

(1) Number of Pages.....10.
(2) Date of repair.....18.6.1966
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	212	Press
~~B.P. No.~~		~~Mis~~
Dated	16 th Feb	1874
		196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

212

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
16th February 1874.

No. 138. Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to D. F. CARMICHAEL, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Chepauk, 9th January 1874, No. 59-4 :—

I HAVE the honour to forward, as requested, a letter from Mr. J. Cook, Acting Second Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, bringing to notice what he considers the hardship of his case as affected by the ruling of the Accountant-General on G. O., dated 18th January 1873, No. 63.

2. With reference to Mr. Cook's case, I have to point out—

(1.) That Mr. Cook does not complain of having been deprived of any pay or allowances; his complaint being that he does not obtain an increase never hitherto enjoyed by any Survey officer.

(2.) That he was transferred to the Settlement Department on increased pay, and that, during the two years he served under Mr. Banbury, he probably drew more than Rs. 2,000 in excess of what he would have drawn in the Survey.

(3.) That the case of Military officers, as affected by G. O., No. 63, of 18th January 1873, is infinitely harder than Mr. Cook's; in some cases amounting to a total stoppage of promotion and the removal of all prospect of increased pay, however long they may remain in the department.

(4.) That, as reported in my letter, dated 31st January 1873, No. 307-9, paragraph 4, in anticipation of the scheme for re-organizing the department being sanctioned, some vacancies in the officer's grade were not filled up.

3. I cannot, therefore, support Mr. Cook's application, as his promotion will cause embarrassment in carrying out the scheme for re-organization and for placing Survey officers, as regards pay and allowances, on a footing more nearly approaching, than at present, that of Survey officers in Bengal and Bombay. Mr. Cook draws, and will continue to draw, the full pay of Second Assistant Superintendent at the same rate as all Second Assistants have hitherto drawn it:

P.S.—I beg to append, for reference, a memorandum on the subject of the pay of Survey officers in Madras.

No. 139. ORDER THEREON, 16th February 1874, No. 212.

Miscellaneous.

It is clear that Mr. Cook is not an acting officer in the sense in which his claim to an increase of salary after five years could be prejudiced. He has really been serving in a permanent position on the establishment, though, for the reasons given by Colonel Priestley, he has not been entered as "permanent." The Governor in Council is of opinion that he is now entitled, on completion of his five years' service, to Rs. 425 per mensem, and that the same decision is applicable to other officers similarly situated.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.
.. the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Revenue Survey Office.
6 Sep 1874.
212

The Superintendent Revenue Survey.

The Secretary to Government

Revenue Department.

SIR,

I have the honour to forward, as requested, a letter from Mr J. Cook Esq. ^{sub} Assistant Superintendent Revenue Survey bringing to notice what he considers the hardship of his case as affected by the ruling of the Accountants General, on G A dated 18th January 1870.

2/ With reference to Mr Cook's
case, I have to point out,

I That Mr. Cook does not complain of having been deprived of any pay or allowances, his complaint being that he does not obtain an increase never hitherto

[illegible]

enjoyed by any Survey Officer.

II That he was transferred to the Settlement Department on increased pay and that during two years he served under Mr. Bamberg he probably drew more than Rs 2000 in excess of what he would have drawn in the Survey.

III That the case of Military officers as affected by G.O. No 63 of 18th January 1873 is infinitely harder than Mr. Cook's in some cases amounting to a total stoppage of promotion and the removal of all prospect of increased pay however long they may remain in the Department.

IV That as reported in my letter dated 31st Jan^r 1873 Para 4, in anticipation of the scheme for re-organising the Department being sanctioned some vacancies in the officers

grade were not filled up
3/ I cannot therefore support Mr. Cook's application as his promotion will cause embarrassment in carrying out the scheme for re-organisation and for placing Survey Officers as regards pay and allowances on a footing more nearly approaching, than at present, that of Survey Officers in Bengal and Bombay. Mr. Cook draws and will continue to draw the full pay of Second Assistant Superintendent at the same rate as all Second Assistants have hitherto drawn it.

I have the honour to be
Sir

Your most obt^d servant
W. Priestley Esq

Superintendent Revenue
Survey

P.S. I beg to append for reference

a memo on the subject of the pay
of Survey officers in Madras.

Sp

Revenue 1874 Sept.

From H^o 285

Mr. Superintendent

Mr. Survey

Mr. Secretary to Govt

Mr. Secy

Oct 9

Sept 29

Oct 30

Revenue Dept

H^o 59

S. G. No. 212-16. 26. 74

Subordinate on engine

Letter from Mr. Secy

Mr. Secy stating that

he cannot recommend

We can pass it - No. 202
one - Not application etc
made - There are no regulations
paper? Passed then 3 or 4 months
ago? Much
3/11

None whatever
It is a very hard
case. I. O. S. D.
H. J. P. R. S. D.

212/4
From Sup^t Rev. Survey
2/9-1-74
received 30th Jan.

This, Mr. Cooke's - case seems a
hard one -
He has been 5 years in a certain grade,
& is now by the Rules entitled to an
increase in pay - the Audit Officer
objects "he was only acting"

But it is shown that he was not
a mere 'locum tenens' - Col Priestley
explains that Mr. Cooke has not been
called 'permanent', because he, he thought
it not fit to delay making him so
in anticipation of a certain Re-organ-
ization scheme being sanctioned by Govt.,
which was submitted on the 22nd May '71,
now going on for three years & more,
but on which no orders have been passed by
Govt. As this scheme involves a
considerable additional cost, it is of course
never likely to be sanctioned -

So here, meanwhile, any reason for
withholding Mr. Cooke's increased pay, on
the facts of the case, he cannot be helped?
L. O. S. D.
H. J. P. R. S. D.
S. G. No. 307-74.

come to the same
 meeting and I think
 we had a happy
 conference of all the
 members and took
 action on the
 report of the
 committee on the
 scheme of the
 were then (I think)
 recommended
 was voted that
 the committee
 be had called
 after the

138-139

Questioning Mr Cook's
Belonging - R. & S. Survey

Mr Cook G.O. ^{dist. from admt.}
No 2/20
It is clear that Mr Cook

is not an acting Officer, in the
sense in which his claim to an
increase of Salary after five years
could be prejudiced. He has really
been serving in a permanent
position on the Estab^t, though for
the reasons given by Col Priestley he
has not been entered as "permanent".
The G.O. is of opinion that he is
now entitled, on completion of his
5 years service, to Rs 425 per mensem,
and that the same decision is appl^y
to other officers similarly situated.

16: Feby/74 55.6.5/2-74

13th Sept. Res. Survey dis.
6. Oct. 1974 17 Feb 74
43
3

31 per R.S. 138