 25th November 1891.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Home Department, in continuation of endorsement No. 3593, dated the 25th August 1891.

(sd) A. Kensington
By: Secretary to the Govt of India.

No. 560

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras for information in continuation of letter No. 320 dated the 1st September last..

By order,

Home Department.

(Establishments)

Calcutta, the 8th Dec 1891.

M. M. M.

Under Secretary to the Govt of India.

(sd) M. M. M.

UNDER SECRETARY
13 DEC 91
PUBLIC SECRETARY

287
21991

A is constantly overflowing.
It has been suggested
that there shall be an
off-take to A [an Under Secy.
who may deal finally with
certain papers of consequence]

No: says the India Office
we cannot but think it ~~impossible~~
to reduce the volume of
water discharged into A.

Divers one of the large
streams, & one of the moderate
sized ones, & one of the
very little, & turn the
first into B.

And then, if there are
still floods, have a lock
put up (& mind it is
not a white ~~whore~~
one) an one of the re-
maining streams, & all
will go well.

4. The Revenue Secy., it has
been agreed upon by Members
of Govt., has his hands
quite full enough without
transferring some three
thousand papers (the
probable number in the
Financial dept. this year)
to him. Moreover, there is
believed to be a distinct gain
in having some continuity
as regards the establishment
which is employed in noting
& drafting an financial work.
Much of it requires for correct
disposal a knowledge of what
has been going on for months &
years - a knowledge of what
Members of Govt. have said about
various questions. It happens
that those in charge at present

Pub. 475-6
7-6-91 & 867
11-9-91

From

Govt. of India
Home Dept.

No. 560

Dated 8th }
Received 14 } Decr. 91
Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Regarding proposals for reducing
the work of the Chief Secy.

Recd. 17/12/91

For orders, ~~which~~
It appears from the
terms of the Secy
of State's despatch
that he will in no
circumstances sanction
the addition of an
Under Secretary to the
Staff. & the only question
remaining is the policy
of (1) doing all or part
of what he suggests
(2) doing any thing
else to relieve the Chief
Secretary.

1. As to (1), it is difficult
to understand how such
suggestions can have much
value.
2. Suppose two tanks of limited
capacity. In to one are
discharging three large
streams (the publ. Public
& Finl. depts), three moderate
sized ones (the Coll. Educat.
& Marine depts), & two little
ones (the Eccles. & Legislative
depts).

In to the other B.L. the
Rev. Secy. two large streams
[the Revenue & Pension depts]
are discharging.
It has been shown that
B is filled at ordinary seas
not to speak of flood-tides
& it has been shown that

the present the Secretary
& of the work are to be
transferred to the Revenue
Secretary. It is believed that
from no fault whatever
of the rem hands who
would have to undertake
the work (it would be
disposed of less quickly,
& on the whole less correctly,
than now - they are who
has had experience of
budget work will know
that the disposal of
numbers of estimates will
occupy far as five times
as long when there has
been no previous knowledge
of the items.

There is also the ob-
jection of the dislocation
which the transfer of the
dept. will cause. Recently
of late years, there has
been a system of gross
interference in the Chief
Secy's depts which has
greatly facilitated work.
but with one dept. or
more separated & placed
in another office the
general index will be
of the past will be
of much less use.

Yet again, it is true
that the Bombay Govt.
unites finance & revenue
under one Secretary, but
the conditions are different.
The Govt. of India on the

other hand prefers to have
 separate Secretaries for
 the subjects. The Chief
 Secy. has held charge
 of the Finl. Dept. for
 many years - Generally
 speaking, the Secy. who
 has held charge, as is
 usually the case in Madras,
 first of the Revenue Dept.
 & then of the others,
 takes some interest in
 finance, & there is a
 fair in the older &
 more experienced man
 watching over the purse
 strings. The Revenue Dept.
 is the great spending
 dept. & it is just as
 well not to unite the
 two.

And lastly, if this
 particular charge is taken
 from him, & he becomes
 merely a Secretary in charge
 of certain branches of
 work, important indeed
 but of less importance
 than Revenue & Finance.
 The raison d'être of
 the Chief Secretary possibly
 ceases. Govt. will prob-
 ably not wish to make the
 change so antagonistic
 to the practice of
 many years.

With regard to the
 transfer of the Marine
 & Eccles. depts. to

* So does the Bengal
 Govt., which has a
 Secy. for Finl. & Municipal
 matters, separate from
 the Chief Secy. & the
 Revenue Secy.
 So does the Govt. of
 N. W. P. & Aundh.

the Military Dept., it does not
 rather in the rightest
 Secy. does the Eccles. and
 its transfer will relieve
 the Chief Secy. of a
 paper or two per
 diem. He had better
 keep it on for the
 reason that his office
 can put up papers &
 precedents, & draft
 disposals, quicker than
 any other office could
 without two or three
 years knowledge of
 past disposals.
 As to the Marine Dept.
 it has already been pointed
 out that the conditions
 are different in this respect.
 There is a fitness in the
 Military Secy. at Bombay
 or Calcutta disposing
 of much Marine work
 as there is an Indian ^{marine} ~~thing~~
 at Madras. There
 are two or three papers
 in the year connected with
 men of war or harbour
 defences. The great
 bulk of the ~~prospective~~
 have to do with the
 financial position of the
 ports on the large sea
 board of the Presidency
 & if any transfer of the

dept. as a whole should
be thought advisable,
it ought to be preceded
by a transfer of much
of the work to the
Financial Dept.

That the transfer
of part of the Marine
work would relieve the
Chief Secy. to some
extent may be decided.
The subjects are at
times complicated &
troublesome. But without
disrespect to Genl.
Hope, ^{of the service of a Chief Secy} a ~~traveller~~ is
probably more likely
from local knowledge
of many of the parts,
acquired during twenty
years service in different
districts, & from ac-
quaintance with the
working of district
officials, ^{to properly} to appreciate
these subjects than
an officer whose service
has been confined to
Military Stations &
whose study has been
in questions relating
to Her Majesty's Army.
There might be said
in favour of transferring

the Marine work to the
P.W. Secy., but it may
be doubted whether this
would work particularly
well.

As to the suggestion
to appoint another
uncanvanted assistant
to be a Native of India,
to the Chief Secy's office, &
this is to be done, it
appears, only if the
transfer of the three
depts. named by the
Secretary of State is
found to give only a
partial relief.

This must have been
proposed by Sir Alex.
Dikuthwa, & shows
an entire misapprehension
of the state of things.
The reasons of this
class are of no use
in relieving the Chief
Secy. of work. They
can only add to it,
by making work for
him; they cannot, of
course, present a
single paper of con-
sequence.
Another assistant would
merely relieve those now

in the office of part
of their work, & this
is neither necessary nor
desirable.

All papers that are
run put before the
Chief Secy. are put
before him with notes
by his Under Secretaries
or by the Assistants.
& it is obvious that
the appointment of
another of the latter
class could not possibly
take away a
single file paper those
put before him. The
newly appointed man
would merely note on
papers which ~~some~~^{otherwise} same Under
Secy. or assistant
would have noted on.
Those papers would come
to him all the same,
they would take up
his time just as much.

As to (ii): all
things considered,
the Chief Secy. is
convinced that no action
be taken on the despatches
& that it be simply
recorded. Work will
be despatched in the

best way it can be. That
is all he can say.
At the same time, it
is amazing that the
doctrine of ~~the~~^{the}
opinion as to the injudic-
iousness of adding to the
Secretariat should be
set against the know-
ledge of the actual state
of things which Govt.
possesses, & impracticable
alterations in the detail
of Madras Sect. work,
based on experience
of about a quarter of
a century ago, suggested.
The Govt. of India have
added 4 Secretaries
all round, it is under-
stood, & Bengal &
the N. W. P. have managed
at one time & another
to obtain sanction in
the former case for one
Chief & two (Civil) Secretaries
(P.W. Secretaries & 1st Series
excluded as in this case?)
with four Under
Sect. Secretaries - in the
latter case for one Chief
& two (Civil) Secretaries
with three Under Secretaries.

As to the general remarks
about reducing work.

C. No. 3715/81

Order 19 Jan 92 41

Recorded.

from order

17/1

16/1

Additional
Order Secy.

There does not appear much to
be done. The suggestions of the
India Office do not seem practicable.

W
15 Jan.

H. M. & C. C.

An Act of Parliament, which is to be a
Notice of India, is of no use.
I doubt whether it will be of any
use in the future - L. H. J.
13/1/92

There is apparently nothing to be done unless
perhaps delegating larger powers to the
Boards & Officers. In what direction
this can be done is not apparent. The
departments mentioned in para 4 of
the S. of S. Committee to the Govt.
of India have not been commended
to this Govt.
What the Secy of State perhaps would
be able to do is to afford the slightest relief. The
work of the Office is more than any
one man can do and is steadily
increasing.

L. H. J.

I don't think anything can be done
I was never very certain that the app't
of an additional Under Secy was wanted

C. 7/1

W. C.
8 Jan

it is of little use saying
this unless local faults
are given a much freer
hand in regard to returns.
That much could in any
case be done in this
Secretariat in this respect
may be doubted. A
good deal of attention
has been given to this
point, but the results
have not been large.
Mr. Carden, who as the
Hon. Secy. Members will
know, had a ~~large~~
reducing mark in his
dept., did all he could
first in the publ., &
then in the S. & M.
dept., but found that
very little could be done.
He had a return knocked off.
Here another. Had there
the same Dept. prescribed
three or four new ones,
& the work is greater than
before.

Something could be done
perhaps, could one see
the way, in stopping officers
& Boards from making
two or three letters where
one would do. But this
is the vice of the age,
& short of prescribing a
maximum number of letters
to be written in a year, or
restricting the supply of st. 2 -
of both of these steps - the cure
is difficult to find.

17/12