

623

9

M.R.O. 1-20,002-12-8-65.

- (1) Number of Pages 18
(2) Date of repair 3-9-66
(3) Initials of the Referencer [Signature]

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.

B.P. No.

623

Press

Mis.

Dated

23.5.1874

196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

623

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd May 1874.*

No. 215. Read the following letter from the Superintendent of Revenue Survey,
to C. G. MASTER, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue
Department, dated Chepauk, 2nd April 1874, No. 1,064-32:—

At the request of Messrs. Cook and Baber, Assistant Superintendents, Revenue
Survey, I have the honour to submit an
original letter from each, relative to
the increased rate of pay sanctioned in
G. O., No. 212, of 16th February 1874.

No. 61-53 of 11th April 1874.
„ 165 „ of 16th „ „

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From E. M. BABER, Esq., Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, to Captain J. G. CLOETE,
Deputy-Superintendent, No. 1, Revenue Survey, dated Coimbatore, 16th April 1874,
No. 165.

GOVERNMENT Order, No. 212, of the 16th February 1874, passed with reference to
Mr. Cook's appeal against the ruling of the Accountant-General on G. O., dated 18th January
1873, No. 63, says that Mr. Cook is now entitled on completion of his five years' service to
Rs. 425 per mensem, and that the same provision is applicable to other officers similarly
situated.

2. It so happens that my case is precisely similar to Mr. Cook's, for we entered the
Survey Department on the same date, we were both promoted to Acting Second Assistant on the
11th March 1869, and were similarly temporarily transferred, on special duty, to the Settlement
Department.

3. Thus, according to the provisions of G. O., dated 16th February 1874, No. 212, I became
entitled to the increased allowance on the 11th March last. But I now find that a recent ruling
of the Accountant-General's debars me from the advantages of the late orders of Government on
the subject.

4. In the ruling (copy of which is enclosed for information), the Accountant-General says
that the increased allowance will be due after five years' actual service as *Uncovenanted
Assistant in the Revenue Survey Department*, and he fixes upon the 22nd May 1875 as the date
from which I am to draw my increased pay. Now the difference in time between this date and the
11th March 1874, which, as stated in paragraph 3, is the date on which I became entitled to the
increased allowance according to the G. O. first quoted, corresponds with the period of my special
duty with the Settlement Department; so the Accountant-General is evidently of opinion that
this period of special duty (1 year 2 months and 10 days) is not to count as service in my own
department.

5. With reference to this ruling, I have the honour to point out—

- (1.) That I did not apply for the Settlement Department, but was transferred to meet the
requirements of the public service, and was sent back to the Survey when no longer
required.
- (2.) That I certainly drew, as did Mr. Cook, about 1,500 Rs. more than I should have done
had I remained in the Survey as Second Assistant, but during my absence I was
twice superseded by officers junior to me.
- (3.) That if my settlement service is not to count towards the increased rates of pay
recently sanctioned, I must sustain a loss in pocket as well as in position and
prospects.

6. I beg, therefore, that you will forward this letter to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey,
with a request that the orders of Government may be obtained as to the correctness of the
Accountant-General's ruling, that the period of my special duty in the Settlement Department is

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd May 1874.*

not to count towards the five years' service necessary to qualify me for the increased rates of pay under G. O., dated 18th January 1873, No. 63.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. H. COOK, Esq., Second Assistant Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to the Deputy-Superintendent of Revenue Survey, No. 3 Party, dated 11th April 1874, No. 61-53.

I HAVE the honour to state that notwithstanding the Government have been pleased to rule in their order, No. 212, dated 16th February 1874, that I am "now entitled to my 425 Rs. a-month after five years' service," you will observe from the accompanying demi-official of the Accountant-General that he objects to my getting the increased allowance till July 1876, on the plea that during the last five years I had been employed in the Settlement Department *for a time*, and that service therein cannot count towards my getting the higher salary.

2. Considering that when the Government passed the above quoted order they must have been aware that I had served in the Settlement Department (inasmuch as I mentioned the same in my letter to Colonel Priestley which he forwarded, and the Superintendent also alluded to the fact in his own letter), and yet in face of this information were pleased to direct that I was *now* entitled to the increase sought, I cannot but think the Accountant-General's objection open to doubt, and would, therefore, respectfully request you would be so good as to forward, with such remarks as you may deem fit, this my letter and its enclosures to the Superintendent, and ask him kindly to submit the same at an early period to the Government for their final orders.

3. The question for which I have the honour respectfully to solicit the decision of Government amounts simply to this, namely, whether the five years' service mentioned in G. O., No. 212, of 16th February last, as entitling me to the increased salary, included that portion of my service I was *lent* to the Settlement, or whether the Government intended that I should have five years' *actual* service in the Survey in addition to the five years I was under Mr. Banbury.

4. The circumstance under which I entered the Settlement (though the fact is perhaps already known to Government) was that in 1871 on two of Mr. Banbury's Assistants being absent, —one on furlough and the other on promotion,—application was made to the Survey for two officers to supply their places, when Mr. Baber and myself were selected. Mr. Baber was gazetted to act for Mr. Mayor, and I for Major (then Captain) Stuart. On the return of these officers to their respective posts, we reverted to ours in the Survey.

5. It will thus be seen from what I have said, as well as from correspondence that has passed between the Superintendent and Mr. Banbury on the subject of my appointment, that I was merely *lent* to the Settlement Department for a short period, and though doing duty there was to all intents a Survey Officer.

6. Under these circumstances, I can scarcely think the Government intend that the portion of my five years' service which I spent in the Settlement Department should be prejudicial to my prospects as regards higher salary; but as the Accountant-General has thought good to differ and accordingly refuses to pass my pay at the new rate sanctioned in G. O., No. 212, of 16th February last, I have the honour to request their final decision on the matter, and trust I may be pardoned for the trouble I am giving.

7. In conclusion, I would respectfully request that if the Government be pleased to decide in my favour I may be permitted to draw back-pay from the date of completion of my five years, namely, 10th March 1874, inasmuch as the Accountant-General has retrenched the excess from my salary.

8. My bill for March I prepared in strict accordance with G. O., No. 212, which I thought had but one interpretation, that notwithstanding my service in the Settlement, which, as I have pointed out, was simply *lent*, I "was now entitled after five years to 425 Rs. a-month".

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd May 1874.*

No. 216.

ORDER THEREON, 23rd May 1874, No. 623.

Miscellaneous.

THE Superintendent of Revenue Survey forwards letters from two of his Assistants, requesting orders on a ruling of the Accountant-General which deprives them of the benefit of the higher rate of salary sanctioned to officers of their grade by the Resolution of the Government of India, dated 31st October 1872, No. 3,927 (Madras G. O., 18th January 1873, No. 63, Revenue Department).

2. According to this Resolution, the consolidated pay, inclusive of travelling allowance of a Second Assistant Superintendent, was fixed at Rs. 425 per mensem, with the proviso that for the first five years of their service *Civil* Second Assistants should only draw Rs. 325.

3. Messrs. Cook and Baber, who have now addressed Colonel Priestley, were promoted as Second Assistants on 11th March 1869, and claim the increased rate from 10th March 1874 when the period of five years expired.

4. It appears, however, that shortly after they became Second Assistants in the Survey Department it was found necessary, as a temporary measure, to utilize their services under the Director of Revenue Settlement, their names being retained in the meantime as permanent on the Survey Establishment to which, in due course, they reverted when their settlement duties were over.

5. The Accountant-General, it appears, is of opinion that this service in the Settlement Department cannot count towards the five years referred to in paragraph 2 *supra*.

6. The Government have already ruled (G. O., 16th February 1874, No. 212, Revenue Department), that Mr. Cook's claim to an increase of salary after five years could not be prejudiced by the fact that, for certain reasons, he had been considered *acting*. In the present case, they are similarly of opinion that neither he nor Mr. Baber should be sufferers from the fact that, on public grounds, their services had for a time been lent to the Settlement Department. It is true that they drew higher allowances while so employed, but their work was more important and harder, and this cannot be held to be a bar to their regular promotion in their own department.

7. It is observed that the present circumstances were alluded to in the letter recorded in G. O., 16th February last, No. 212.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.
,, the Director of Revenue Settlement.
,, the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 1064
32

Revenue Survey Office.

623
3/28 April 1874.

From

The Superintendent Revenue Survey.

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department.

SIR,

At the request of Messrs. Cook & Baker
Assistant Superintendents Revenue Survey, I have
the honour to submit an original letter from
each relative to increased rate of pay sanc-
tioned in G. O. No. 212 of 16th February 1874

No. 61 of 11th
53 April 74
165 of 16th Do

I have the honour to be
Sir

Yours Most Obedt Servant
Wm. Roberts Captain

1st Asst Supte for
Supte Revenue

Copd L^{tr}
Encl G. O.

Govt. of 1874
REVENUE.
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF
REVENUE SURVEY.
Dated May 29th 1874
Encl.
MAY.
Nos. 215-216.
Messrs. Cook and Baker, Assistant Superin-
tendents, Revenue Survey, Department.—Con-
sider the claims of — regarding increase to their
salaries tunable.



DEMI OFFICIAL.

Accountant General's Office,

Madras, April 8th 1874.

Sir,

Referring to our communication of the 1st inst. I beg to inform you that having referred to the papers connected with your case, I find that you are not entitled to the increased allowance till 20th July 1876 as your service in the Settlement Dept cannot count towards it.

I remain

Yours faithfully

R. H. S. S. S.

To
J. H. S. S. S.

18 June 1873 No 117-118

16 July 1874 - 1879.

No 1409
Reference 1874 September.

The duplicate of the

to the Secretary to Govt.

Rev. Secy to

Dated 28th April 1874

to 1874

No 1064
32

subject

submit 2 original

letters from Mr. S. S. S.

Govt. & Madras regarding

the increase of their pay

5023 June 1874 No 623

2/5.

Cy 7th May 1874 R 222

Revenue Department

N^o 623.

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 23rd May 1874

Read the following letter
from the Sup^t Rev. Survey.

Submitting 2 original
letters from Messrs. Cook &
Baker regarding the increase
of their pay.

H.C. 25th April 1874, N^o 1064/52

The Superintendent
of Revenue Survey forwards
letters from two of his
Assistants requesting
orders on a ruling of the
Accountant General which
deprives them of the benefit
of the higher rate of salary
sanctioned to Officers of
their grade by the Resolu-
tion of the Government of
India dated 31st October
1872 N^o 3927 (Madras
G.O. 18th January 1873, N^o 63

Revenue



9.1.12

Rs. 1409/12

L.S.
9.5.

13/3

Revenue Department.)

2. According to this Resolution the consolidated pay, inclusive of Travelling allowance of a second Assistant Superintendent was fixed at Rs 425 per mensem with the proviso that for ^{the} first five years of their service Civil second Assistants should only draw Rs 325.

3. Messrs. Cook and Baber, who have now addressed Colonel Puntley were promoted as second Assistants on 11th March 1869 and claim the increased rate from 10th March 1874 when the period of 5 years expired.

4. It appears however that

that shortly after ⁶²³ they became second Assistants in the Survey Department it was found necessary, as a temporary measure, to utilize their services under the Director of Revenue Settlement, their names being retained in the mean time as permanent on the Survey Establishment to which in due course they reverted when their Settlement duties were over.

5. The Accountant General it appears is of opinion that this service in the Settlement Department cannot count towards the five years referred to in paragraph

2. Supra.

6. The Government have already ruled (G.O. 16th February 1874 No. 212 Revenue Department) that Mr. Cook's claim to an increase of salary after five years could not be prejudiced by the fact that for certain reasons he had been considered acting. In the present case they are similarly of opinion that neither he, nor Mr. Baber, should be sufferers from the fact that on public grounds their services had for a time been lent to the Settlement Department. It is true that they drew higher allowances while so employed but



but their work was ^{62/8} more important and harder, and this cannot be held to be a bar to their regular promotion in their own Department.

7. It is observed that the present circumstances were alluded to in the letter recorded in G.O. 16th February last No. 212.

G.M.

To 13 Ld of Revenue Survey with 2 En
13 Ld of Revenue Settlement } Sep 1, 1874
6 Acct of Genl }

60/4

Montgomery
Regarding increase for
Salary of Mess Cook and
Baker of the Revenue
Survey Dept

Cor

Des

215-216.

Cyth May 1/74 R22²