

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2910

DATED 11th July 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Issuing amendment to para 4 of G.O. 2354
of 2-6-98. regarding overtime fees.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

0
18 4,000-19-1 97.

Revenue (1898) Department.

99. CURRENT No. 112.

From

*J. M. Atkinson Esq. Secy.
Madras.*

Order

No.

Dated 30 June

Received 2 July

Registered 2ⁿ

Enclosures 1.

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

*Regarding a statement
made at the end of para 4 of
G.O. No. 2354-Mis. in our time
2-6-98
jus.*

*11
2.9.98*

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

Remarks in the last sentence of para 11 of G.O. 2354, mis, dated 2^d June 1898 "that the total fee will not exceed £600 on any occasion".

It is evidently based on the supposition (1), that more men than comprise a salt preventive party (1 Ally officer & 5 Pione) will never be required, (2) that not more than one steamer will work overtime, or if more than one that the vessels will be moored close to each other within the harbour, (3) that one evening's overtime would be sufficient. The remark appears to be taken from para 6 of this office letter 1047 G. dated 22^d February 1898 in which the cost (roughly) of one party working for a single evening is set forth as an illustration of the charge for a special force supervising overtime work as compared with the large interests involved. It was not intended to

mean that under other circumstances
than those under consideration the
charge might not exceed the amount
mentioned.

2. The figures were arrived at as follows:-

1, Petty Officer @ Rs 10. per mensem =	per diem	1
1, 1 st Grade priv @ Rs 8		0-5-4.
		0-4-3.
2, 2 nd Grade privs @ Rs 7		0-7-4.
2, 3 rd " " @ Rs 6		0-6-4.
		<hr/> 1-7-3.

or Rs 1-8-0 per diem.

Overtime calculated as per G.O. 829, Rev.

30 September 1897 would be a day's pay

for every 4 hours or part of 4 hours

counting from the time the men left

Emore to the time of their return

thereto. If the force left by the

3.45 P.M. train and returned to Emore

by the train leaving the ^{Royapuram} Madras Station

@ 8 A.M. the following morning it

would have been about 16 hours.

$Rs 1/8 \times 4 = Rs 6$ to which must be

added

added, railway fare both ways viz

Rs 1-5-4 or a total cost of Rs 7-5-4.

It is however an open question whether

the Government intended that the force

should be charged for the remaining

hours of the night during which

work is done. If not some further

instructions as to how the fees are

to be calculated are necessary.

It does happen that with a

harbour full of steamers discharging

foreign cargoes & working up to 9 P.M.

that an occasional steamer laden with

Kerosine oil cases anchored at Coimbatore

& requires to work overtime also.

This occurred in April and as the

existing staff was inadequate a

requisition was made on Emore

factory for 2 Petty Officers & 10 men,

the fees for the force amounting

to Rs 12-10-0; & to say that the fees

on any occasion would not amount

to more than Rs 6 or 7 is not quite
accurate. It might also happen
that two steamers moored on opposite
sides of the harbour and discharging
on the beach would require special
supervision in which case more than
one party would be necessary in the
event of the customs staff being
fully employed tallying cargo on the
pier. If the sentence was altered into
"Rs 6 or 7 per night per steamer on special
occasions" it would lead to less
for misunderstanding in the event of the
customs amounting to more than the
sum now mentioned by the Government.

This will hardly do. The
figure was exceeded in
April — It might be
"will not, generally exceed
Rs 6 or 7 per steamer
per night"

Sea Customs Collector's Office,
MADRAS,

D.O. *6/7* June 30 1898.

My dear *Forbes*
Yesterday I received
B.P. (Sep. Rev) No 2431
dated 14th June; forwarding
a copy of P.O. Rev.
No. 2354 dated 2nd June
1898. — The statement
at the end of para 4 of
the P.O. ("The total fee
will not exceed Rs 6 or 7 on
any occasion") is hardly
accurate, & might lead to

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
No. 1
Dated 11/2

to more than Rs. 60/- is not quite accurate. It might also happen that two steamers moored on opposite sides of the harbour and discharging on the beach would require special supervision in which case more than one party would be necessary in the event of the customs staff being fully employed tallying cargo on the pier. If the sentence was altered into "Rs. 60/- per night per steamer on special occasions" it would lead to less misunderstanding in the event of the fees amounting to more than the sum now mentioned by the Government.

This will hardly do. The figure was exceeded April — It might be "will not generally exceed Rs. 60/- per steamer per night" —

misunderstanding with the Chamber of Commerce. I enclose a note which I have had drawn up in my office, which will explain matters. I think the wording of the sentence in the R.O. should be altered a little, so as to avoid the appearance of fixing a maximum charge.

Yours sincerely,
J. H. M. M. M.

Read D.O. from Mr Atkin
Des. dt 30-6-98
(D.O. cor: 112 of 98)

To Secretary.

Para 4 of G.

No. 2354 dt 2-6-98 run
as follows: -

"As regards the
"scale of fees sancti-
"ed in G.O. No. 829 dt
"30-9-97, the Govt ob-
"serves that it is by
"no means excessive
"compared with the
"fees which the Harbour
"Trust Board pays
"to its employees and
"that the total fee
"will not exceed
"Rs 6 or 7 on any occa-
"sion."

Mr Atkinson points
out that the words
underlined, [which,
by the way, were
based on the portion
of his letter marked
in red pencil on
pages 7 and 8 of the

c4/7/98

~~are~~ current under ^{the} ~~are~~
 are hardly accurate,
 and that they might
 lead to misunderstanding
 with the chamber
 of commerce. To
 avoid the appearance
 of fixing a maximum
 charge, he suggests
 a modification of
 the wording as follows:-
 "and that the total
 fee will not generally
 exceed Rs 6 or 7 per
steamer per night.
 2. May an erratum
 issue in this sense?

KD
4/7/98

H.H.
 It will be safer
 JH
 4/7/8

9/7/98

Please see a draft
order below.

KD
9/7/98

11/7/28
 11/7/28

To the chamber of commerce.
 - Board S.R.
 " Colls of ~~under~~ Sea Customs

Defd
 14.7.98

G.O. mis No: 29/04/11 July 1898.

The following
erratum ^{will be} issued:-

For the words
 "and that the total
 fee will not exceed
 Rs 6 or 7 on any occa-
 sion" occurring at
 the end of para 4
 of G.O. No. 2354 d. 2-6-98.
 Substitute

"and that the total
 fee will not generally
 exceed Rs 6 or 7 per
 steamer per night."

KD
9/7/98

JH
 11/7/8

From orders.

SAV
 9/7/98

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ } 189
When examined _____
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____ DATED _____
189 ,

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO U. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

0

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.