3,000—5-2-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 5609

DATED 17th December 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording letter from the Accountant General stating that sub-protem arrangements are inadmissable in the case of certain Deputy Collectors placed on special duty in connection with the plague.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Establishment of the Records from the charge of the Record-keeper.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 7263

From The Accountant General Madras

Order his no 5009/717 14 Dec 1898.

Recorded.

17/12/98

Dated 21 Oct 1898

Received 22/10

Registered 25/10

Enclosures —

Spare copies

17/12/98
16 XII 98

SUBJECT.

Stating that sub Professional arrangements are inadmissible in the case of Officers placed on special duty in connection with Plague.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Dr to 8/10/98

Draft. Con. No 235

The Accl. General is requested to report whether there is any objection to substitution arrangements being made in the place of Deputy Collectors employed on Special duty in connexion with the plague.

Mills
8/x/98

Govt

Ootacamund
8th October 1898

To
The Accl General

Recd 8/10/98

Govt
7.R.98

BACK PAPERS

...ount of the Records from the charge of the Record-keeper.

Gazetted audit

DEPARTMENT.

FORT ST. GEORGE,

Accountant-General's Office,

21st October 1898.

No. 4751

From

T. Hesketh Biggs Esqr.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Secretary to Government,

Revenue Department.

SIR,

With reference to Government Memorandum No 235, dated the 8th of October 1898, I have the honour to state that I am of opinion that sub-pro-tem arrangements are inadmissible in the cases of officers placed on special duty in connection with plague, whose allowances are regulated by article 101 Civil Service Regulations.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

W. S. Dawson

for Accountant-General.

Cc. 21/10

D 2 1,000—7-9-93.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 7263 of 98

From the Acct. General, No 4751
Offrs note from Fml Dept
Dated 21. X and 19. XI. 1898.

A Opn. 235
8.X.98

FOR ORDERS.

To Undersecy

Messrs T. T. Lever and C. Gahan, two Dy Collectors of the 4th Grade having been appointed on special duty in connexion with the plague, the Acct. General was in Oct last requested to state whether there was any objection to making sub pro tem arrangements in their place

2. In reply thto, Acct. General, without citing any authority, expresses his opinion that sub pro tem arrangements are inadmissible in the case of the above Offrs "whose allowances" he says "are regulated by Art. 101 of the Civil Service Regulations

3. The Article in question, as it is worded, has reference only to "officers deputed to famine work". From the indexes of this office and from (H.O) enquiries made in the Financial Dept and in the Home Depts it does not appear that there has been any order of the Secy of State's extending the provisions of the article to plague officers, in general, who are deputed on plague duty.

From the notes sent H.O. by the F.D. (hereunto submitted it, however appears that that Dept recently held that Mr Lever's case would fall within the provisions of the above article and passed allowance to him accordingly. The G.O. on the subject has not been communicated to the H.D. nor does it appear that it was sent for the Secy's counter initials before issue. The original was applied for but it is stated that it is not now available and (it is understood) worn[illegible]

FOR ORDERS.

would not become available for sometime to come. The Hon: Sir Henry Bliss who had (other exceptions to the principle involved in) that order has, however, stated that "now "that the grant has been made "it must stand".

4. Whether the cases in question correctly fall under the provisions of (or not) Art: 101 of the C.S.R., it is apparently open to this Govt to decide if such pro tem arrangements should be made in place of Officers deputed on plague duty. In the case of famine officers the Govt in Dec[r] 1897 following a previous ruling made by it in 1877 declared that only acting and not sub pro tem allowances should be given to officers acting vice others employed on ~~plague~~ famine work. The Acct General it will be seen was at the time of opinion that sub pro tem allowances

vide correspondence in G.O. 1046-B 13. XII 97

allowances could be passed if necessary. It would thus appear that there is no account objection to sub pro tem arrangements being made in the place of the two Dy Collectors if the Govt. saw fit to do so — asking (other than sub pro tem) arrangements in the higher grades being inadmissible under the rules in the case of Dep.ty Collrs.

6. The question therefore whether sub pro tem arrangements should be made or not, in the cases under consideration, is submitted for orders.

13/XII.98

Secy

Tally in the decision in the case of famine, it would perhaps be better not to make Sub. arrangement, in [illegible] vacancies, caused by deputation of officers on [illegible]

To Under Secy

A draft G.O recording the paper is submitted

16/XII.98

[G. 75]

Pol
Political C. No. 3100

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

With ref: to C86 query
note on the docket, please see the notes flagged XIII in the enclosed file.

Cmd
13.XI.98

Send a copy of this note to Rev. Chard also.

11/11/98.
No. 2581 dt 21-11-98.

To. Revenue with copy of Secretariat notes dt 27.10.98 & 31.10-98.

Cmd
16/11/98.

11/19-11-98

RECEIVED IN THE SECRETARIAT OF MADRAS
16 NOV 98

...the Records from the charge of the Record-keeper.

Copy of note by the Hon.Sir H.W.Bliss,K.C.I.E., d/ 27th October 1898:-

I do not follow this or see the difficulty. Art.101 applies only to the case of an officer from another presidency or province. How can it be applied to (say)Mr.Lever? And(why, by the way, should Mr.Lever get a lot extra because employed as a Dy.Collector in one capacity rather than in another?

Copy of note by the Hon.Sir H.W.Bliss,K.C.I.E.,d/- 31st October 1898:-

I did not know any Police had got any increase.If they are brought into direct contact with plague,however, as no doubt they are, it is only reasonable that they should get an increase. Similarly with the Plague Commissioner. He has a "decided increase of work and responsibility"(v.art.98).But Mr.Lever's case is that, being a Dy.Collector, he is employed on different duty, viz. on patrolling the Bellary frontier (for which he gets travelling allowance) instead of sitting in an office. His station, even, has not been changed. It appears that H.E. passed the order granting Mr.Lever deputation allowance. But the order should have come to me, not to H.E. who is not in charge of either the Financial or Public Dept. I can't recollect that I ~~am~~ in any way authorized the grant. Now, however, that the grant has been made it must stand. Art.98 seems to me to fit the case and I can't ~~see~~ why any reference should be made to India.

PAPER

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
R = Copy reading only.

Papers taken out of the Records from the charge of the Record-keeper.

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

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	..	..	..	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.										
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.										
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.										

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
C = Copy abstract only.
D = Copy reading only.